

COUNCIL

MONDAY, 19TH JUNE, 2017

At 7.30 pm

in the

DESBOROUGH SUITE - TOWN HALL,

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
3.	<u>BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN</u> To consider the above report	3 - 114

This page is intentionally left blank



Borough Local Plan 2017

Statement on Regulation 18 Consultation
(December 2016)

May 2017

Contents

	Page
1 Introduction	5
2 Consultation Actions	6
Promotion of the consultation	6
Consultation events	7
Feeding back to the consultation	7
3 Responses to the Consultation	8
Appendix 1 - Press Notices	12
Appendix 2 – Consultation posters	16
Appendix 3 - Consultation postcard	17
Appendix 4 - People and groups responding	20
Appendix 5 - Questionnaire	21
Appendix 6 – Main issues raised in Reg 18 Consultation and the Council’s response	23

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) is in the process of preparing a Borough Local Plan to replace the saved policies of the Local Plan adopted in 1999. As part of this process, the Council undertook a consultation on the draft Local Plan from 2 December 2016 to 13 January 2017 in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 1.2 The purpose of this consultation statement is to set out how the Council undertook this consultation and the findings that emerged from it. The following document summarises how we consulted, who was invited to make representations, the comments that were received and how we have responded to these in the Draft Borough Local Plan (Submission version).
- 1.3 Approximately 6,000 comments were received during the Regulation 18 consultation. This statement summarises the main comments received and our response to them. It identifies what consultation was undertaken, when, with whom and how it has influenced the new version of the plan.
- 1.4 This report has been produced in accordance with Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012 (Clause 22) (1)(c)(i-iv). This states that a Consultation Statement has to be produced to show:
- Which bodies and persons RBWM invited to make representations under Regulation 18;
 - How those bodies and persons were invited to make representations under Regulation 18
 - A summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to Regulation 18
 - How any representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account
- 1.5 The Consultation Statement will assist the Inspector at the Examination in determining whether the borough's Local Plan complies with the requirements for public participation and government guidance. The report shows that the consultation carried out by the borough has complied with the statutory requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012 (Regulation 18). The report also shows that public involvement was carried out following the approach set out in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

2. Consultation Actions

- 2.1 There is considerable flexibility open to local planning authorities in how they carry out the initial stages of plan production, provided they comply with the specific requirements in Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, ('the Local Plan Regulations') on consultation, and with the commitments made within an adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

Promotion of the consultation

- 2.2 Consultation on the draft Borough Local Plan (Reg 18) document took place between Friday 2 December 2016 and 13 January 2017.
- 2.3 The Reg 18 consultation was promoted through a variety of means. These included:
- Formal notifications of the consultation were sent by email or letter to the specific and general consultation bodies set out in the SCI as well as other individuals and organisations on the Councils Local Plan consultee database that requested to be notified. Together this involved contacting 2,450 people/organisations.
 - Part of the Planning Policy webpage was devoted to the draft Local Plan Reg 18 consultation event. This gave people access to information on the consultation as well as the Reg 18 draft Borough Local Plan and the supporting documentation.
 - The Local Plan documents were made available online and in hard copy at town and Parish Offices and public libraries. Libraries have specific facilities to enable disabled users to access the consultation material including large print screens.
 - Statutory notices were placed in 4 papers:
 - Bracknell News – 30th November 2016
 - Maidenhead Advertiser – 1 December 2016
 - Slough/Windsor Express – 2nd December 2016
 - London Gazette – 2nd December 2016.Copies of the Adverts are in Appendix 1.
 - Press releases occurred in the Maidenhead Gazette 29th November 2016 and in the Council's newsletter - 'Around the Royal Borough'.
 - Public posters and banners were distributed across the borough to raise awareness of the Plan and Consultation (Appendix 2).
 - A takeaway postcard was made available at libraries, Council and Parish offices and the Consultation events. This postcard set out the main themes of the BLP, encouraged people to have their say on the plan and indicated how they could find out more and have their say. (Appendix 3)
 - Social media was also used:

- A total of 20 ‘tweets’ were sent from the RBWM twitter account using #RBWM_BLP. A number of Borough Councillors “re-tweeted” the information to their followers.
- Nine posts were made by the Planning Policy team on the RBWM facebook page. This included two posts prior to the start of the consultation.

Consultation events

- 2.4 3 public consultation events were held in the borough libraries. Staff and Members were available at the events to answer questions:
- Maidenhead Library
Thursday 8th December from 3pm to 6.45pm with 34 Public Attendees.
 - Windsor Library
Tuesday 13th December from 3pm to 6.45pm with 27 Public Attendees.
 - Ascot Durning Library
Thursday 15th December 3pm to 6.45pm with 37 Public Attendees.

At the events a copy of the Draft Local Plan and supporting documents were available.

Feeding back to the consultation

- 2.5 General and ad-hoc comments could be provided through a number of means including;
- Questionnaires (available both online on the Draft Local Plan website and in hard copy versions).
 - Comments could be made online via Objective, the Councils consultation system which allowed people the time to consider what they wanted to say and in their own time.
 - Submission of letters and emails.
- 2.6 A copy of the questionnaire is contained in Appendix 4.

3. Responses to the Consultation

- 3.1 As a result, of the methods outlined in Section 2 , approximately 6,000 comments were received from 2,148 different respondents during the consultation.
- 3.2 Comments were received from a wide range of people and organisations including statutory consultees, land owners and developers, Parish councils, special interest groups, neighbourhood planning groups and individual residents. Organisations concerned with the preservation and enhancement of the natural environment were well represented, as were resident groups and parish councils.
- 3.3 Two petitions were received in response to the consultation. The first was received in relation to the allocation of Site HA11 and received 40 signatories. The second objected to the level of development for Ascot, Sunningdale and Sunninghill and received 1374 signatories. Several standard letter templates were used by residents. The first of these objected to the number of homes proposed in the Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale area. The second related to the allocation of sites HA6, 7, 8 &9 on highway grounds.
- 3.4 Details of the respondents are set out in Appendix 5.
- 3.5 The key themes emerging from the consultation were:

a. Support for many policies

Respondents expressed support for many of the policies (either in whole or in part) and the plan objectives. Noteable policies attracting support included the SP1 - Spatial Strategy, SP5 (River Thames), ED1 Economic Development, HE1(Historic Environment) and NR3 (Managing Flood Risk and Waterways)

b. DTC & Neighbourhood plans

Respondents raised the issue of fulfilment of the Duty to Co-operate requirements. Calls were made for an early Plan review to deal with cross border issues, including unmet needs arising from HMA partners.

The importance and role of Neighbourhoods plans and planning process were often commented on in responses. Concern was expressed that the BLP did not take sufficient account of neighbourhood development plans.

c. Mixture of support and opposition to Spatial strategy

The spatial strategy was of particular interest to respondents and attracted a mixture of support and opposition. The strategy of urban expansion, limited Green Belt

release and meeting objectively assessed housing and employment needs (OAHN) in full was supported by some. For others, urban expansion, indicative capacity of sites and loss of green belt was not supported, principally on grounds of character and insufficient infrastructure to support the development.

d. GB release and boundary adjustments

A mixture of responses were received in relation to the proposed Green Belt release. These included:

- Support for the Green Belt release
- Requests for further Green Belt release to meet need
- Requests for existing settlements washed over Green Belt to be inset from the Green Belt
- Suggested minor adjustments to boundaries taking further areas out of the Green Belt
- Opposition to the Green Belt release, asking for it to not happen or for the release to be more limited.

A number of respondents did not consider exceptional circumstances had been demonstrated for Green Belt release. Others did feel Exceptional Circumstances had been demonstrated.

e. Housing requirements

The proposed housing target and commitment to meeting full objectively assessed need attracted both support and opposition. Those opposing the housing requirement were divided between whether the target was too low or too high. Some respondents considered the target needed to be reduced in order for constraints (such as Green Belt) to be recognised. Others felt the requirements were too low and should be increased to help meet unmet housing need in other areas such as Slough, South Bucks and London.

f. Maidenhead Growth area

There was a mixture of support for Maidenhead as a growth area. Some considered Maidenhead was being asked to accommodate too much growth and sought the maintenance of green gaps between Maidenhead and Holyport, Bray and Cookham. A number of respondents supported the expansion of the high density area where tall buildings could be accommodated beyond the defined town centre area. Others sought the retention of the Maidenhead Town Centre AAP Tall buildings policy in terms of area and height. It was considered that the cluster of strategic sites south of Maidenhead Town Centre were interdependent and should be considered on a comprehensive basis.

g. Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale

Many respondents suggested that the Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale area was allocated too much development in the Spatial strategy. There was a concern that the level of development proposed would undermine the character of the area and that insufficient infrastructure would be provided to support it.

h. Need for additional sites

Many respondents suggested additional sites would be needed to meet the housing requirement. One of the reasons for this was a belief that the deliverability of some of the sites proposed in the Reg 18 document was questionable. A number of additional sites were suggested to meet the need.

i. Infrastructure

Respondents considered the existing highways, open space and community infrastructure would insufficient to meet the growth needs set out in the BLP. There was strong support for the provision of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan to accompany the BLP.

j. Affordable housing

Respondents sought the provision of higher levels of affordable housing provision but did query whether it was achievable.

k. Need for plan to take London population growth, Heathrow expansion, Cross Rail and Brexit into account

Respondents suggested there was a need for plan to take London population growth, Heathrow expansion, Cross Rail and Brexit into account.

l. Waterways and Flooding

Respondents frequently highlighted the importance and significance of the Waterways project and expected the Plan to make reference to it.

The flooding constraints affecting the Borough were recognised and respondents stressed the need for the plan to take a sequential approach to the allocation of sites in light of this.

m. Phasing of sites

Respondents suggested that the Plan should phase the release of Green Belt sites to the back end of the plan period. Others reflected concern that the plan was backloaded and would not meet housing need now.

n. Evidence base

Respondents identified the need for parts of the evidence base to be updated and for it to include an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and housing land availability assessment.

o. Commitment to early review

A number of respondents suggested that an early review of the plan would be needed to deal with uncertainties relating to deliverability, unmet need and employment evidence base.

p. Need for policy rationalisation and clarification

Respondents suggested some rationalisation and clarification of the policies in the plan to deal with duplication. The Design policies were singled out for particular attention.

3.6 The main issues raised in the Reg 18 consultation on the Draft Borough Local Plan, as well as the Council's responses, are set out in Appendix 6.

3.7 All responses received to the Draft BLP Reg 18 consultation are available to view online via the consultation portal using the following hyperlink:

<http://consult.rbwm.gov.uk/portal/blr/blr/blr>

Appendix 1: Press Notices

BRACKNELL NEWS

Wednesday, November 30, 2016 35

Public Notices

Tel: 0118 9553333
Fax: 0118 9553330

BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL
(BOND WAY, BRACKNELL)
(PROHIBITION OF WAITING AND STOPPING) ORDER 2016

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Bracknell Forest Borough Council has made an Order under Sections 1(1), 2(1) to 2(4) and Part IV of Schedule 2 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 as amended, and the Traffic Management Act 2004.

Effects of the Order:
The effects of the Order are to:
1) To revoke the existing restrictions as detailed in Schedules 1 and 2.
2) To introduce the restrictions as detailed in Schedules 3 and 4.

The Order was made on the 23rd day of November 2016 and will come into operation on the 13th day of December 2016.

Further Details:
Copies of this notice, the Order, the REMITTANCE OF PROVISIONS AND THE JOURNALS of the Environment, Culture and Communities Department reception, Time Square, Market Street, Bracknell, Berkshire RG12 4JD between 9.00 a.m. and 5.00 p.m. on Mondays to Fridays.

Objections:
Any person wishing to question the validity of the Order or any of its provisions, on the ground that it is not within the powers of the relevant enabling Act, or that a requirement of any such enabling Act or of any relevant regulations made thereunder has not been complied with, may within 6 weeks from the 30th day of November 2016, make application for this purpose to the High Court.

Dated 20th November 2016
Vincent Palacka
Director of Environment, Culture and Communities

Plumbing & Heating

CosyHeat
Plumbing & Heating

- Boilers supplied and fully fitted.
- Boiler Service £49
- Bathrooms Fully Fitted From £455
- All plumbing & gas work undertaken call today for free quote

07967 225257
cosyheat@bt.com

Roofing Services

ABLE BUILDING & ROOFING
24 HOUR EMERGENCY SERVICE

SPECIALISTS IN ALL ASPECTS OF ROOFING & BUILDING WORKS

- DOMESTIC & COMMERCIAL • FLAT ROOFS
- TILE/SLATES • CHIMNEY • LEAKWORK
- UPVC FACIAS • VALLEY/WALL COATING
- BARGEBOARDS • GUTTERING • MOSS REMOVAL
- BOFFETS & CLADDING • APPROVED INSTALLER
- 10 YEAR GUARANTEE

TEL: 0118 973 5845 / 01344 689471
MOBILE: 07771 880111

Unit 1, 168 New Mill Rd, Farnborough, Wokingham
www.able-uk.co.uk

Removals & Storage

MR SHIFT IT
REMOVALS SERVICE

• LONG DISTANCE
• LOCAL
• OFFICE REMOVALS
• HOUSE CLEARANCE
• PACKING & STORAGE

Hourly rates from £25ph
fixed prices on request

Mob: 07860 867210
FREEPHONE: 0800 4585265

Find us on www.mrshiftitremovals.co.uk

Removals

G. SIBLEY REMOVALS

From one item to Whole House, Flat & Office.
Collection & Delivery.
All Clearances Undertaken.
No Job to Big or Small
Free Quote.

Tel: 01344 424367
Mob: 07886 557025
garysibley67@yahoo.co.uk

Rubbish Clearance Services

ALL RUBBISH CLEARED
CHEAPER THAN A SKIP, HOUSE AND GARDEN CLEANING.
NO JOB TOO SMALL, WE WILL LOAD FOR YOU.

BEST PRICE GIVEN -
IF YOU FIND A CHEAPER QUOTE ANYWHERE ELSE, WE WILL BEAT IT

LICENSED WASTE CARRIERS.
DON'T DELAY YOUR PHONE FOR A FREE QUOTE 24/7
CALL 0118 941 3433 OR 07860 113 698

Skip Hire

Skip Hire Company

LOCAL SKIP HIRE BEST SERVICE - BEST PRICE

Skip Hire 8 yard and 12 yard Grab Hire
Much Away Wall and Load Service
For further details please contact us:
janek@skiphire.co.uk
07746167171

Storage

Nestings Self Storage Ltd

Secure self storage units.
40sqft to 160sqft Units.
24hr Security.
Forklift service available.
01344 483957

Adult Services

Chatlines

855 CHEAP ADULT CHAT
REAL HOT XXX
0909 864 0644

Please mention this paper when replying to adverts

THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004 THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL PLANNING) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012 BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION

This notice has been prepared in accordance with Regulations 18 and 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead is preparing a new Borough Local Plan which includes an ongoing programme of engagement and consultation. The purpose of this consultation is to enable people to make representations on issues of content and policies prepared following previous public and stakeholder consultation and consideration by the Council. Representations will be reviewed and assessed, and where appropriate incorporated into the Borough Local Plan publication which will be submitted to the Secretary of State.

The consultation will run from Friday 2 December 2016 until 17.00 on Friday 13 January 2017.

Where possible, representations should be made electronically clearly indicating which policy, paragraph or page number is being referred to. Alternatively, complete and submit a paper response form which can be found on our website and at parish and town council offices and libraries during normal opening hours. Each representation should be made on a separate sheet, marked with the relevant policy, paragraph, or page number.

A summary of all representations received and the representations themselves will be publicly available on the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead website. Personal details will be redacted.

Representations are invited and must be received no later than 17.00 on Friday 13 January 2017.

Representations can be made in the following ways:
Online at: www3.rbw.gov.uk/lp
Via email: lp@rbwm.gov.uk
Writing to: FREEPOST RBWM PLANNING POLICY

If you have any further enquiries please contact Planning Policy on lp@rbwm.gov.uk

Bracknell News www.bracknellnews.co.uk

MAN & VAN EXCELLENT RATES
Big or Small, Give Me a Call!
RUBBISH CLEARANCE ALSO UNDERTAKEN
FROM £20
Tel: 07818 365294

To advertise in the Bracknell News
you can book online at:
www.bracknellnews.co.uk
Or contact us on:
Tel : 01753 627270

TRANSIT MAN REMOVALS
13 yrs in the trade
My services are:
• Flat and House Removals
• Office Removals/Storage
• Callipers & Deliveries
• rubbish Disposal

Mobile: 07818 613 399
Mobile: 07756 853 829
www.transit-man.com

House Removals man and van services.

Office removals clearance
Deliveries and Collections
Local or Long Distance
Free quotes

Family owned and operated business
01344 513 652
www.bracknellremovals.co.uk

News in Brief

Learn about autism

ROYAL BOROUGH: Anyone who wants to find out more about autism and similar conditions is invited to a special session later this month.

The event, run by the Royal Borough's Autism Partnership Board, will be held at Braywick Heath Nurseries, in Braywick Road, on Thursday from 4-5pm.

Alternatively, regular sessions are held at the Bear pub, in Maidenhead High Street, on Wednesdays from 7-9pm.

Contact Ann Taylor at taylorax@stopenworld.com or Louise Mole on 01628 640200 to find out more.

Car fire is a mystery

STONE PAGES: A car fire in Stoke Poges had to be put out by firefighters on Wednesday.

Crews from Slough Fire Station were called to the blaze in Church Lane at about 11.30pm.

A Volvo parked in a carport had caught fire and firefighters had to use two hose reels to douse the flames.

The car was empty and it is not yet known how the fire started.

Concert cash for TVAP

WINDSOR: A community concert was due to be held last night (Thursday) at Windsor Girls' School.

The annual Windsor Community Carol Concert is organised by the Windsor St George Rotary.

Money raised at the concert will be donated to the Thames Valley Adventure Playground.

Reindeers ready to go

WINDSOR: Father Christmas will be accompanied by real reindeer as he parades through the town centre on a sleigh tomorrow (Saturday).

The parade leaves from Windsor Castle's Adventure Gate at 2pm.

It will go through St Alban's Street, Park Street, High Street, Peascod Street and finish at King Edward Court behind the rear entrance of Danis's Store.



WINNER: Murphy James, Erin Clauson,

'Fix th

Windsor: Club urges

SPEED READ: A broken pedestrian crossing in Windsor is putting young athletes and their parents at risk, a running coach has warned. Athletes from Windsor Slough Eton and Hounslow Athletic Club have to use the crossing, often at night, twice a week.

By David Lee
david@haylmedia.co.uk
@DavidLee_BM

A RUNNING coach has warned the council not to wait until one of her athletes is hit before fixing a pedestrian crossing in Windsor.

Twice a week, promising young runners from the Windsor Slough Eton and Hounslow Athletic Club (WSEHC) run from their base at the Thames Valley Athletics Centre, in Poocecks Lane, to The Long Walk.

Along the way they have to cross Datchet Road, by Eton Bridge, but the pedestrian

JUDITH ANNE BROADGATE

(Deceased)

Pursuant to the Inheritance Act 1975, any persons having a claim against or interest in the Estate of the above named, late of 50 Chapel Way, Farnham Common, Surrey GU10 2JL, who died on 18th October 2016, are required to send written particulars of their claim to the undersigned on or before 14th December 2016, after which date the Estate will be distributed having regard only to the above named persons to whom they have full rights.

Walsworth, District Charities, High Street 10, Farnham GU10 2JL. Tel: 01253 82827

theZone
your one-stop-shop for entertainment
Starts P23

THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004 THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL PLANNING) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012 BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION

This notice has been prepared in accordance with Regulations 18 and 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead is preparing a new Borough Local Plan which includes an ongoing programme of engagement and consultation. The purpose of this consultation is to enable people to make representations on issues of content and policies prepared following previous public and stakeholder consultation and consideration by the Council. Representations will be reviewed and, where appropriate, incorporated into the Borough Local Plan and submitted to the Secretary of State.

The consultation will run from Friday 2 December 2016 until 17.00 on Friday 13 January 2017.

Where possible, representations should be made electronically, detailing which policy, paragraph or page number is being referred to. Alternatively, complete and submit a paper response form which can be found on our website and at parish and town council offices and libraries during normal opening hours. Each representation should be made on a separate sheet, marked with the relevant policy, paragraph, or page number.

A summary of all representations received and the representations themselves will be publicly available on the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead website. Personal details will be redacted.

Representations are invited and must be received no later than 17.00 on Friday 13 January 2017.

Representations can be made in the following ways:
Online at: www.rbwsm.gov.uk/bip
Via email: bbp@rbwsm.gov.uk
Writing to: FREEPOST RBW/M PLANNING POLICY

If you have any further enquiries please contact Planning Policy on bbp@rbwsm.gov.uk

1513

out to c
secu
the
not
For
expo
subs
an old
surve
You
know
you ru
3. Ren
moving
Estat
fees, su
are all s
the ofte
cost is \$
varies de
purchase
£125,000
changes t

colled by the Proprietors



[All notices](#) [Resources](#) [The Gazette: 350 Years](#)

Notice details

Type:

Planning
> [Town and Country Planning](#)

Publication date:

2 December 2016, 17:36

Edition:

The London Gazette

Notice ID:

2657575

Notice code:

1601

Issue number:

61778

Page number:

25706

[About Town and Country Planning notices](#)

Town and Country Planning

The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004 THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL PLANNING) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012 BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION

This notice has been prepared in accordance with Regulations 18 and 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead is preparing a new Borough Local Plan which includes an ongoing programme of engagement and consultation. The purpose of this consultation is to enable people to make representations on issues of content and policies prepared following previous public and stakeholder consultation and consideration by the Council. Representations will be reviewed and assessed, and where appropriate incorporated into the Borough Local Plan publication which will be submitted to the Secretary of State.

The consultation will run from Friday 2 December 2016 until 17.00 on Friday 13 January 2017.

Where possible, representations should be made electronically clearly indicating which policy, paragraph or page number is being referred to. Alternatively, complete and submit a paper response form which can be found on our website and at parish and town council offices and libraries during normal opening hours. Each representation should be made on a separate sheet, marked with the relevant policy, paragraph, or page number.

A summary of all representations received and the representations themselves will be publicly available on the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead website. Personal details will be redacted.

Representations are invited and must be received no later than 17.00 on Friday 13 January 2017.

Representations can be made in the following ways:

Online at: www3.rbwm.gov.uk/blp

Via email: blp@rbwm.gov.uk

Writing to: FREEPOST RBWM PLANNING POLICY

If you have any further enquiries please contact Planning Policy on blp@rbwm.gov.uk

8 The Advertiser, December 1, 2016
PUBLIC NOTICES

Vintage clothes at festive fair

ST MARKS: A vintage Christmas fair will raise money for two charities on Saturday, December 10.
There will be tea, cakes and stalls with crafts, gifts, vintage clothes, candles and homemade purses.
The fair will raise money for The Brett Foundation and The Bone Cancer Research Trust.
It will take place in St Mark's Methodist Church in Ailenby Road from 1-5pm.
Entry costs £1.

Goods Vehicle Operator's Licence

AGS Roofing & Building Supplies Ltd trading as **Speakman Roofing Contractors** of **35 Florence Avenue, Maidenhead, SL6 8SJ** is applying for a licence to use Unit **36, Lower Mount Farm, Long Lane, Cookham, Berks, SL0 9EE**, as an operating centre for 1 goods vehicle.

Owners or occupiers of land (including buildings) near the operating centre(s) who believe that their use or enjoyment of that land would be affected should write representations to the Traffic Commissioner at **Hilcrest House, 366 Harehills Lane, Leeds, LS8 6NF**, stating their reasons, within 21 days of this notice. Representors must at the same time send a copy of their representations to the applicant at the address given at the top of this notice. A Guide to making Representations is available from the Traffic Commissioner's office.

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

The Council has received the following planning applications:

16/10484/ADW. Consent to display 1 x internally illuminated hanging sign and 2 x non illuminated signs - Pizza Express, 2-4 Brogo Street, Maidenhead. (Development Affecting the Character or Appearance of a Conservation Area)

16/03467/FULL. First floor handrails/escalator extension and front canopy - Wingate, High Street, Hurley, Maidenhead. (Development Affecting the Character or Appearance of a Conservation Area and Development Affecting the Setting of a Listed Building)

16/00513/LBC. Consent for 1 x (1/100) dormer, alterations to landscaping, internal alterations to include relocation of kitchen and formation of ground floor (two), gravel hard parking and rear vegetation - 1 Bismarck Villa, Marlow Road, Deodar, Marlow. (Listed Building Consent)

16/03360/FULL. Extension of existing building by altering second floor and adding third and fourth floor and partless floor, change of use from office to create 7 no 1 bed and 7 no 2 bed apartments with gym and management office at basement level with external alterations (amendments to planning permission 16/00009/FULL) - Coleman Solicitors, 21 Marlow Road, Maidenhead. (Major Development and Development Affecting the Character or Appearance of a Conservation Area)

16/03876/LBC. Consent for single storey rear extension - Corner Cottage, Peasey Street, Maidenhead. (Listed Building Consent)

16/00482/FULL. Change of use from B1A (Business) to B1 (Business) and Sui Generis (Residential) - 18A Single Street, Maidenhead. (Development Affecting the Character or Appearance of a Conservation Area)

16/00028/FULL. Rear extension roof replaced with flat roof, front canopy flat replaced with sloped flat canopy and 2 No. front replacement windows and 1 No. door (retrospective) - 2 Abdon Cottages, Church Road, Cookham Dean, Maidenhead. (Development Affecting the Character or Appearance of a Conservation Area)

16/03612/FULL. Single storey rear extension (part retrospective) - Dairy Farm, Common Road, Elm Wick, Windsor. (Development Affecting the Setting of a Listed Building)

16/00611/FULL. 1 x front dormer, gravel hard standing, new wooden fencing, alterations and amendments to landscaping - 1 Gisham Villa, Marlow Road, Deodar, Marlow. (Development Affecting the Character or Appearance of a Conservation Area and Development Affecting the Setting of a Listed Building)

16/00006/FULL. Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the use of part of the building for a taxi business is lawful - The Pegasus Group, Baintonburgh House, 69-60 Thames Street, Windsor. (Development Affecting the Character or Appearance of a Conservation Area and Development Affecting the Setting of a Listed Building)

If you wish to comment, you must do so within 21 days from the date of this notice to the address shown below. You may inspect the application and plans on our website at www.rbw.gov.uk/environment_planning.htm or during office hours at the Town Hall, 21 Ayles Road, Maidenhead or York House, Shaft Street, Windsor.

Date: 1 December 2016



GOLD WINNER: Kate Richardson-Walsh led the Team GB hockey team to victory.



IN ACTION: Sophie Christiansen in the Paralympics.

Golden girls on awards shortlist

Maidenhead: Sophie and Kate up for coveted BBC title

By Grace Witherden
gracew@barnesmedia.co.uk
@GraceW_BM

SPEED READ: Team GB athletes Sophie Christiansen and Kate Richardson-Walsh, both from Maidenhead, have been shortlisted for the BBC Sports Personality of the Year award. The winners will be announced on Sunday, December 18.

TWO gold medallists from Maidenhead have been shortlisted for the BBC Sports Personality of the Year 2016 award.

Paralympian Sophie Christiansen, who won three gold medals in Rio 2016 in equestrian sports, and Kate Richardson-Walsh, captain of England and Great Britain women's hockey team, have both made the shortlist.

The annual awards ceremony, this year being held on Sunday, December 18 in Birmingham, recognises sportsmen and women for their achievements during the year.

Sophie Christiansen, 29, who was born with cerebral palsy, has won a total of eight gold Olympic medals, one silver and one bronze. When the shortlist was announced on Monday, Sophie, who is originally from Sunningdale, said on Twitter: "I am shocked and honoured to be nominated for BBC Sports Personality of the Year, especially in such an important year for sport where hundreds of athletes are worthy of award."

Kate, 36, who is married to her fellow team

member Helen Richardson-Walsh, tweeted: "Unbelievably honoured to be on BBC Sports Personality shortlist representing Great Britain Hockey and England Hockey squads, staff and the one and only hockey family."

She led the hockey team to victory in Rio 2016 and after the Olympics, retired from international duty having notched up 375 appearances, 49 goals and 13 years as England and GB skipper.

The other 14 sportsmen and women on the shortlist are:

Andy Murray, tennis; Nicola Adams, boxing; Gareth Bale, football; Alistair Brownlee, triathlon; Kadeena Cox, athletics/cycling; Mo Farah, athletics; Jason Kenny, cycling; Laura Kenny, cycling; Adam Peaty, swimming; Nick Skelton, equestrian; Dame Sarah Storey, cycling; Jamie Vardy, football; Max Whitlock, gymnastics; Danny Willett, golf.

The winner will be announced on the live show. Visit www.bbc.co.uk/sport/sports-personality to vote online.



SUCCESS: Sophie Christiansen on the podium. Photo by onEditionEquestrian

THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004 THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL PLANNING) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012 BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION

This notice has been prepared in accordance with Regulations 18 and 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead is preparing a new borough local plan which includes an empirical programme of engagement and consultation. The purpose of this consultation is to enable people to make representations on issues of content and policies proposed following previous public and stakeholder consultation and consideration by the Council. Representations will be reviewed and assessed, and where appropriate incorporated into the Borough Local Plan publication which will be submitted to the Secretary of State.

The consultation will run from Friday 2 December 2016 until 17.00 on Friday 13 January 2017.

Where possible, representations should be made electronically clearly indicating which policy, paragraph or page number is being referred to. Alternatively, complete and submit a paper response form which can be found on our website and at parish and town council offices and libraries during normal opening hours. Each representation should be made on a separate sheet, marked with the relevant policy, paragraph, or page number.

A summary of all representations received and the representations themselves will be publicly available on the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead website. Personal details will be redacted.

Representations are invited and must be received no later than 17.00 on Friday 13 January 2017.

Representations can be made in the following ways:
Online at: www.rbw.gov.uk/bbb
Via email: bbp@rbwm.gov.uk
Or writing to: FREEPOST RBWM PLANNING POLICY

If you have any further enquiries please contact Planning Policy on bbp@rbwm.gov.uk

The Waste of the Manor of Hurley

South East Water Limited have applied to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for consent under section 38 of the Commons Act 2006 to carry out restricted works on The Waste of the Manor of Hurley. The Planning Inspectorate will decide the application on behalf of the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

The proposed works involve installing a new water main connection to the Nethercliffe Nurseries Development, this will be installed by excavating along approximately 45 metres of the eastern verge of Green Lane from Nethercliffe Nurseries to the existing water main to the south. Temporary 'heras' fencing will be erected to protect the excavation and will enclose an area of approximately 193 square metres. The works are expected to last no more than 2 weeks. Following completion, reinstatement will take place at all affected areas followed by any necessary reseedling.

The works will be located at Green Lane, Littlewick Green, Maidenhead, SL6 3RH.

A copy of the application form and accompanying documents can be inspected at Cox Green Library, Highfield Lane, Maidenhead SL6 3AY during normal office hours Tuesday and Friday 1:30pm - 5:00pm, Wednesday 10:00am - 7:00pm, Thursday 10:00am - 5:00pm, Saturday 10:00am - 1:30pm and Sunday 11:00am - 2:00pm until Tuesday 6th January 2016. A copy of the application form and accompanying documents may be obtained by writing to: FAD Fred Denne, 20 Hollingworth Court, Turkey Mill, Ashford Road, Maidenhead, Kent, ME14 5PP or at fred.denne@delcourtaclaren.com or call 01622 639055.

Any representations should be sent in writing ON or BEFORE that date to the Planning Inspectorate, Commons Team at 3F Temple Quay House, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN or commonlandcases@pin.gov.uk

South East Water Limited, Rockart Road, Snodland, Kent ME8 5AH. 1st December 2016

New face of land owners

ALL DISTRICTS: A new chairman has been elected for the Country Land and Business Association Berkshire (CLA).

Chartered surveyor Andrea Gardiner said 'these are interesting times' to take over as chairman and cited Brexit housing and the economy as challenges to face.

The CLA advises landowners on how to protect and make the most of their land.

What's going on? Find out every day online at: www.landsec-uk.com

Appendix 2: Consultation Poster

www.rbwm.gov.uk

Royal Borough
of Windsor &
Maidenhead

HELP SHAPE YOUR COMMUNITY



Have your say on our draft Borough Local Plan and help build a borough for everyone

The objectives are to:

- Protect our heritage
- Provide housing
- Promote tourism
- Grow local businesses
- Ensure town centres are the heart of our communities
- Maintain, improve and provide new local services

www3.rbwm.gov.uk/blp

blp@rbwm.gov.uk

FREEPOST RBWM PLANNING POLICY

Appendix 3: Consultation Postcard

The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead is currently developing the Borough Local Plan which will help shape the way our borough looks in the future.

Planning affects everyone, and we are inviting residents, businesses, parish and town councils and any other interested parties to let us know your thoughts on a number of key planning issues.

The consultation runs from Friday 2 December 2016 to Friday 13 January 2017. To find out more and take part:

www3.rbwm.gov.uk/blp

blp@rbwm.gov.uk

FREEPOST RBWM PLANNING POLICY



The postcard features a purple background with white text. At the top, it says "Help shape your community" in a large, bold font. To the right of this text is the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead logo and the website address "www.rbwm.gov.uk". Below the main text is a horizontal strip of eight small images showing various scenes from the borough: a street with people, a modern building, a stone tower, a bridge over a river, a park with a lamp post, a street with trees, a modern building, and a street with people. Below the images, it says "Have your say on our draft Borough Local Plan and help build a borough for everyone". Underneath that, it lists "The objectives are to:" followed by two columns of bullet points.

Help shape your community

www.rbwm.gov.uk
Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead

Have your say on our draft Borough Local Plan and help build a borough for everyone

The objectives are to:

- Protect our heritage
- Promote tourism
- Ensure town centres are the heart of our communities
- Provide housing
- Grow local businesses
- Maintain, improve and provide new local services

Appendix 4: People and groups responding

Consultation Body Type	Name of responding individual or organisation.
Local Councillors	Cllr. Derek Wilson Cllr. Leo Walters Cllr. Malcolm Beer
DTC Bodies and Statutory Consultees	Bracknell Forest DC Chiltern and South Bucks GLA Runnymede BC Slough BC Spelthorne DC Surrey County Council Surrey Heath DC Wokingham BC Wycombe DC Berkshire Local Nature Partnership Education Funding Agency Environment Agency Heathrow Airport Ltd Historic England National Grid Natural England NHS Sport England Thames Water Transport for London
Parish Councils	Bray PC Cookham PC Cox Green PC Datchet PC Horton PC Hurley PC Old Windsor PC Sunningdale PC Sunninghill and Ascot PC White Waltham PC Wraysbury PC Colnbrook with Poyle PC (Neighbouring Parish) Dorney PC (Neighbouring Parish) Taplow PC (Neighbouring Parish)
Neighbourhood Development Plan Groups	Ascot and Sunnings NDP Windsor NDP Forum Maidenhead and Cox Green NDP Group Maidenhead and Cox Green NDP (Blue and Green Sub Group) Maidenhead NDP Steering Group
Resident and Interest Groups	ASCENT (Ascot and Sunnings Community Environment Network) Berks, Bucks, Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)

Consultation Body Type	Name of responding individual or organisation.
	Berkshire Archaeology Burnham Beeches SAC (City of London) Clewer Group Residents Association (The) Cookham Society CPRE (Campaign to Protect Rural England) Datchet Village Society Down Place Residents Association HBF (Home Builders Federation) Hitcham and Taplow Society Maidenhead and District Chamber of Commerce Maidenhead Civic Society Maidenhead Farmers Market Maidenhead FOE (Friends of the Earth) Maidenhead Heritage Trust Maidenhead Liberal Democrats Maidenhead Town Partnership Maidenhead Waterways Restoration Group OGFRA (Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association) Slough Windsor & Maidenhead CAMRA SPAE (Society for the Protection of Ascot and Environs) West Windsor Residents Association Wild Maidenhead Windsor and Eton Society The Woodland Trust
Agents and developers	Barton Willmore Bell Cornwell Berkeley Homes Berkeley Strategic Berkeley Strategic Land Boyer Planning CALA Homes CBRE CBRM Claremont Planning Carter Planning DHA Planning and Development Dijkstra Planning Gerald Eve G L Hearn GVA Indigo Planning Kebell Homes Kevin Scott Consultancy KRL Planning Leigh and Glennie Ltd Litchfields (NLP) Maddox Associates Maze Planning Network Rail Milgate Homes

Consultation Body Type	Name of responding individual or organisation.
	Montagu Evans Mr Ian Pankhurst Nexus Planning NMB Planning Paul Butt Planning Paul Dickinson and Associates Pegasus Persimmon Homes Planning Potential POD Architects Porta Planning PRP Quod Ronald Perrin RPS CGMS Savills St Williams The Planning Bureau Turnberry Turleys West Waddy ADP White Young & Green Woolf Bond Planning
Local residents	1,691 individuals responded to the consultation

Appendix 5: Questionnaire



Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
Borough Local Plan (December 2016)
Representation Form

Ref:
(For official use only)

The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead is preparing a new Borough Local Plan. The purpose of this consultation is to enable people to make representations on issues of content and policies prepared. All representations will be reviewed and assessed, and where appropriate, changes will be incorporated into the publication version of the Borough Local Plan which will be submitted to the Secretary of State. A consultation report will be prepared to summarise the responses to the representations.

Please note, due to the volume of representations anticipated, we will not be able to respond to individual representations.

The consultation will run from Friday 2 December 2016 to Friday 13 January 2017

We would encourage you to respond online at www3.rbwm.gov.uk/blp

If you would like to complete a hard copy of this form then please ensure completed forms are received at our offices by **5pm Friday 13 January 2017**

Scan and email to: blp@rbwm.gov.uk

Post hard copy to: **FREEPOST RBWM PLANNING POLICY**

Please note that representations must be attributable to named individuals or organisations. They will be available for public inspection and cannot be treated as confidential. Unless you tell us otherwise, we will use your contact details to let you know about future progress of the Borough Local Plan.

Please tick the box if you do not wish to be notified about future consultations.

PART A – CONTACT DETAILS

	Personal Details	Agent Details (if applicable)
First name		
Surname		
Job title (if appropriate)		
Address		
Post Code		
Telephone number		
Email address		

PART B—YOUR REPRESENTATION
(Please use a separate sheet for each representation)

To which policy, site option or section does your comment relate?

Policy Number	Site Reference	Section Reference/ Page Number

Is your representation supporting, objecting or making an observation? Please insert a tick as appropriate.

Support	Object	Observation

Please use the space below to set out your comments including your reasons. If you are seeking a change, it would be helpful if you are able to outline your proposal. If you need more space, please continue on a separate sheet of paper.

Signature	Date


Appendix 6: Main issues raised in Regulation 18 Consultation and the Council's response

General matters

General issues	RBWM Council response
An early Plan review should be considered to deal with cross border issues, including unmet needs arising from HMA partners.	The Submission BLP acknowledges that an early review of employment and housing needs is likely to be necessary, potentially requiring an early plan review.
Fulfilment of the Duty to Co-operate requirements has not been adequate.	The Council considers it has adequately discharged the Duty to Co-operate Requirements in regards to the preparation of the Submission BLP. The details are set out in the Council's Compliance Statement which can be viewed on the Planning Policy page of the Council's website.
The BLP does not take sufficient account of neighbourhood development plans and should better reflect adopted NDP proposals.	The importance of Neighbourhood Plans and Neighbourhood Planning process in undertaking local place-making has been recognised in the Submission BLP.
The BLP should adopt neighbourhood plan policies for specific areas in order to provide a strategic framework for the embodiment of locally mandated development, especially with respect to the level of development proposed for individual sites and design criteria	The strategic framework for the development of the Borough is set out in the BLP. The outcomes of the Neighbourhood planning processes have helped inform the development of the strategic framework set out in the BLP. The importance of Neighbourhood Planning in undertaking local place-making has been recognised in the Submission BLP.
Individual policies were poorly expressed with no regard to the holistic impact of the policies which were often in conflict with each other.	The potential policy conflicts have been noted and resolved through the Sustainability appraisal process. A number of policies have been simplified or merged with other policies to aid clarity, reduce conflict and provide a more holistic approach.
The evidence base should be updated and include an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), housing land availability assessment & flood risk assessment.	The Plan has been based on an extensive evidence base which can be viewed at: https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/info/200414/local_development_framework

General issues	RBWM Council response
	/592/monitoring and evidence/2 An IDP, Land Availability Assessment & Strategic Flood Risk Assessment forms part of this.
Inadequate consideration has been given to Cross Rail	The potential of the Elizabeth Line (Cross rail project) has been an important component in the development of the Borough Local Plan. It has been factored into evidence base studies and the Plan. As it represents an economic benefit for the Borough and strongly supports Maidenhead as a sustainable development location it is an important element in the Spatial Strategy.
All references to Ascot as a "town" should be removed. Ascot is a village with a district centre.	Noted

Strategic and non strategic policies

Strategic and non strategic policy Issues	RBWM Council Response
 Too many policies are unnecessarily strategic and the designation of sites as strategic/non-strategic should be reassessed	As a result of the simplification and merging of policies to aid clarification reduce conflict and provide a more holistic approach the number of strategic policies has reduced.

Spatial vision and objectives

Spatial Vision and objectives issues	RBWM Council response
Revisions to Objectives 1 and 2 are required to make Green Belt release explicit and confirm support for the retention of the remaining Green Belt.	The Council has clarified in the Submission BLP the details of the Green Belt release. The Spatial strategy and Green Belt policies have been re-inforced and clarified to make clear support for the retention of the remaining Green Belt.
Special qualities objective is supported	Noted
Meeting housing needs objective is supported	Noted

Spatial Vision and objectives issues	RBWM Council response
Support for Objective 3 subject to addition of "as well as existing visitor attractions across the borough." to the end of the first clause.	Noted
Support for Local Business Economy Objective	Noted
Support for the objectives but concern that the BLP did not achieve the aims in a number of instances	Noted
Objective on Sustainable Transport supported but further proposals are required to implement it suggesting commitments to cycling infrastructure and public transport funding, autonomous shared transport and a cycle hire scheme.	Noted
Supported for the objective on Environmental Protection but considered that the BLP proposals were in conflict with the aim.	Noted
Suggestion that "promote the greening of urban areas and retention of green boundaries" should be added to the Environmental Protection Objective.	The Submission BLP supports the development of green infrastructure.
Open space and leisure objective should be redrafted to "Ensure that new development contributes to providing open space within or outside new development."	Noted
Climate Change and Biodiversity Objective should be amended to promote a net gain in biodiversity through enhancement, creation and connectivity of natural green space.	Noted

Spatial strategy

Spatial strategy Issues	RBWM Council response
The spatial strategy with its urban expansion, commitment to meeting the full OAN and limited green belt release is supported.	Noted
Support is given for high density development alongside associated green space to support access to the natural environment for health and well-being	Noted
The need for new homes is recognised but the spatial distribution does not recognise existing constraints to development.	The Borough is subjected to a number of constraints including green belt, nature conservation, heritage and flooding. These constraints have informed the development of the Spatial Strategy as it has been developed. The Council considers the Spatial Strategy to be a sustainable approach to accommodate growth needs in the Borough to 2033.
Support for the provision of "garden villages" or a new settlement to meet housing needs, rather than urban expansion.	The Spatial Strategy set out in the Submission BLP is considered a sustainable and robust approach to accommodate growth needs in the Borough to 2033.
The preferred option of urban expansion is not supported.	The Spatial Strategy set out in the Submission BLP is considered a sustainable and robust approach to accommodate growth needs in the Borough to 2033.
Spatial strategy of urban expansion involving loss of land from the Green Belt not supported.	The Spatial Strategy set out in the Submission BLP is considered a sustainable and robust approach to accommodate growth needs in the Borough to 2033.
Exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release are demonstrable with reference to the constraints in meeting the OAN for housing and employment and previous judgements.	Noted
Exceptional circumstances for the release of land from the Green Belt have not been adequately demonstrated by the plan. Achievement of the OAN does not, in itself, constitute the exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release.	The Council is satisfied that the exceptional circumstances case required by the NPPF has been achieved. The exceptional circumstances case is set out in the Submission BLP and supporting evidence.
Green Belt sites should be released during the latter phase of the plan period once all non Green Belt sites have been developed.	Site release is largely dependant on land owner intentions and site delivery constraints. A number of the larger green belt sites are

Spatial strategy Issues	RBWM Council response
	expected to come forward in the later stages of the plan period for these reasons.
The housing requirement should be based on meeting local need rather than stimulating additional demand by building homes which will be occupied by in-migration to the borough.	The housing target set out in the Submission BLP is based on meeting full objectively assessed housing need as set out in the 2016 Berkshire SHMA. This is based on identifying local need.
The preservation of strategic green gaps is supported together with the need to maintain a strategic gap between Maidenhead and Holyport, Maidenhead and Cookham and Maidenhead and Windsor via the "Bray Green Gap". The separation of the Cookhams from each other and Ascot from Sunninghill and Sunningdale is vital to the character of the areas.	One of the purposes of Green Belt is to prevent the coalescence of settlements and thus it is not considered necessary to identify strategic green gaps.
Land to be removed from the Green Belt should be made explicit in the plan.	More detailed plans showing land to be released from the Green Belt are included in the draft Borough Local Plan (Submission version)
The OAN is too low and should be adjusted with respect to economic forecasts (including Cross Rail) and affordability uplifts	The 2016 SMA sets out the objectively assessed housing need for the Borough. The Council considers it provides the most up-to-date and reliable assessment of full housing need for the Borough.
The OAN is too low and should be adjusted to take account of unmet needs in surrounding areas including HMA partners and London.	The 2016 SMA sets out the objectively assessed housing need for the Borough. The Council considers it provides the most up-to-date and reliable assessment of full housing need for the Borough
The demographic starting point for the OAN should use the 2014 based population and household forecasts. The CE forecasts used are out of date. No Brexit adjustment should be made to economic forecasts. An adjustment for Heathrow expansion should be included. The uplift applied to increase affordable housing. A review of the SHMA is required	<p>RBWM has commissioned JG Consulting to review the latest demographic data available and contrast it with the data used by the Berkshire SHMA. The purpose of this research was not to revise the Objectively Assessed Need but to understand the potential impact of latest forecasts. The projected population and household growth is lower than the 2012-based projections.</p> <p>It is considered too early to understand the impact of Brexit on the economic forecasts.</p> <p>At the time the SHMA was undertaken, there was no information available on the timescale of delivery of additional airport capacity. This</p>

Spatial strategy Issues	RBWM Council response
	<p>will be factored into the next SHMA undertaken.</p> <p>RBWM are awaiting the outcome of the Housing White Paper consultation and anticipated further consultation on OAN methodology changes.</p> <p>The NPPG states that whilst population and household projections are generally updated every 2 years, this does not automatically mean that housing assessments are rendered outdated every time new projections are issued.</p>
<p>The impact of migration from London and displaced migration to the South East (that would have been accommodated within London under the DCLG household assumption but have been diverted to the south East under the Mayor's alternative migration assumptions) have not been addressed by the SHMA which does not factor in any uplift to account for the alternative migration assumptions of the London SHMA arguing that current migration trends already register higher levels that no further uplift is required.</p>	<p>Migration patterns between London and the South East were factored into the London Sensitivity Analysis scenario of the Berkshire SHMA. RBWM continues to work with GLA and London boroughs under Duty to Cooperate and changes to migration patterns will be one of the factors that would constitute a meaningful change in the housing situation prompting a requirement for an updated OAN assessment.</p>
<p>An OAN of 800 dpa is more appropriate - Barton Willmore Housing Needs Technical Review indicates that using the latest ONS/CLG projections would bring down the baseline OAN, CE forecasts used should be updated. A selection of economic forecasts should be used CE, OE, Experian. The uplift of 8% for affordability issues and household formation rate adjustments is insufficient, a 20 – 25% uplift would be more appropriate. .</p>	<p>RBWM has commissioned JG Consulting to review the latest demographic data available and contrast it with the data used by the Berkshire SHMA. The purpose of this research was not to revise the Objectively Assessed Need but to understand the potential impact of latest forecasts. The projected population and household growth is lower than the 2012-based projections.</p> <p>RBWM is awaiting the outcome of the Housing White Paper consultation and anticipated further consultation on OAN methodology changes.</p>
<p>Green Belt constraint should be used to justify a housing requirement below the OAN.</p>	<p>The 2016 SMA sets out the objectively assessed housing need for the Borough. The Council considers it provides the most up-to-date and</p>

Spatial strategy Issues	RBWM Council response
	reliable assessment of full housing need for the Borough
Suggest that 89% of OAN would be more appropriate with removal of HA7, HA8, HA9, HA20, HA21, HA22, HA39 ad HA40 from the plan.	The 2016 SMA sets out the objectively assessed housing need for the Borough. The Council considers it provides the most up-to-date and reliable assessment of full housing need for the Borough
OAN should be reduced to 13,200 dwellings . Object to the inclusion of a market uplift figure of 8% in the OAN. The desirability of the area means that prices are high. The uplift will do little to address affordability or aid delivery as reflected by the December 2016 Maidstone inspectors report.	The 2016 SMA sets out the objectively assessed housing need for the Borough. The Council considers it provides the most up-to-date and reliable assessment of full housing need for the Borough
Notwithstanding the intention to meet the full OAN for RBWM other districts within the defined HMAs may have unmet needs which will need to be addressed collectively for by the plans in the area. Suggest that in the absence of an agreed position that there should be a commitment to early review of the plan to address unmet housing needs post 2021.	Noted
A back loaded approach to delivery has been adopted which leaves the borough in housing need in the earlier stages of the plan. Alternative sites are required to meet the housing need.	The Spatial Strategy and site allocations set out in the Submission BLP are considered a sustainable and robust approach to accommodate growth needs in the Borough over the plan period to 2033.
Phasing of the strategic allocations is required	Noted
Further land should be allocated to fully meet the need in case of delivery delay, 20% supply buffer and DTC contributions.	Delivery delay, supply buffers have been taken into account in the identification of the housing supply as set out in the Submission BLP and supporting evidence base. This supply is considered by the Council to be adequate to deliver the Spatial Strategy and meet full growth needs in the Borough.
The deliverability of the proposed allocations is questioned. Additional site are required to meet the housing need	Delivery delay, supply buffers have been taken into account in the identification of the housing supply as set out in the Submission BLP and supporting evidence base. This supply is considered by the Council to be adequate to deliver the Spatial Strategy and meet full growth needs in the Borough.
Development should not be exclusively focused on the Maidenhead urban area	The Spatial Strategy is based on a distribution of growth around the borough. The Maidenhead area is a sustainable location in the borough

Spatial strategy Issues	RBWM Council response
	and has been identified as a growth location. However, two other growth locations have also been identified along with a number of other smaller locations.
Spatial distribution of residential development towards Maidenhead, Datchet, Cookham Ascot and the Sunnings is too high for character, highways and community infrastructure reasons.	The Spatial Strategy set out in the Submission BLP is considered a sustainable and robust approach to accommodate growth needs in the Borough to 2033.
A settlement boundary for Maidenhead should be established to aid clarification on the strategic policy approach.	The Submission Draft and the Policies Maps clarify Green Belt boundaries and the status of land released from the Green Belt.
Stronger emphasis should be placed on achieving higher density within the 'urban area of Maidenhead' rather than confining the approach to Maidenhead Town Centre as defined by the Town Centre AAP. Consideration of the extension of the defined town centre to the south may support regeneration opportunities for the wider area	Maidenhead Town Centre and areas to the south are recognised in the Submission BLP as a growth location where higher intensity development to support regeneration and development will be acceptable. The growth locations are identified on the policies map.
Objections to the collective allocation of HA6, HA7, HA8 and HA9 on grounds of highways capacity. Alternative sites to the north of Maidenhead, where highways networks could be improved, offered a more appropriate direction of expansion for the town and that better use of town centre sites could be made through high density, high rise development..	The Spatial Strategy and site allocations set out in the Submission BLP are considered a sustainable and robust approach to accommodate growth needs in the Borough over the plan period to 2033.
Development to the south of Maidenhead should only follow completion of the M4 motorway upgrade to allow pollution impacts to be assessed.	The Submission BLP policies, including the site allocations have been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment process. The Maidenhead sites south of the town centre are not anticipated to come forward for development in the next five years and may beyond completion of the Smart Motorway programme on the M4.
Maidenhead Town Centre infrastructure must be designed into the proposed plans at the start of the process. Based on the amount of office and residential space proposed in Maidenhead town centre, there must be an allocation of parking space for offices - at least 5 spaces per 1,000 SQFT and at least 1 space for each bedroom in residential blocks of flats.	The 2017 Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out the amount and type Infrastructure required to support the development needs identified in the Submission BLP, along with means of delivery. The IDP can be viewed on the Planning Policy page of the Council's website. Parking standards will be set via a forthcoming Parking Strategy SPD.
Strategic allocations to the south of Maidenhead are to some extent	The interdependence of these 3 sites is recognised and policy in the

Spatial strategy Issues	RBWM Council response
interdependent. Suggest Bullet point 8 refers to a 'minimum of 2,530 dwellings' to be delivered across the three sites.	Submission BLP adjusted to reflect this.
Additional land must be found on the outskirts of Maidenhead - whether Greenbelt or not - to accommodate family homes, with car parking and gardens	The Submission BLP directs new development to provide a mix of dwelling types and sizes to meet local needs.
Tall Buildings must be contained within the limits described in the AAP.	Maidenhead Town Centre and areas to the south are recognised in the Submission BLP as a growth location where higher intensity development to support regeneration and development will be acceptable.
Further allocations are required in Windsor to meet the housing need	The housing supply identified in the Submission BLP and supporting evidence base is considered by the Council to be adequate to deliver the Spatial Strategy and meet full growth needs in the Borough.
Datchet is a sustainable location for development.	Noted
High density residential development should be supported in all identified centres within the retail hierarchy, not just town centres.	Design, character and site characteristics will determine at the Planning Application stages whether or not a site is capable of accommodating high density residential development.
Spatial strategy of directing development to Ascot High Street is supported	Noted
Level of development proposed for Ascot and Sunnings is too high and unsustainable and would destroy the semi-rural character of the area. The existing transport and education infrastructure could not support any further development in this area. Sites proposed for development by the plan could be redeveloped as appropriate development within the Green Belt to ensure that defensible, appropriate Green Belt boundaries were maintained in Ascot and the Sunnings.	The Spatial Strategy and site allocations set out in the Submission BLP are considered a sustainable and robust approach to accommodate growth needs in the Borough over the plan period to 2033. The distribution of allocated development sites across the Borough, and the levels of development proposed for them are considered to be an appropriate response in light of the identified growth needs
Plan does not respond to the impacts of the Brexit decision on the economy or the impact of Crossrail or Heathrow expansion.	It is considered too early to understand the impact of Brexit on the economic forecasts. The identification in the Spatial strategy of Maidenhead town centre and areas to the south as a key growth location is a response to the

Spatial strategy Issues	RBWM Council response
	forthcoming arrival of the Elizabeth line.
Contribution of windfall development in reducing the residual housing requirement was considered to be too low	The contribution is based on the historical delivery of windfall sites in the borough. The delivery rate is expected to continue and thus it is considered to represent an appropriate level of supply from this source.
Concerned at the level of development in areas of flood risk	The Council has taken a sequential approach to the assessment and selection of sites. This has been done in accordance with an up-to-date SFRA. The SFRA can be viewed on the Planning Policy pages of the Council's website.
Support for making best use of land within existing built up areas and intensifying use of previously developed land, including the conversion of underused community facilities and vacant offices to residential use.	Noted
A sequential approach to site selection with regards to flood risk should be taken in accordance with an up to date SFRA.	The Council has taken a sequential approach to the assessment and selection of sites. This has been done in accordance with an up-to-date SFRA. The SFRA can be viewed on the Planning Policy pages of the Council's website.
<p>34</p> <p>The SHMA does not take into account the impact of Heathrow expansion and does not adequately address the effects on Crossrail or Brexit on the housing market. The estimate covers a period of some 20 years with a very unlikely flat estimate. Realistic growth forecasts should be shown based on the existing housing stock and numbers of residents.</p>	<p>It is too early to understand the impact of Brexit on the economic forecasts.</p> <p>At the time the SHMA was undertaken, there was no information available on the timescale of delivery of additional airport capacity or the effects of Crossrail on the local housing market. These will be factored into the next SHMA undertaken.</p> <p>RBWM are awaiting the outcome of the Housing White Paper consultation and anticipated further consultation on OAN methodology changes to understand the appropriateness of the current OAN methodology used.</p>
The 445,400 sq. ft. of floor space will accommodate between 1,878 and 4,450 staff members with space allocation of between 100 sq. ft. and	To check the validity of the findings of the Berkshire EDNAs in the local context, RBWM has undertaken an assessment of the appropriateness of

Spatial strategy Issues	RBWM Council response
250sq. ft., per person. Currently there is enough office space across Berkshire; with a generous space allowance per employee. 20,000 new jobs across Berkshire by 2021 would require 5,000,000 sq. ft. of office space (assuming all jobs were office based).	the broad sector classifications used in the Berkshire EDNAs and employment density assumptions to the local circumstances in RBWM. This sensitivity analysis has identified a higher net need for B1 floorspace and a lower requirement for B8 warehousing; which would be analogous to market trends.
The deliverability of some sites is questioned. Insufficient sites have been allocated to meet the need and additional sites should be identified.	The housing supply identified in the Submission BLP and supporting evidence base is considered by the Council to be adequate to deliver the Spatial Strategy and meet full growth needs in the Borough.

Quality of place

Quality of place issues	RBWM Council response
Concern for the liveability of centres under a "town cramming" approach without adequate parking and highways capacity improvements and lack of green space.	The Submission BLP has rationalised and clarified the design policies and introduced a place-making approach to create a framework within which sustainable and high quality development can take place. The IDP has identified the level of infrastructure required to support this development and set out how it will be delivered. This includes transport and green space infrastructure to create high quality development.
A review of strategic and non strategic policies is required to ensure Neighbourhood plan policies can take precedence for local issues.	The importance of Neighbourhood Planning in undertaking local place-making has been recognised in the Submission BLP. As part of the rationalisation and clarification of policies in the plan to deal with duplication a review of the Strategic/Non strategic policy split has been undertaken. The number of strategic policies has reduced as a result.
Community led development should be supported where the proposals are in general conformity with BLP strategic policies and/or where proposals are contained in a Neighbourhood Plan	Noted
Policy SP3 (design policy) is too detailed to be considered strategic and will undermine neighbourhood plan policies.	Design policies in the draft BLP (Submission version) have been rationalised and clarified. The BLP now sets a sustainable framework for placemaking within which detailed and area specific design guidelines can be created. Policy SP3 is denoted as a non strategic policy. Reference is now made in the Explanatory text to the opportunity for local communities to set specific design policies and guidance through Neighbourhood Plans.
Design policy is non specific with regard to the definition of high quality design	Design policies in the draft BLP (Submission version) have been rationalised and clarified and make clear what is considered to be high quality design.
The potential impact of tall buildings should be considered, including the creating of wind corridors and sunless zones.	Policy SP3 has been amended to make reference to the need to demonstrate exceptional design quality and avoid unacceptable impacts. The Explanatory text details potential adverse effects of tall buildings.

Quality of place issues	RBWM Council response
Proposed Design SPD should be used to encourage significant climate change and biodiversity support measures.	Noted
Preservation of the historic centre of Eton and the character of the villages of Cookham and Datchet were considered to be poorly supported by the policy and better supported by the respective local design guidelines	Design policies in the draft BLP (Submission version) have been rationalised and clarified. The BLP now sets a framework for placemaking within which detailed and area specific design guidelines can be created.
The design policies are too vague to be applied meaningfully.	The BLP creates a framework for placemaking within which detailed and area specific design guidelines can be created though Neighbourhood Plans, Design Codes, Village Design Statements and SPD's. Policy SP3 sets a robust set of general design principles for assessing individual development applications across the Borough.
The relationship of new development to the adjoining waterway is key	Design policies in the draft BLP (Submission version) have been rationalised and clarified. Policy SP3 references the waterways and the need for development to front onto water bodies.
Townscape and Landscape Character Assessments are out of date	The Townscape and Landscape Character Assessments are noted in the Plan as starting points for considering local character attributes and will be one of the factors taken into account when the Council is assessing the design quality of development proposals. It is acknowledged that these documents may need updating by referring to "(any updating successors)" in the Explanatory Text.
Support the policy SP5 River Thames but suggest that Clause 3 includes the wording, "maintain tree cover, conserve and enhance natural river banks and their associated bankside and marginal vegetation and the ecological value of the area, including its role as a wildlife network."	Noted. Clause included in Policy in Submission BLP.
Support for the enhancement of the waterways in Maidenhead as a leisure destination and the commitment made to preserving and enhancing biodiversity along river corridors.	Noted
The entire Maidenhead Waterway is officially part of the River Thames, with an irrevocable right of public navigation (albeit awaiting restoration). It should be included in the Policies map and treated the same as and have the same 'protect and improve' policy aims as for the	The Maidenhead Waterways form an important part of the blue/green infrastructure in Maidenhead. The Submission BLP contains references to the Maidenhead Waterways project and has introduced an Blue/green infrastructure policy.

Quality of place issues	RBWM Council response
<p>rest of the Thames corridor. Explicit acknowledgement should also be given to the 2009 Maidenhead Waterways Framework SPD which applies to the whole of the Cookham to Bray waterway route, which passes directly through Maidenhead town centre and is a key element of the adopted AAP.</p>	
<p>Policy SP6 requires rewording. It is not clear why the Council considers it necessary to redraft and amend/augment national Green Belt policy in Policy SP6. The Framework does not provide opportunities for authorities to apply different and local tests for Green Belt development. It is unnecessary for the Plan to add anything to national Green Belt policy. The list in para 3 omits the re-use of buildings and the limited infilling or partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites which are identified as appropriate development in para 90 of the NPPF. The re-use of buildings in para 90 is not limited to non-residential uses. Para 3(f) refers to the replacement of an existing dwelling on a one-for-one basis, t and is not consistent with NPPF Para 90. Para (5) sets out additional tests for new buildings or structures associated with outdoor sport and outdoor recreation. This is inconsistent NPPF Para 89. The proposed tests in policy SP6 para 5 relating to essential facilities are more onerous than national policy. This paragraph should be deleted. Para (3) (b) to (e) all refer to agricultural and forestry workers dwellings and should be within a single sub paragraph. A comprehensive Green Belt review of villages washed over by the Green Belt should be undertaken in accordance with NPPF Para 86. Where settlements do not fulfil a Green Belt function they should be excluded from the Green Belt and their detailed boundaries reappraised. The defined settlement approach to the former recognised settlement areas is in conflict with the NPPF. Villages in the Green Belt that do not possesses an open character contributing to the openness of the Green Belt should be excluded from the Green Belt, with the mechanism for</p>	<p>The policy has been reviewed and clarified in the Submission BLP and local interpretation of national policy added.</p>

Quality of place issues	RBWM Council response
<p>controlling their character relying on those factors set out NPPF Para 86.</p> <p>The following Green Belt boundary adjustments should be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • boundary of Warren Row should be amended to include Beckfords and Woodlands within the Recognised Settlement area boundary. • Horton, Earleydene & Woodside should be settlements excluded from the Green Belt. • Adjustment to the Green Belt boundary around the Ascot Grand Stand • Removal of areas from the Green Belt of areas likely to be required for delivery of Eton College's Strategic Building Development Plan • Release Green Belt to achieve infill development adjacent to settlement at Land at Stubbings Farm • Align Green Belt boundaries at Coronation House, coronation road Ascot with footpath to the rear of the property. • Land at Grove House, Maidenhead, garden at Coronation House, Ascot, Land at Furze Platt, Land at the junction of Tarbay Lane and Oakley Green Road, Oakley Green, Windsor, Land at Crimp Hill, Land at Grove Park, Land at Orleton, Earleydene, Land at Henley Road, Stubbings, Land at Crown Farm, Eton Wick, Land at Blackamoor Lane, Maidenhead, Land at Woodside Road, Woodside, Ascot should be excluded from the Green Belt 	<p>The Spatial Strategy, green belt releases and site allocations set out in the Submission BLP are considered a sustainable and robust approach to accommodate growth needs in the Borough over the plan period to 2033. The green belt releases, distribution of allocated development sites across the Borough, and the levels of development proposed for them are considered to be an appropriate response in light of the identified growth needs. The Council does not consider further releases are justified or required.</p>
<p>Request that recognition for important PDL sites in the Green Belt is reinstated for the college campus with a specific policy revision for SP6 in support of development and infilling of important large-scale Green Belt PDL.</p>	<p>The Spatial Strategy, green belt releases and policy approaches and site allocations set out in the Submission BLP are considered a sustainable and robust approach to accommodate growth needs in the Borough over the plan period to 2033. The green belt releases, distribution of allocated development sites across the Borough, and the levels of</p>

Quality of place issues	RBWM Council response
	development proposed for them are considered to be an appropriate response in light of the identified growth needs. The Council does not consider further releases are justified or required.
Request that an allocation for the operational area of Eton College is made to allow redevelopment of the estate to an agreed masterplan to be adopted as SPD.	Noted
Policy SP7 should be deleted and the policy aims should be included within SP6.	Policy has been deleted and Green Belt policies in the draft BLP (Submission version) have been rationalised into SP6.
Safeguarded land should be identified to meet longer term development needs and ensure that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be reviewed at the end of the plan period in accordance with NPPF Para 85	Following further work on employment needs the Council is protecting the Triangle site for potential long term Employment.

Housing

Housing issues	RBWM Council response
Meeting the housing need was supported	Noted
Suggested alternative locations for housing development include: Broom Farm; Combermere Barracks; Crown Estate land; Eton Wick; Fifield; Furze Platt; Holyport; Ockwells Park; Old Windsor; White Waltham Airfield; Wooley Green.	The Council has undertaken a robust assessment of proposed development sites which focuses development on previously developed land. If additional sites are promoted of sufficient size each will be assessed through the HELAA to determine deliverability.
Allocation of land to the south of the proposed allocation at HA11 is considered preferable in terms of flood risk, landscape impacts and impacts on existing residents. The allocation should be extended to include land to the south of HA11 to meet the full housing need for the plan period. Alternatively land to the south should be allocated instead of HA11	An area south of the proposed allocation of HA11 was assessed in the Edge of Settlement Analysis (2016) as making a strong contribution to both preventing sprawl and encroachment, which informed the HELAA (2016) deliverability classification of this area as 'Not developable in the next 15 years.'
<p>The following potential sites have been identified as part of the Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan process:</p> <p>1: Land between St Marks Hospital and Cemetery - size not established but potential for 25 homes. 137 Boyn Valley Road - smaller but similar to Middlehurst as currently occupied by commercial business.</p> <p>2: Small triangle of Green Belt land - between Ockwells Road and Thurlby Way - approx. 10 dwellings.</p> <p>3: Land south of Cox Green - and north of Ockwells Road. This land is not Green Belt but is protected by covenant to preserve the setting of Ockwells Manor. However, the Manor is obscured by vegetation even in winter. Consideration should be given to developing the northern and eastern side along Shoppenhangers Road and Cox Green Road. This would still leave substantial open space to the south and west of the site - along Ockwells Road.</p>	Sites of sufficient size promoted to the Council will inform site assessment work undertaken as part of the HELAA. Sites should be promoted through the proforma available on the Council's website, including a red line of the site.
Respondents also supported the provision of "garden villages" or a new settlement to meet housing needs.	The development of a 'garden village' or new settlement has not been progressed due to previous work through the Sustainability Appraisal which assessed such a proposal as unreasonable.

Housing issues	RBWM Council response
Clarify which housing sites which are strategic.	Policy HO1 included a list of sites considered to be strategic in nature. Revisions to Policy HO1 show which sites are considered to form part of growth locations.
Evidence base to support allocation of individual sites insufficient . Need further impact assessments for biodiversity (including mitigation measures), air quality and further flood risk assessment work.	A large amount of site assessment work has been undertaken, which has informed the allocation of individual sites. This includes an assessment of constraints, including flood risk and biodiversity.
Site assessments lacked robustness and selection/non-selection of sites with very similar strengths and weaknesses is not consistent.	The Council considers the site assessment and selection process suitably robust.
Site selection process should have regard to an up to date SFRA. Where flood risk a key consideration the site proforma should detail whether the land is within Flood Zone 2 or 3. These sites should not be put forward for development allocation unless other potential sites located in areas at lower risk of flooding are not available.	The site selection process considers flooding as one of a number of constraints. It is not considered necessary to state whether sites are located in a particular Flood Zone due to the changing nature of flood maps.
Sufficient sites have not been allocated to meet the need in view of site specific deliverability constraints. Site capacities appear to have been increased for a number of sites without justification. Master planning is required to demonstrate the required capacity is deliverable.	In some cases sites capacities have been changed to take account of recent assessment work, and further information from land owners and developers submitted during, and after public consultations.
Sites located within flood zone 3a with no safe access and egress cannot be viewed as deliverable.	Noted.
Site allocation pro-forma need to be strengthened with all development levels set out as maxima rather than minima.	Site proforma have been amended to include reference to 'approximate' levels of development.
Site pro-forma should include open space requirements in accordance with Neighbourhood Plan proposals.	Allocated sites will need to comply with the open space standards set out in the Borough Local Plan.
There are other areas of Green Belt identified for analysis in the Jan 2014 Preferred Options Consultation that are omitted from the BLP. If they have been omitted after due consideration the BLP should explain their exclusion.	Some sites consulted on previously have not been proposed as allocations. The HELAA (2016) sets out information regarding site assessments.
The windfall allowance is too high, representing 14% of planned supply. Evidence to support the windfall contribution is required. The windfall	The Small Sites Analysis appended to the HELAA (2016) sets out the justification for the windfall allowance.

Housing issues	RBWM Council response
allowance should be limited to 83dpa and alternative site allocations made in order to meet housing needs.	
Windfall sites should be deliverable in the early stages of the plan period ahead of Green Belt sites.	The nature of windfall sites means that they will come forward throughout the plan period. It is not possible to delay the development of greenfield sites as a result.
The windfall allowance should not include development on residential gardens.	Noted. Calculations for windfall allowance are based on past trends, where development on residential gardens has been excluded.
Evidence for the capacity and deliverability of a number of the proposed allocations has not been demonstrated.	The HELAA (2016) sets out the deliverability classification of the sites proposed.
Housing mix and type should be specified and reflect the SHMA	Policy HO2 has been amended to make reference to the mix of dwelling types and sizes in the Berkshire SHMA 2016, and successor documents.
The housing mix should reflect the needs of the communities and seek to balance the housing stock over and above market demand.	Noted. Policy HO2 provides further detail on Housing Mix and Type.
The mix of homes should be specified in the policy. One bedroom flats should be excluded from the total and only 25% of the total accommodation of two bedroom flats should be included on an annual planning basis. Where possible provision for three bedroom flats should be included in the mix of dwelling types.	Policy HO2 Housing Mix and Type sets out the approach taken.
High density, flatted development will not meet the need.	High density development is proposed in highly sustainable locations such as Maidenhead town centre. In other parts of the borough lower density development will be more appropriate, and will provide a mix of housing types and tenures to help meet local need.
Neighbourhood Plans will be an invaluable source of reference to determine the appropriate mix, type and size of dwellings for development proposal.	Noted
The BLP should plan positively to meet the needs of the older population.	Policy HO2 and the accompanying Explanatory text seek to provide a flexible, accessible, adaptable and age friendly housing stock that meets the needs of all groups.
A requirement to demonstrate need in the local area should be introduced for residential care facilities in HO2.	Policy HO2 has been adjusted to take account of local community need.

Housing issues	RBWM Council response
The need for care homes has already been demonstrated by the SHMA which identifies a need for 742 bed spaces. Applicants should not need to further demonstrate need in the local area.	Policy HO2 Housing Mix and Type sets out the approach, to ensure a variety of housing types and tenures.
Policy should recognise the changing demographic and the higher proportion of older people in the population. The delivery of a suitable range of housing stock is required to meet the needs of the ageing population.	Policy HO2 Housing Mix and Type sets out an appropriate approach to meeting the needs of current and future projected households.
The impact of the inclusion of the 20% wheelchair accessibility needs to satisfy PPG tests and be subjected to viability testing	Policy HO2 Housing Mix and Type has been amended
Not all sites are appropriate for the inclusion of a mix of dwelling sizes and tenures. Some flexibility should be included in the policy in Clause 1a	Policy HO2 Housing Mix and Type is considered appropriate in seeking a mix of housing types and tenures.
The provision of wheelchair accessible development is considered too onerous. A target for the provision of wheelchair adaptable accommodation is considered more appropriate	Policy HO2 Housing Mix and Type has been amended
The wording in the sentence regarding extensions and PD may introduce confusion within the planning process as it appears to suggest that extensions to properties do not require planning permission. In the context of permitted development some extensions may not, but others do. The insertion of the word "some" at the beginning of the sentence would remove this perception.	Text amended.
Sufficient commitment to affordable housing provision has not been expressed.	The Council is committed to ensuring increased levels of affordable housing are provided across the borough. The Council considers the inclusion of a policy that specifically supports affordable housing provision is sufficient. The threshold for providing affordable housing has been reduced, which will increase supply.
A 30% level of affordable housing provision at is considered too low and inadequate to meet the need identified by the evidence base. All development should contribute to the provision of affordable housing, regardless of size.	Viability evidence has shown that the affordable housing threshold is justified. The threshold for requiring affordable housing has been lowered to take account of planning practice guidance.


Housing issues	RBWM Council response
Commuted sum payments in lieu of affordable housing in Ascot and the Sunnings should not be accepted	Policy HO3 Affordable Housing states that commuted sums will only be acceptable in specific circumstances.
"Affordable" and particularly social housing should be evenly spread across the borough; creating concentrations of any type of tenure should be avoided to ensure diversity and sustainability.	As set out in Policy HO3, affordable housing will be sought on all relevant development proposals across the borough.
Affordability of 'affordable rent' products as 80% of market rent is still considered to be unaffordable to households with average incomes for the area	Noted
Local families/keyworkers and young people should receive priority with regard to the purchase/rental of homes within the proposed developments.	Noted
Off site provision of affordable homes is unworkable in RBWM due to the land supply constraints.	Policy HO3 Affordable Housing states that the on site provision of affordable housing is the priority.
45 The role of the council as land owner is an opportunity to provide high levels of genuinely affordable housing to rent on council owned land	The Council will pursue the delivery of affordable housing on publicly owned sites through the Joint Venture, to provide a suitable mix of types and tenures, including affordable housing. Further information will become available as the sites come forward for development.
Meeting housing need should not be met at the expense of existing businesses a	Noted
Affordable Housing Rural Exception Sites should comply with the strictest environmental standards such as code 4 or higher under sustainable homes, waste and water management, protection and enhancement of biodiversity, maintaining or creating new wildlife corridors and using at least 5% renewable energy	It is not considered appropriate to require specific environmental standards on particular sites.
Flexibility in the application of the policy is required. The provision of affordable housing will need to consider economic viability, market conditions and other infrastructure requirements. In addition there should be a flexible approach to product mix especially in view of government introduction of new affordable tenures	Policy HO3 Affordable Housing states that the viability of developing sites will be considered.

Housing issues	RBWM Council response
Those living on traditional roaming boats should be recognised as a distinct group to be protected by policy like other nomadic groups and that riverside mooring should be restricted to roaming boats not floating houses.	Noted
Object to the stepped trajectory.	Noted
Support for the exceptional delivery of affordable housing supported by market housing.	Noted
Include flood consideration in Clause D of Policy HO4 and include an additional clause requiring "Adequate on-site utilities, including water resources and supply, waste disposal and treatment, are provided."	Policy HO4 Gypsies and Travellers has been amended to include clause (e) to refer to onsite utilities.
HO5 and SP3 should be combined to avoid repetition	Design policies in the draft BLP (Submission version) have been rationalised and clarified. Policy HO5 has been combined with SP3
Amenity in residential development should be secured within Policy SP3 or HO5.	Design policies in the draft BLP (Submission version) have been rationalised and clarified. Policy HO5 has been combined with SP3
Replication of existing patterns in new development should not dictate proposed development density. The policy should recognise that design which will not adversely affect an area may be demonstrable without replicating existing patterns.	Policy HO5 Housing Density sets out the approach to housing density, recognising that higher density residential schemes are appropriate in some areas.
Policy HO8 supports development in residential gardens. This is contrary to NPPF intentions. Garden development should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances.	Noted. Policy HO8 has been deleted.
Policy HO8 criterion need to be amended to include ways to reduce rain water run-off by using permeable surfaces and rain water harvesting. Another criterion should be added so that the proposal has measures to contribute to green corridors, so as to contribute to biodiversity (as required by the NPPF).	Noted. Policy HO8 has been deleted. Policy SP3 Design and character of new development, and Policy IF3 Green and Blue Infrastructure support green and blue infrastructure schemes. Further information will be included in the Borough Design Guide SPD.

Economy

Economic issues	RBWM Council response
Support the approach to intensification and redevelopment of existing employment sites to meet the employment floorspace required over the plan period	Noted the policies reflect this in the Submission BLP
Employment designations should not be retained unless viable in accordance with NPPF Para 22.	Noted
Economic development needs are poorly defined. The 2013 CE forecasts are out of date. The council has not adequately assessed the land or floorspace needs. Proceeding on past trends does not meet NPPF para 161 requirements	The Submission BLP has changed the approach and an early review is planned for this topic.
Neither the supporting text or policy of ED1 mention requirements associated with economic development including staff parking, transport links and infrastructure. These matters should be referenced as important considerations.	These are covered by other policies in the BLP
Policies to protect employment designations should be considered in light of the forecast employment floorspace requirements. In view of the expected 13% windfall contribution it is expected that a number of employment sites could contribute to meeting housing needs. While the current policy complies with NPPF Para 17, where less efficient employment sites could be redeveloped to increase employment floorspace applicants should be able to demonstrate that other sites could be released for residential development.	The points are noted and in order to protect the Green Belt, reusing brownfield land is important. Effectiveness of policies in the submission BLP will be monitored.
Note that 7 sites (HA12, 13, 15, 17, 26,27 and 29) currently in employment use are proposed wholly for residential allocation and a further 6 (HA1,2,4,5,10 and 25) are proposed for mixed use development. The plan does not quantify the level of employment floorspace to be retained / re-provided at these sites. Without clear quantities, there can be no assurance that the required level of floorspace is delivered. The proposed provision of employment land on	The points are noted, but the Green Belt will be protected and the effective of policies will be considered and the evidence base for the Economy topic will be updated. Some sites will be subject to development frameworks or design briefs.

Economic issues	RBWM Council response
HA9 should be specified to ensure that the level of provision on the site will be sufficient to re-provide the level of floorspace lost by reason of the residential allocations (approximately 6.8ha). The residential development is accepted but the resultant loss of employment floorspace should be quantified. Consider the allocation of Lower Mount Farm as industrial land to help to ensure that a variety of employment sites continue to be provided in the borough.	
The Plan fails to allocate sufficient replacement commercial land for sites proposed for residential conversion, or providing suitable sites for small and medium sized business start ups.	Effectiveness of policies in the submission BLP will be monitored.
acknowledgement of the role of the Farmer's Market in providing a means for small local food producers to sell direct to customers, without the need to own or rent a permanent retail outlet	Not sure how this can be reflected in policies?
Tables 11 and 12 and their explanations are confusing. In particular, they do not adequately explain the difference between the three scenarios with any clarity	The layout of the plan has changed and more information will be in the topic paper.
Specify the intended housing and employment mix on mixed use sites	Some sites will be subject to development frameworks or design briefs where this information will be made clearer.
Stafferton Way should be listed as Warehousing	It has 3 areas and these should be clear in the BLP.
Support the reuse of the Alma Road/Imperial House site for residential use since the current extant permission appears to no longer reflect market demand.	There is demand for modern high quality offices and we wait for an appropriate development to come forward.
Land at Lower Mount Farm should be allocated as an industrial site.	See comment above.
Land at Grove Park should be released from the Green Belt for either a mixed use development retaining modern office blocks to the south or intensification of the business use with allocation as a business park under ED2	There are proposals for the land in the BLP.
Object to the allocation of the Switchback Office Park within the B2 industrial allocation at Furze Platz. Part 1 of the policy should better	It is important for the BLP to deliver sustainable development, which must include economic activity, so retaining employment land is

Economic issues	RBWM Council response
reflect Para 22 of the NPPF by not restricting development to "economically beneficial uses" where other development may support sustainable communities	important.
Land to the south of Furze Platt industrial allocation should be allocated for residential development instead of B2.	It is important for the BLP to deliver sustainable development, which must include economic activity, so retaining employment land is important.
New development must include a basic level of parking of 5 parking spaces per 1,000 sqft of office space, this space must be within the curtilage of the building or new parking spaces within 4 mins walk of the proposed office.	This is covered by other policies in the plan and an SPD.
In recognition of the continued need for employment land the allocation of HA26 for sole residential use is questioned. The proposed allocation at Shirley Avenue should be extended to the north to include the whole  Wale Road Industrial estate. The whole site should be allocated for mixed use employment compatible with residential use and residential development of approximately 130 dwellings.	This will be a mixed use site.
Extensive marketing evidence required by Policy ED3 for change of use of employment land is contrary to NPPF Para 22 and is considered contrary to the established PD rights for office to residential conversion.	It is important for the BLP to deliver sustainable development, which must include economic activity, so retaining employment land is important.

Town centres and retail

Town centres and retail Issues	RBWM Council response
Contribution that residential development can make to centres is acknowledged and the need to maintain vitality and vibrancy is supported for all centres within the retail hierarchy.	These comments are noted.
Consider inclusion for support for small business start ups within the plan objectives.	The Economy chapter is intended to support a range of businesses including start ups.
Support for allocation of residential development in the town centre to support the daytime and night time economy.	Noted
Welcome the recognition of Dedworth Road West as a local centre as well as Dedworth Road/Vale Road.	Noted
The BLP does not appear to offer any positive encouragement for businesses to invest in Maidenhead. Planning policies should be positive, promote competitive town centre environments in accordance with NPPF	This point is disputed, there are positive design policies, Town Centre and Retail policies as well as positive policies on the economy.
Request inclusion of the following Para to the supporting text "Studies have also shown that Farmers' Markets have the following benefits: More money is spent in the local economy, and it circulates in the locality for longer. There is high knock-on spending in other shops on market days They provide an outlet for local produce, helping to start new local businesses and expand existing ones. - they reinforce local job and business networks, maintaining local employment." and "The successful monthly Farmers' Market and weekday street markets ensure that: - more money is spent in the local economy, and it circulates in the locality for longer there is high knock-on spending in other shops on market days. - an outlet is provided for local produce, helping to start new local businesses and expand existing ones . local job and business networks are reinforced, maintaining local employment."	There is a policy on markets in the plan.

Town centres and retail Issues	RBWM Council response
There should be an aspiration to improve Maidenhead Town Centre's position in the retail rankings (344th).	Noted
Large, flexible retail units should be encouraged and support of amalgamating units to fulfil the needs of larger retailers.	There are new retail developments coming forward during the plan period and they may include formats to meet this need.
The policy should aim to encourage community facilities in the town centre together with family orientated leisure within and on the edge of town.	Noted
Loss of A1 in the prime retail frontages should be resisted	There are policies covering this matter in the plan.
Policy TR2 should be reviewed to give further flexibilities to the uses permitted within the primary and secondary frontages as defined within the BLP	This depends where the property is in the centre and the policies degree of flexibility varies according to how close to the centre.
Proposed visitor development area should be reviewed to define "visitor development" and ensure that other beneficial forms of development are not excluded from the defined area	Not exactly clear what this representation is proposing.
AAP Policy MT6 on Tall Buildings should be reinstated	Noted
Policy TR4 is supported. The wording "limited scope in each district centre" conflicts with the policy and should be changed to "some scope".	Noted
The impact threshold of 500sqm is too high for a district centre.	Noted, the policy is considered proportionate.
Contribution that residential development can make to centres should be acknowledged and the need to maintain vitality and vibrancy is supported for all centres within the retail hierarchy.	Noted

Visitors and tourism

Visitors and tourism issues	RBWM Council response
Enhancement of the riverside in Maidenhead was supported, particularly with regard to the provision of food and drink and leisure facilities close to the river together with parking and street furniture, not just flatted development	Noted
Support the stated objective of supporting and promoting the key heritage attractions of Windsor, Ascot and the River Thames. Support the inclusion of requirements 2b and 5 for the protection afforded to heritage assets and the character of an area.	Noted
Waterways and Heritage Centre in Maidenhead should be included in Policy VT1	The Waterways Project is considered in other areas of the Submission BLP (including Design and Green and Blue Infrastructure and Rights of Way and Access to the Countryside))
By “..bringing the Thames into town”, the waterway will substantially enhance Maidenhead’s attraction to visitors. The BLP should specifically acknowledge and support the Waterways project.	The Waterways Project is acknowledged in a number of areas of the Submission BLP (including Design and Green and Blue Infrastructure and Rights of Way and Access to the Countryside)
Existing visitor attractions should be recognised as a focus for visitors and further visitor related development. Policy VT1 is not in accordance with the NPPF as it currently reflects a presumption against development. .	Policy VT1 in the Submission BLP has been rationalised and revised to provide a positive approach to the historic environment.
An additional clause in support of the enhancement of the racecourses and Windsor Castle and Legoland as existing visitor attractions should be added to Policy VT1..	The Borough recognises the important contribution of these areas to the local economy but does not consider specific additional reference to be necessary.

Historic environment

Historic environment issues	RBWM Council response
Support positive strategy for the historic environment that valued the intrinsic value of historic buildings and their settings.	Noted
The recognition of the historic setting of the Thames supported	Noted
Concern that the historic place evidence base is inadequate. Evidence base should refer to the Conservation Appraisals and East Berkshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment.	Noted
Greater recognition of archaeology is required in the supporting text with reference to the Historic Environment Record and possibly the Historic Landscape Character Assessment.	The historic environment policies have been rationalised to provide a clearer and more robust policy framework for Heritage assets.
"Heritage Assets" definition should be in accordance with the NPPF glossary definition.	Noted
A specific policy for Windsor Castle is unnecessary. HE1 and HE2 together provide the required protections. The policy should be deleted.	The Council has retained the Windsor Castle policy as it is considered to provide local and specific guidance for an important local and national heritage asset .
Support Policy HE8 Local Heritage Assets Suggest that heritage assets at risk are identified to include Beenham's Heath Conservation Area, Noah's Boathouse and the Royal Mausoleum and a commitment to monitor them is set out in the plan in accordance with NPPF Para 126. Include a paragraph to commit the council to monitoring buildings and heritage assets at risk and ensure that schemes to positively repair and maintain the assets are considered, and, as a last resort, to use statutory powers. Suggest Policy HE8 is not restricted to those assets already on the list.	Noted


Natural resources

Natural resources issues	RBWM Council response
Reference should be made to the MW Framework for all waterway sites	Noted
Local planning authorities no longer have the power to add local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings at higher levels than Building Regulations.	Noted. Design policies in the draft BLP (Submission version) have been rationalised and clarified. Policy NR1 has been combined with SP3
Policy NR3 supported	Noted
The Jubilee River is a flood defence that incorporates a wetland feature and is not considered a SUDs scheme. Land associated with the River Thames Scheme should also be safeguarded by the policy at Clause 7. Suggested rewording of the policy at Clause 1 to reference the SFRA Level 1 and Clause 2.b. to reference the flood zone designation. Confirm at point 4 that the exception test will still apply.	The supporting text and policy has been amended to incorporate comments made.
Policy confuses and combines two quite different issues – flood relief and the Maidenhead waterway. Maidenhead waterway is NOT a flood defence scheme	Noted
Policy should support the role that trees and woods can play in terms of water management	
The word 'must' in Clause 3 should be replaced with 'should' to be consistent with the wording of Clause 2 and Clause 5. Clause 3c is vaguely worded and could be construed as preventing development on flood risk grounds even where it has passed the sequential test (and exceptions test if required), which is not consistent with the NPPF. Clause 3c should be deleted or amended to ensure it does not go beyond the requirements of the NPPF or conflict with the sequential test approach.	'must' has been replaced with 'should' to be consistent. Clause 3C is considered to be clear and is retained. There is not considered to be a conflict with the sequential approach. Reference to the planning practice guidance has been added in the supporting text.
Policy only requires a flood risk assessment for development of 1 Ha or more in flood zone 1 and development in flood zone 2 and 3 in accordance with the NPPF.	Noted

Environmental protection

Environmental protection Issues	RBWM Council response
The requirement for cumulative impact to be assessed is too onerous and is only required for development requiring Environmental Assessment. Clause 1 should be removed.	The Council does not agree; it is appropriate for this to be demonstrated at planning application stage.
Object to lack of cumulative impact assessment on air quality for the plan.	Noted
Specific requirements for all artificial lighting to be directional and focused with cowlings to reduce light spill into river corridors and other wildlife corridors within the Borough.	This is detail which would be picked up at planning application stage and which it would be appropriate, in principle, to control through a planning condition.
Part 4 should be deleted from Policy EP4. Development proposals should be assessed on an individual basis. Borough wide standards would be restrictive and onerous	The Council does not agree; whilst proposals should be assessed on an individual basis it is appropriate to indicate what noise standards proposals will be assessed against in order to achieve acceptable internal noise levels on noise sensitive developments.
Plan should reflect the aim of the NPPF by ensuring that existing and new development will not contribute to water pollution and that the aim of the Water Framework Directive of achieving good ecological classification in the borough's waterbodies, or at least ensure there is no deterioration within said classification. It should also reflect the targets and objectives set out for your local authority in the Thames RBMP.	Noted

Natural environment

Natural environment issues	RBWM Council response
With the scale of growth proposed for Maidenhead the waterways as a public amenity and source of open space should be acknowledged and supported.	The Waterways Project is acknowledged in a number of areas of the Submission BLP (including Design and Green and Blue Infrastructure and Rights of Way and Access to the Countryside)
Amend Policy NE1 to ensure that all new developments next to rivers will not lead to the deterioration of the ecological status of the waterbodies and where feasible will contribute to raising their status.	This is covered in Policy NR3 Nature Conservation
Amend policy NE1 to ensure that fragmentation of existing habitats is avoided and, enhanced connectivity is secured where feasible	This is covered in Policy NR3 Nature Conservation
Amend policy NE1 to afford protection for ancient woodland	This is now covered in Policy NR2 Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows
The cumulative impacts on biodiversity should be considered through the Sustainability Appraisal Process.	Noted
Amend Clause 3 of NE3 to refer to the health and quality of the tree, woodland or hedgerow.	The health and quality of the tree, woodland or hedgerow would be identified in the submitted tree survey to British Standard.
<p>5  Correct reference to the publication date of British Standard 5837 to 2012. Correct references to “Ockwells Park” to read “Ockwells Park and Nature Reserve, Cox Green”</p>	Noted
Include the Natural England definition of Green Infrastructure.	Included.
Open Space Audit should be available as a supporting document to the plan.	Noted
Support the designation of Poundfield as local green space	Noted
Object to allocation of Poundfield as local green space The Draft Plan in respect of Policy NE5 Poundfield Local Green Space is unsound in failing adequately consider reasonable alternatives has failed the legal requirement to produce a robust Sustainability Appraisal in this regard. The policy should be deleted.	The policy is in compliance with the NPPF
Policy NE6 should be amended to include criteria for biodiversity protection	This is picked up in Policy NR3 Nature Conservation

Infrastructure

Infrastructure issues	RBWM Council response
An infrastructure delivery plan should be prepared to demonstrate the deliverability of infrastructure to support the development proposed.	The Submission Plan evidence base includes an IDP
Policy IF1 should be amended to allow choice for education facilities, as well as need.	This is covered in the NPPF
Opposed to the relocation of the leisure centre. The existing site is considered to be more accessible by non car users and supports the town centre through linked trips. Loss of green belt, car parking on the existing site and the impact on the GP surgery of concern. Exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release have not been demonstrated. Highways capacity insufficient to accommodate the relocation and that the provision of sufficient car parking would be problematic. Provision of multi-storey car parking would not be sympathetic to the surroundings	A sequential assessment has been completed in relation to the relocation of the Leisure Centre together with other evidence base work which supports the allocation.
Policy IF2 should include a requirement to provide safe pedestrian and cycle access to the site from the town centre, and across the A308 to the proposed allocations to the south of Maidenhead	The policy basis to secure this is covered in the BLP and through CIL/Section 106.
Design of Leisure Centre should be sensitive to Cemetery and Braywick Nature Reserve	Noted
Use of the Local Transport Plan is flawed since it was produced in 2012 before the development proposed was envisaged or allocated sites identified. It is not considered an appropriate evidence base to inform the resolution of transport problems such as acute traffic congestion and lack of parking through the BLP.	The BLP is supported by a 2017 Transport Model
Production of Highways Design Guide and Parking Strategy SPD supported	Noted
Parking in centres has not been adequately considered	Parking has been considered in the infrastructure section of the BLP and more detailed consideration will be given to the design of parking through the Design SPD.
Further parking would be required at Maidenhead station to serve the increased population and Crossrail commuters.	Noted
Car parks in Maidenhead are operating at capacity. With high vehicle	Parking has been considered in the infrastructure section of the BLP and

Infrastructure issues	RBWM Council response
ownership, additional car parking is required to support retail and offices and for the proposed residents. Car parking spaces will need to reflect these increases. Unless parking, accessibility and infrastructure issues are addressed, Maidenhead's attractiveness will diminish	more detailed consideration will be given to the design of parking through the Design SPD.
A modal shift from private car use was not supported by the plan	The BLP is supported by a 2017 Transport Model, the relevant reports form part of the evidence base.
Object to the support for the car parking standards set out in Neighbourhood Plans. The application of a number of different standards within on local authority could inadvertently steer/hinder development in specific areas. A borough wide standard should be set to provide transparency and consistency which should also consider local circumstances and character	Noted
Crossrail" should be referred to as "The Elizabeth Line" from operation	Noted and done
New motorway grade link for the M40, M4 and M3 to be achieved in RBWM by upgrade of the A404 should be considered to alleviate congestion around A308 near Bray and Holyport	Noted
Proposals for a Bypass linking Slough Road and Majors Farm Road would take traffic out of the centre of the village but may become a rat run and raise air pollution level	Noted
Level of growth will lead to an increase in east/west commuting along the A4 leading to increased congestion and pollution in Taplow. Consider the A4 to be operating above capacity to the east of Maidenhead near Taplow	The BLP is supported by a 2017 Transport Model
Cross border consideration with Bracknell Forest is required in view of the high level of development proposed in both districts at and adjacent to Ascot.	The BLP is supported by a 2017 Transport Model and cross border transport matters are covered in the IDP and Compliance Statement
Capacity of existing highways and community infrastructure insufficient to accept further development. The concentrations of development in Ascot and the Sunnings, Cookham, Datchet, Maidenhead and Windsor of particular concern.	Infrastructure requirements are set out in the IDP
Transport modelling should be undertaken to demonstrate the impact of the plan proposals on the highway network and specify required any mitigating actions required in allocation policies.	The BLP is supported by a 2017 Transport Model and mitigation actions in relation to allocation sites covered in the IDP
Proposed provision of green open space infrastructure insufficient.	The plan is supported by an open space audit and contains open space

Infrastructure issues	RBWM Council response
	standards at appendix C
Ockwell Park would be too distant from Maidenhead town centre to have relevance	Noted
Emergency services should be listed as a stand alone infrastructure type	Noted and done in the IDP

Monitoring and appendices

Monitoring and appendices issues	RBWM Council response
Additional indicators for Monitoring Indicator 8 should include the number and percentage of assets on the Heritage at Risk Register and the number and percentage of Conservation Areas with an up to date character appraisal.	Noted. Suggested change to Monitoring Indicator made
The climate change and biodiversity targets do not satisfy the requirements of the NPPF. Additional targets should be included. Planned yearly net gain in biodiversity with new developments measured in ecological units as per the DEFRA 2012 guidance, number of developments with effective SUDS features, amount of green infrastructure provided, amount of priority habitat lost and gained. A Biodiversity Action Plan would provide for biodiversity monitoring.	Noted. Monitoring indicator adjusted to take comments into account.

Allocated Sites

Strategic locations

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
HA1 61	<p>Responses were fairly evenly split between support for and objection to the residential development of the site.</p> <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site assembly as an issue regarding deliverability of this proposal within the specified timeframe. • Potential for disruption during any construction. Emphasised the need to ensure that the railway line remained open at all times. • Site would be better developed as a transport interchange with improvements to the existing circulation of vehicles and pedestrians. • Proposals must provide adequate station parking along with high levels of parking provision within any residential scheme. • Grade II Listed Clock Tower should be preserved and opportunity taken to ensure that the setting is enhanced in any future proposal 	<p>The site is allocated for 150 residential development as part of a mixed use development on brownfield land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council considers that the site will be deliverable within the periods specified in the housing trajectory. • The allocation pro-forma supports the development in a manner that facilitates the delivery of a transport interchange with improvements to pedestrian interchanges. • The limited site area will prohibit the provision of extensive areas for parking. But the emphasis on the developing a working transport interchange will reduce the need for vehicle parking and the town centre local will reduce demand from residential. • The clock tower is identified as a key consideration.
HA2	<p>The majority of respondents objected to the proposals.</p> <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery timescales given the existing land use are unclear. Access may not be deliverable. The sequential test has not been applied to the allocation of the site. • Proposed 150 unit residential units will impact on school catchment areas for existing residents. 	<p>The site is allocated for approximately 150 residential units as part of a mixed use development on brownfield land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council is confident that the development can be delivered within the plan period particularly given that this and other town centre sites are being promoted as part of the joint venture with Countryside. • Employment workspace will be included as part of the mixed use component of future scheme.

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> wastewater network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage infrastructure may be required. This is a particular concern in light of the cumulative impact of HA2: Reform Road and HA5: York Road. existing light industrial employment units are likely to be lost as a result of the development which will be potentially detrimental to the local economy. Loss of employment use is considered a potential detriment to the local economy. <p>Suggestions for the improvement of the allocation guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> where flood risk is shown as a key consideration the site pro-forma should detail whether the land is within Flood Zone 2 or 3. The majority of this site appears to be located within flood zone 3. It is unlikely that a mixed use development of 150 residential units, with education facilities and employment space could be supported by required flood mitigation measures. the change of use from industrial estate to housing and a landscape buffer offers opportunities to increase biodiversity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall need for school places has been taken into account in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) Developers will be expected to liaise with the utilities companies to ensure that capacity is developed to cope with the additional residential units. The site proforma notes the need to provide suitable mitigation for development land located in flood zone 3A. Additionally, flood risk betterment is required on site incorporating appropriate flood risk reduction measures and ensuring that the exceptions test is met.
HA3	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> in favour of retaining the leisure centre in town as a more accessible location with scope for linked trips. The leisure centre could be developed within the town centre by using the bowling alley, with the residential development could be accommodated at Braywick. 	<p>Site is allocated for residential development of approximately 600 units, which will only become available, once a new sports and leisure facility is constructed on Braywick Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site forms part of the joint venture, and the redevelopment of the site will ensure a more efficient use of previously development land in close proximity to Maidenhead town centre.

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
63	<p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern regarding impacts on the GP service • Sufficiency of parking and the provision of local highways and community infrastructure provision required for the additional residents • number of units proposed on site is too high • loss of Green Belt at Braywick. • The redevelopment proposals should consider biodiversity enhancement and retention of mature trees bounding the site. <p>Suggestions for the improvement of the allocation guidance: Some support providing the principles of the Maidenhead Waterways Framework SPD are incorporated.</p> <p>Several comments on proposed policy IF2 (New Sports and Leisure Development at Braywick Park).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GP surgery is not included in the red line boundary of the site. The Council will continue to work with the CCG and the surgery to ensure appropriate solutions to the issues raised can be accommodated, including an expansion of facilities as appropriate. • In accordance with Policy SP3 development will be expected to front onto the waterway, in order to improve the setting of the waterway and design of the development proposed. • The guidance requires future development to provide green infrastructure linking to the existing green and blue infrastructure network.
HA4	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of the site for mixed use and the opportunity to improve access to the high street and Kidwells Park. • The owners of part of the site consider the site capacity should be increased to 310 residential units.. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern regarding parking and pedestrian/cycle routes. • Biodiversity enhancement should be considered. • Concern regarding disruption to services with regard 	<p>The site is allocated for approximately 240 residential units as part of a mixed use development on brownfield land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The allocation for 240 units is considered appropriate in order to ensure a sufficient mix of uses is accommodated. • Site proforma has been amended to require the retention of the Listed building. • Cycle and pedestrian routes through the site, including to Kidwells Park will be enhanced, as required by the site proforma. • It is anticipated that the existing surface level car parking will come forward for development prior to the remainder of the site. Discussions will continue between the Council and BT regarding their

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
	<p>to services provided by the telephone exchange</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on Grade II Listed Reform Church. 	<p>land ownership.</p>
<p>HA5</p> <p>64</p>	<p>Broadly equal numbers supporting and objecting to the proposals.</p> <p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The (partial) landowner confirms that the site is available for development in the short term. • Inclusion of criteria retaining the Grade II listed library within an appropriate setting • Usage of the Green Way as a route to/from the Town Centre will increase with development at the ex-park and ride and relocation of Leisure to Braywick Park. • The inclusion of a pocket park is very welcome. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • car parking provision • need to retain community uses on the site • high number of dwellings proposed. • Biodiversity should be enhanced by the proposals and a high quality open space retaining the "damp green strip" included, not a "pocket park". • Small office units should be included in the development mix to support business start ups. • Wastewater network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage infrastructure may be required. Concern regarding the cumulative impact of HA2: Reform Road and HA5: York 	<p>The site is allocated for approximately 320 residential units as part of a mixed use development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site forms one of the areas included in the joint venture. The site is located in a highly sustainable location, which is appropriate for higher density development. • New development proposals will be expected to comply with the Council's Parking Standards, whilst recognising the proximity to sustainable modes of transport, notably Maidenhead railway station. • The proforma requires the provision of green and blue infrastructure, including a pocket park is anticipated to provide high quality public realm. This includes improvements to the waterways to encourage walking and cycling through the town centre, including along the Green Way. • The mixed use development of the site will include employment floor space to support the viability and vitality of the town centre, which may include space for business start ups. • Future development will be expected to enhance the York Stream by improving its amenity value and accessibility and integrating waterways into the new development is a key consideration. • The boundary of the site has not changed. • Mixed use employment will allow for the development of a range

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
65	<p>Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of HA1, HA2 and HA5 will need to minimise any disruption during construction and ensure that the railway line remains open at all times. • The boundary should be extended to make the streets the boundary so that buildings are not excluded. • "Mixed use employment" is poorly defined. Does this refer to residential and office use? • In accordance with the Maidenhead Waterways Framework, York Road Bridge needs to be replaced both to allow narrowboat navigation and to allow continuous walking and cycling on the Green Way. <p>Suggestions for the improvement of the allocation guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include 1 York Road and the Corner House Pub in the site allocation. • Compliance with the principles of the Maidenhead Waterways Framework SPD; • Contribute to the implementation of the Maidenhead Waterway project; • Provide pedestrian and cycle links through the site to the Maidenhead Waterway and the town centre; • Enhance pedestrian and cycle links along the waterway; • Include a replacement bridge over the waterway at York Road 	<p>of employment uses in conformity with ED1 to allow for a flexible response to economic requirements.</p>
HA6	<p>High number of people responded to the proposal for the development.</p> <p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited support for the proposals, subject to infrastructure improvements, which would 	<p>This green belt site is allocated for approximately 2000 residential units, educational facilities (including a primary and secondary school), strategic public open space (including formal play and playing pitch provision) and multi-functional community hub.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IDP sets out the likely infrastructure to support the cumulative

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
66	<p>significantly boost the supply of housing in the area. As a Council owned site, the provision of affordable housing was supported, particularly for social rent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Retention of Rushington Copse and other mature trees on site, together with the provision of green corridors to ensure that existing populations do not become isolated, including a suggestion that Rushington Copse could be designated as a key wildlife site to prevent over use. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Number of dwellings proposed for the site was considered too high, given the on site infrastructure requirements, the resulting development would be too dense and not in keeping with the suburban, green leafy character of the area. ● impact on existing residents surrounding the site was of concern including impacts on residential amenity, privacy and house prices ● development to the south of Maidenhead would lead to coalescence of Maidenhead with Holyport ● the existing highways and community infrastructure had limited ability to cope with the increased number of residents and vehicle movements ● loss of Green Belt ● loss of biodiverse, green open space, and impact on biodiversity. ● loss of the golf course as a community facility and asset for Maidenhead was also of concern. ● the collective allocation of sites HA6, HA7, HA8 and 	<p>development proposed across the borough. Further information regarding specific on site requirements will developed as the site comes forward for development. The Council will continue to work with service providers to assess the infrastructure requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Policy SP3 supports the use of green corridors through development as part of an integrated and well connected site. Specific information regarding biodiversity protection and enhancement requirements will be progressed as more detailed assessments are undertaken. The proforma requires the development of the site to be designed sensitively to conserve the biodiversity of the area. ● The site proforma requires the design to be sensitive to the existing properties around the site and the sloping topography, and to retain existing mature trees, including Rushington Copse. ● The number of dwellings proposed on the site is considered to be deliverable, including the on site infrastructure required, as indicated in the IDP. The density of the site will reflect its sustainable location in close proximity to Maidenhead town centre, and the railway station. The BLP proposes higher density development in Maidenhead town centre, in addition to a number of other sites across Maidenhead and the wider borough. ● The strategic road network provides a durable boundary that prevents the coalescence of settlements. ● The IDP sets includes a number of schemes that will mitigate the impact of the development proposed on the local highways

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
67	<p>HA9 on grounds of highways capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • alternative sites to the north of Maidenhead, where highways networks could be improved, offered a more appropriate direction of expansion for the town <p>Suggestions for guidance for future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include specific biodiversity protection and enhancement requirements. • Support for the preservation of the mature trees bounding the site to preserve the privacy of existing residents. 	<p>network. Further information and assessments will be undertaken as the site comes forward for development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways, pedestrian and cycle access to the site will be considered in relation to HA7 and HA8 to ensure an integrated approach. The IDP includes further information relating to the educational facilities which may be provided on site. • Developers will be expected to liaise with the utilities companies to ensure that capacity is developed to cope with the additional residential units. • The site has been assessed as making a lower or moderate contribution to all the purposes of the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development. • The site is expected to provide affordable housing in accordance with Policy HO3.
HA7	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The allocation of HA6 and HA7 are supported. The sites are available and deliverable for development. The allocation of 2000 dwellings on the golf course appears realistic and consistent with the need to balance environmental impacts against the need to use land efficiently in such a highly sustainable and accessible location. • The parcel controlled by Heyford Developments is available and deliverable for development within 0-5 years. Suggest that an SPD is produced for the allocation in consideration of the multiple ownerships within the 	<p>This green belt site is allocated for development of approximately 380 residential units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has been assessed as making a lower or moderate contribution to all the purposes of the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development. • The number of dwellings proposed on the site is considered to be deliverable, including the on site infrastructure required, as indicated in the IDP. The density of the site will reflect its sustainable location in

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
68	<p>allocation. Support the provision of open space on the site and confirm that areas within the site at risk of flooding will not be developed and that a number of surface water drainage strategies could be explored to ensure there would be no increase in surface water run-off from the future development.</p> <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the existing highways and community infrastructure's ability to cope with the increased number of residents and vehicle movements. • 350 dwellings is considered undeliverable on the site in consideration of onsite mitigation measures for noise and air pollution and flooding, habitat and protected species constraints. • The site capacity is constrained by noise and pollution together with ground water and surface water flooding, which constrains the developable area • loss of Green Belt land • flooding concerns for the site • impact on existing residential properties • impact on biodiversity • coalescence of Holyport and Maidenhead • alternative sites to the north of Maidenhead, where highways networks could be improved, offered a more appropriate direction of expansion for the town and that better use of town centre sites could be made through high density, high rise development. <p>Suggestions to guide future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities for biodiversity enhancements on the site and potential links the Braywick green space and Thrift Wood area could be established. 	<p>close proximity to Maidenhead town centre, and the railway station. The BLP proposes higher density development in Maidenhead town centre, in addition to a number of other sites across Maidenhead and the wider borough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IDP sets out the likely infrastructure to support the cumulative development proposed across the borough. Further information regarding specific on site requirements will developed as the site comes forward for development. The Council will continue to work with service providers to assess the infrastructure requirements. • The IDP sets includes a number of schemes that will mitigate the impact of the development proposed on the local highways network. Further information and assessments will be undertaken as the site comes forward for development. Highways, pedestrian and cycle access to the site will be considered in relation to HA6 and HA8 to ensure an integrated approach. • The site proforma includes various requirements to improve accessibility, conserve and improve biodiversity, and ensure development is high quality, as set out in Policy SP3. The topography of the site will also be taken into consideration in the design of future schemes.

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flooding areas could be adapted to minimise downstream surges and accommodate wild life in situ using shallow ponds and reed beds. include specific biodiversity protection and enhancement requirements. Provide , across land parcels HA6,7,8,9, a green superhighway comprising a continuous woodland/rough grassland or wild corridor to enhance biodiversity including under the A 308 road and linking HA7 to the river known as 'The Cut' on the other side of the road". Include protected species under key considerations. 	
HA8 69	<p>Support for :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Masterplanning and capacity analysis of the site has identified that it can accommodate circa 220 dwellings so the capacity of the site should be amended to reflect this. The site is available and deliverable within the early part of the plan period. <p>limited, support was given to the development of the site subject to appropriate highways capacity increases.</p> <p>Objection to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> existing highways and community infrastructure ability to cope with the increased number of residents and vehicle movements, loss of Green Belt flooding concerns The existence on the site and across the wider area of deer, foxes, squirrels, woodpeckers, tits, finches, thrushes, slow worms and wild orchids need to be taken into 	<p>This green belt site has been allocated for development of approximately 220 residential units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has been assessed as making a lower or moderate contribution to all the purposes of the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development. The IDP includes a number of schemes that will mitigate the impact of the development proposed on the local highways network. Further information and assessments will be undertaken as the site comes forward for development. Highways, pedestrian and cycle access to the site will be considered in relation to HA6 and HA7 to ensure an integrated approach. The proforma also requires improved access through the site to improve connectivity, including alterations to Harvest Hill Road to facilitate pedestrian and cycle access. The entire site is located in Flood Zone 1. Flooding is therefore not considered a significant development constraint.

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
70	<p>account.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coalescence of Maidenhead and Holyport would result in the south Maidenhead expansion. • The level of development proposed for the area is out of keeping with its suburban character. • Objection to the collective allocation of HA6, HA7, HA8 and HA9 on grounds of highways capacity. • Alternative sites to the north of Maidenhead, where highways networks could be improved, offered a more appropriate direction of expansion for the town and that better use of town centre sites could be made through high density, high rise development. • Wastewater network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage infrastructure may be required. • The site capacity is constrained by noise and pollution together with ground water flooding, which constrains the developable area. <p>Suggestions for guiding future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pro-forma should be amended to include specific biodiversity protection and enhancement requirements. • opportunities for biodiversity enhancements on the site and potential links the Braywick green space and Thrift Wood area could be established. <p>Some, very</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development capacity of the site has been assessed with consideration of the requirement that future development should be sensitive to the scale and heights of existing properties on Manor Lane and Kimbers Lane and those granted planning permission on the former site of Shoppenhangers Manor. The BLP proposes higher density development in Maidenhead town centre, in addition to a number of other sites across Maidenhead and the wider borough. • The strategic road network provides a durable boundary that prevents the coalescence of settlements. • Developers will be expected to liaise with the utilities companies to ensure that capacity is developed to cope with the additional residential units.

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
<p>HA9</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">71</p>	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of options are supported by the landowner. <p>Objection to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing highways and community infrastructure ability to cope with the increased number of residents and vehicle movements. • the safety of accessing the site; access to the site will need to be from the A330 unless the A308 (M) is downgraded. The A330 is considered to operate above capacity at peak times. • The site is prone to flooding in the western section and is proposed for 180 residential units. Where flood risk is shown as a key consideration the site proforma should detail whether the land is within Flood Zone 2 or 3. • air and noise pollution • coalescence of Maidenhead and Holyport • Alternative suggestions for the site included a hospital, leisure facilities and commercial use. In spite of short term non availability because it is required by Highways Agency for "Smart Motorway" works, this location is more suitable for Commercial/Light Industrial development, rather than residential. Many businesses will need to relocate from Boyn Valley Road, Reform Road etc, and this represents an opportunity to keep large vehicles away from the Town Centre. • collective allocation of HA6, HA7, HA8 and HA9 on grounds of highways capacity. The respondents considered that alternative sites to the north of Maidenhead, where highways networks could be improved, offered a more appropriate direction of expansion for the town. • Retention of appropriate setting for the Mesolithic Moor Farm monument is required. Archaeological assessment may be needed prior to Submission. 	<p>It is no longer proposed that this site should be allocated for residential development.</p>

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wastewater network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage infrastructure may be required. Special account should be taken of the copse of ancient woodland and the existence of kestrel, snipe, rare grassland / marsh plants such as Mullein and any of the species existing in the wider area. The existence on the site and across the wider area of deer, foxes, squirrels, woodpeckers, tits, finches, thrushes, slow worms and wild orchids need to be taken into account. 	
HA10 72	<p>Very high public response and major template letter.</p> <p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The allocation from the owners of parts of the site subject to various suggestions. Including request that Shorts Waste site is disaggregated from the town centre allocation as per the neighbourhood plan. <p>Objection to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> level of development too high and destroying the semi-rural character of the area. The number of home proposed should be reduced to reflect the neighbourhood plan proposals release of the Green Belt; The southern boundary to Allocation HA10 does not follow the parcel boundary identified in the assessments. As a result as currently drawn it provides an illogical boundary which excludes clusters of existing development and does not follow the “durable boundaries” identified in the analysis. development not in line with the Neighbourhood Plan. Site pro-forma should be in accordance with the 	<p>This part green belt site is allocated for approximately 300 residential units, plus strategic open space, multi functioning community hub and small scale retail development to support the Ascot town centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IDP sets out the likely infrastructure to support the cumulative development proposed across the borough. Further information regarding specific on site requirements will developed as the site comes forward for development. The Council will continue to work with service providers to assess the infrastructure requirements. The part of the site to the south of Ascot High Street has been assessed as making a strong contribution to preventing settlements from merging but a lower contribution to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment in the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016). The Shorts site which is previously developed land is similarly assessed. The Neighbourhood Plan envisages development for residential and a range of other uses especially open space, retail and community uses. Its Policy is to work with the Borough to redraw the Green Belt

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
73	<p>Neighbourhood Plan particularly with regard to detailed design policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • town centre allocation for Ascot not only is Ascot considered to be a district centre but the level of development proposed is too high • The only site supported for development is the Short's waste site and that should be retained in the Green Belt for appropriate redevelopment. • lack of infrastructure delivery plan • CIL receipts should be retained within the area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An updated traffic model should incorporate the impacts of cross border development proposals. • Wastewater network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage infrastructure may be required. • The Green Belt analysis of the various parcels is flawed. PDL sites should remain within the Green Belt subject to appropriate development. Only the Shorts Recycling site should be included in the BLP but retained in the Green Belt. Land to the south of the High Street should remain within the Green Belt. • Open space should be included as part of the allocation with the amount specified. • Reference to a multi-functional community hub should specify the inclusion of a village square and community centre. • The parcel owned by Sole provides more ability to achieve the necessary vehicular and pedestrian accesses from Station Hill to serve the wider allocation and provide convenient links to Ascot 	<p>boundary to allow for this land to come forward in the future to meet community aspirations including retail/community and open space complementary to Ascot Village proposals, residential development to match the “leafy residential suburbs” character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proforma envisages an integrated mixed use development including all the uses identified in the neighbourhood plan, sensitively designed to provide quality improvements in the public realm, especially the high street and which supports the character and function of the area. Development will be required to respect the scale and heights of existing properties around the site and taking account of the sloping topography. • On site infrastructure provision and facilities to cater for race day traffic and parking will be a key consideration. • Biodiversity will similarly be a key consideration with mitigation being required in respect of the impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. • Developers will be expected to liaise with the utilities companies to ensure that capacity is developed to cope with the additional residential units. • Other issues will be considered as part of the usual range of concerns considered through the application of all development plan policies including the neighbourhood plan for this area, as part of the development management process.

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
	<p>Station</p> <p>Suggestions to guide future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proforma should refer to an estimated capacity for the residential units to ensure that effective use is made of allocated land, whilst respecting the need to retain open space and important trees. 	
<p>HA11</p> <p>74</p>	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developer representation supports the proposals and indicates future development concepts and uses <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> lack of infrastructure capacity for the level of development proposed. Highways and community infrastructure capacity will require careful consideration of existing deficits by the IDP potential coalescence of Windsor with surrounding settlements loss of green belt and loss of valued green open space air pollution and flooding potential loss of agricultural land number of units too high to permit provision for gardens and parking. The site capacity is overstated; density should reflect the existing adjacent development at 25dph. The site capacity is for fewer than 390 dwellings when the space for the proposed educational facilities community hub, sports pitches and open space are included. loss of the garden centre affordability of housing provided. re-prioritisation of previously developed land, vacant 	<p>This green belt site is allocated for development of approximately 450 residential units, strategic public open space, formal football and rugby pitch provision, a multi functional community hub and educational facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has been assessed as making a moderate or low contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development. Most of the site is either within flood risk 1 or 2 although a small area along the western edge of the southern area is zoned 3b, providing a substantial area of land which can be developed subject to acceptable measures for dealing with surface water.. The requirements include the provision of enhanced public open space and playing fields. The site is on the edge of Windsor and the assessed capacity of this site has taken into account the character of development in surrounding areas alongside the constraints and requirements for open space etc. Existing valuable trees on site should be retained Affordable housing will be required in accordance with the provisions of the BLP. National planning policy sets out the relationship between local

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
75	<p>property and higher densities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to comply with the Bray neighbourhood plan and impact on Green Gap policy • impacts on the Cardinal Clinic, the listed building, local businesses and the loss of the garden centre as an employer. • Not all land available for development • proposals should have regard to the setting of the Grade II* The Old Farmhouse • edge of settlement Green Belt analysis is considered to be incorrect • site is prone to surface water flooding. Strong support for open space and on site school provision. • Biodiversity impact including Great Crested Newts and Great Water Parsnip <p>Alternative locations for housing suggested, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combermere Barracks • Crown Estate land • Windsor racecourse land • development to the east of Windsor • Broom Farm estate. <p>Suggestions to guide future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wastewater network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage infrastructure may be required. • affordable housing is required • Designed sensitively to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the area, trees and hedgerows." 	<p>plans and neighbourhood plans. Because of the importance of this site in terms of meeting assessed housing need during the plan period, this site has been recognised a strategic site and therefore if adopted will have precedence over emerging neighbourhood plan policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IDP includes a number of schemes that will mitigate the impact of the development proposed on the local highways network. Further information and assessments will be undertaken as the site comes forward for development. • The key considerations listed in the proforma for this development site include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding and surface water • Heritage • Landscaping • On site infrastructure provision and phasing • Highways • Biodiversity.

Maidenhead

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council Response
HA12	<p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • density of development now 300 units proposed. • loss of employment land • noise impacts on existing residents. <p>Suggestions for guiding future development were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • site specific noise constraints for HA12 should be provided. • access via Silco drive will be required. • confirmation that access will be allowed on Crossrail sidings. • waste water network capacity may be unable to support the demand • add requirement for biodiversity. 	<p>This brownfield site is allocated for approximately 240 residential units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site area now allocated has been reduced to allow retention of employment on the south western end. The development capacity has been reduced accordingly. • Requirement for noise attenuation is included in the proforma. • Access including pedestrian and cycle access through the site to the town centre is a requirement. • Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider. • Biodiversity will be protected by requirements for open space and green landscaping.
HA13 76	<p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lack of information on existing uses • where flood risk is shown as a key consideration the site proforma should detail whether within Flood Zone 2 or 3. • question the deliverability of 30 units given location within flood zone 3. 	<p>This brownfield site is allocated for approximately 40 residential units. It is currently not occupied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pro forma includes a requirement for flood risk betterment. • The site capacity has taken account of the likely flood risk requirements.
HA14	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sustainable location for housing with open space <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • proforma should detail whether the land is within Flood Zone 2 or 3. • flooding effects the site and may impact on viability and deliverability • impact on biodiversity and loss of green space. • loss of playing field. • wastewater network capacity may be unable to support the 	<p>This greenfield site is allocated for development of 60 residential units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proforma requires provision of open space in areas of the site prone to flooding. • The site capacity has taken account of the likely flood risk requirements. • Proforma requires retention of mature trees and hedgerows. • Open space re-provision is identified as a key consideration. • Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider.

	<p>demand</p> <p>Suggestions for guiding future development were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specify requirement to protect biodiversity generally and especially in relation to the needs of population of overwintering toads on the site (toads migrate to Summerleaze Lake to breed). Biodiversity Action Plan should be required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology is flagged as a key consideration for future development proposals. The proposals have been the subject of a Habitats Regulations Assessment.
77 HA15	<p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the number of dwelling (too high). Originally proposed for 15 maisonettes, permission has been granted for 45 flats over 4 to 5 storeys. • wastewater network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated • access concerns. 	<p>This brownfield site is allocated for development of approximately 45 residential units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proforma identified a requirement to consider sensitively the privacy and amenity of neighbouring residential properties. • Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider. • Access to the site is flagged as a key consideration.
HA16	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • residential use in view of the surrounding residential land use; considered available and deliverable at identified capacity. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • proposed site capacity 	<p>This brownfield site is allocated for development of 20 residential units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site capacity has been assessed taking into account emerging policies, site context
HA17	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • proposed development available and deliverable in the short term. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to the loss of a successful business park which will affect deliverability • density of the proposed scheme • highway concerns at junction of Holyport Road or Hendons Way. 	<p>This brownfield site is allocated for development of 25 residential units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocated for residential development in order to meet the assessed need for homes during the plan period. Other policies will protect employment sites. • Site capacity has been assessed taking into account emerging policies, site context and the proforma requirement that the design reflects the character of the residential area and the privacy and amenity of neighbouring residential properties.

	<p>Suggestions for guiding future development were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> waste water network capacity may be unable to support the demand future development should reflect design and character of existing homes in the area. mature trees should be protected. should specify whether a detailed drainage strategy is required to be submitted with the planning application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access is listed as a key consideration Retention of mature trees is required Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider. Drainage and other issues will be considered as part of the usual range of concerns considered through the application of development plan policies as part of the development management process.
<p>HA18</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">78</p>	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the allocation as achievable and deliverable for 100 dwellings and support the relocation of the Thames Hospice to the site and its inclusion in the allocation. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> part of the site is Grade 1 agricultural land the sequential test has not been applied site affected by poor air quality removal of the site from the green belt resulting in the coalescence of settlements and loss of the green gap; loss of open space and access to the lakes proposed density of development is too high with impacts on the character of the area relocation of the hospice is accepted, but additional development will have adverse impact on Highways adverse impact on community infrastructure proposals will impact on biodiversity in the area the site is affected by flooding from Bray Lake due to Thames level controls <p>Suggestions for guiding future development were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> waste water network capacity upgrades are considered necessary and Detailed drainage strategy should be required as part of a submission for future development. 	<p>This Green belt site is allocated for residential development of 100 residential units with relocation of the hospice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has been assessed as making a moderate contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development. Proforma includes following requirements and considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> appropriate edge treatment and access to the permitted path around the lake noise from Windsor Road sensitivity to long distance views in the design of future buildings retention of existing mature trees particularly at site boundaries is required. Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider. The list of key considerations includes ecology and protected species. Therefore these issues will be specifically considered during the development management processing of any future

79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • site provides an opportunity for an office for the parish council and a community play area. • buildings should be low profile and designed to mitigate the impact on long distance views and residents on the main road. • public access to Bray Lake should be retained • traffic management measures need to be considered along with bus improvements. • compliance with the principles of the Maidenhead Waterways Framework SPD. • provide pedestrian and cycle links through the site, around the lake to the Bray Cut • biodiversity requirements should note take account of the bats found in the TVERC records around Bray Lake, and other biodiversity, particularly any protected species. • provision of noise mitigation measures 	application for development.
HA19	<p>Support for :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • allocation for 75 residential units as achievable and deliverable <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on adjacent farm, loss of damp meadow habitat to the detriment of owl and goose populations • residential capacity in respect of access and flooding constraints. • the site may be undeliverable in consideration of flood constraints. <p>Suggestions for guiding future development were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • require compliance with the principles of the Maidenhead Waterways Framework SPD; Contribute to the 	<p>This Green Belt site is allocated for residential development for 175 units with provision of plots for self build/ custom build housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has been assessed as making a lower contribution to low contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development. • Site capacity has taken account to the need to meet the assessed need for homes during the plan period including consideration of site constraints and impact of development on populations of protected species. • Requirements are specified in in the proforma in regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ flood risk betterment and appropriate flood risk reduction measures

	<p>implementation of the Maidenhead Waterway project;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide pedestrian and cycle links through the site and alongside the Whitebrook section of the waterway route; • maximise views to the waterway, areas of public realm adjoining the waterway and have an appropriate setting on the waterway. • design should encourage neighbouring field to be used for overwintering geese. • add key considerations of biodiversity, protected species and trees and hedgerows. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ retention of valuable trees ○ design to be of high quality with appropriate edge treatment and transition to countryside. ○ provision of recreational access to the Thames Path ○ biodiversity.
<p>HA20</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">08</p>	<p>Support for :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the site available and deliverable within the first five years of the plan. The site provides suitable access and links to the wider area and suitable heritage and landscape mitigation can be provided to deliver a high quality development with a range of open spaces and community facilities. The robust boundaries and tree lined section will act to contain a development while new planting and consideration of densities will provide a suitable transition to the countryside. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • existing green belt makes a strong contribution to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is highly visible. Objection to loss of green belt and loss of separation between settlement from Maidenhead • brownfield sites in centre of Maidenhead should be prioritised • proposals will increase the level of traffic through the village of White Waltham, when combined with the expected Crossrail generated traffic flows, this increase is considered likely to have an adverse impact. The existing local highways 	<p>This green belt site is allocated for residential development for 300 units with strategic public open space and sports pitches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has been assessed as making a moderate to lower contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development. • The site requirements will require the retention of valuable trees particularly at the site boundaries as part of a design to provide an appropriate edge treatment and transition to the countryside. • The development will be designed to front onto Woodlands Park Avenue. • Although hedgerows are not specifically mentioned, the proforma requires: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the protection of trees particularly at the site boundaries ○ the importance of achieving a satisfactory setting to conserve and enhance the listed building is acknowledged as a requirement.

81	<p>network is unable to accommodate buses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on community infrastructure; GP services and the school are at capacity. • impact on the listed building • impact on Biodiversity • adverse impact on the operation of the airfield • concern for flooding on site. Where flood risk is shown as a key consideration the site pro forma should detail whether the land is within Flood Zone 2 or 3. • it will not be possible to secure safe and suitable access on to Cannon Lane. • the site is within Groundwater source protection zone 1. <p>Suggestions for guiding future development were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • future development of the site should preserve hedgerows and trees to minimise landscape impacts • support the recognition of the setting of the complex of Grade II listed buildings at Lillibrooke Manor. • waste water network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated • add requirement "Designed sensitively to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the area". Add key considerations: Biodiversity, Trees and Hedgerows, Protected Species. inclusion of biodiversity criteria to site pro forma. • an agricultural land quality survey notes the site is 3b - moderate quality. Land at Lillibrooke Manor and Ockwells Manor contain small areas of Grade 2 land which should be reflected in the site pro forma. 	
HA21	Support for :	

82	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> residential development, subject to appropriate flood mitigation and highways capacity improvements support the allocation for residential dwellings but object to the requirement for a secondary school and associated pitch facilities. Retention of on site community facility and provision of changes facilities should only be included if required. Studies indicate capacity for up to 500 dwellings. A vision document including a landscape and visual appraisal and Green Belt review, concept masterplan, transport appraisal, flood risk appraisal, hydraulic modelling note, noise assessment report and secondary education needs briefing note have been prepared in support of the representation and are submitted as evidence. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> extent of the proposed development. 300 residential units and a secondary school are proposed. The eastern section is prone to flooding. Development of the western section only may be accepted for development. the allocation should be redefined so that the woodland is excluded from the area of development highways and community infrastructure capacity in the local area flooding concerns that cannot be mitigated loss of Green Belt and consequent loss of openness and loss of separation between Cookham and Maidenhead The sequential approach to site selection has not been applied. impact on biodiversity Wastewater network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage 	<p>This Green belt site is allocated for residential development for approximately 300 units along with educational facilities and associated sports pitches including the existing football pitch and changing facilities and consideration for provision of a junior football pitch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has been assessed as making a moderate to lower contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development. Flooding and surface water management is flagged as a key issue. Detailed studies of hydrology will be required in connection with future development proposals. The impact of proposed development on utilities and community infrastructure including schools provision have been considered as part of the IDP. Biodiversity is acknowledged as a key issue for any future development The issue of separation is acknowledged in the requirement for an appropriate edge treatment and transition from the countryside Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider.
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

83	<p>infrastructure may be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The education needs briefing note concludes that there is no need for an additional secondary school to serve the local community should the need arise, then the most suitable location for such a development would be Maidenhead Golf Course (HA6). <p>Suggestions for guiding future development were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the development to reflect the surrounding existing developments with regard to building height, density and open space. • On site or walking distance provision of education, health and community needs should be provided. • Add to the requirements: Compliance with the principles of the Maidenhead Waterways Framework SPD; Contribute to the implementation of the Maidenhead Waterway project; • Provide pedestrian and cycle links through the site and alongside the Maidenhead Ditch section of the waterway route; Maximise views to the waterway, areas of public realm adjoining the waterway and have an appropriate setting onto the waterway. • Retention of the copse to maintain biodiversity and conserve protected species including breeding buzzards – especially with regard to noise impact. • The stand of trees / copse should be left undisturbed as it is home to various protected species. There needs to be a wildlife corridor from the copse to a suitable point on the site's perimeter. • ecological enhancements around the riparian corridor of Maidenhead Ditch. Sufficient scope for retained and new habitats for bat populations 	
HA22	Support for:	

- the site is available and deliverable for the capacity indicated. Site proforma should all be amended to reflect the estimation of capacity to aid flexibility. While a small portion of the site is Grade 2 land such a small site is unlikely to form a viable agricultural unit in isolation. The site is privately owned and is not publicly accessible. Therefore development would not result in a loss of public open space.

Objections to:

- indicated capacity is too high
- the proposals will increase the level of traffic through the village of White Waltham, when combined with the expected Crossrail generated traffic flows, is considered too high an increase.
- impact of development on existing community infrastructure; local GP services and the school are at capacity.
- the loss of Green Belt; HA22 is designated as Local Green Space by the Hurleys and Waltham Neighbourhood Plan
- coalescence of settlements and considered that the separation of White Waltham, Woodlands Park and Cox Green should be preserved.
- impact on biodiversity
- loss of open space valued by communities ,
- impacts on operation of the airfield
- the site at Breadcroft Lane is liable to flooding and it will not be possible to secure safe and suitable access on to Cannon Lane.
- noise from White Waltham Airfield and the railway line may impact on capacity

This green belt site is allocated for approximately 100 residential units.

- The site has been assessed as making a low contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development.
- An indicative capacity of 100 residential units is considered suitable. The indicative site capacity has taken account to the need to meet the assessed need for homes during the plan period and create good quality residential environments that reflects the character of the area on this site.
- Most of this land is classified as grade 2 agricultural land but has not been farmed for some time.
- Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider.
- The impact of proposed development on utilities and community infrastructure including schools provision have been considered as part of the IDP.
- There is a requirement that valuable trees be retained on the site. This is to aid the visual separation of the site from existing settlements.
- Noise from the railway line is acknowledged as an important issue for future consideration and there is a requirement for mitigation measures to be included.
- Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider.

	<p>Suggestions for guiding future development were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • waste water network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage infrastructure may be required. • designed sensitively to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the area Provision of Green Corridors in order to enhance biodiversity and connect any green spaces on site and right across the site to the land each side (avoid fragmentation). • key considerations: biodiversity, trees and hedgerows, protected species. 	
<p>HA23</p> <p>85</p>	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the allocation of the site and the scale of development proposed of 100 dwellings as deliverable. Between 92 and 111 dwelling could be delivered at a medium/low density residential scheme which provides on site informal open space. Further flood assessment is being undertaken given that is understood by the landowners that the existing site levels are above the level of the lake akin to surrounding areas outside of zones 2 and 3. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • amount of development in proximity to the lake • highway capacity • flooding concerns • loss of Green Belt leading to coalescence • impacts on the SSSI, • impact on biodiversity • impact on landfill, mineral extraction and flooding impact on deliverability • loss of public open space and rights of way a lake side buffer is preferable to residential gardens down to the Lake. • a sequential approach has not been demonstrated 	<p>This green belt site is allocated for residential development for approximately 100 residential units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has been assessed as making a moderate contribution to preventing sprawl of the built up area but a low contribution to safeguarding the countryside and purposes of the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development. • An indicative capacity of 100 residential units is considered suitable in order to create good quality residential environments on the site and to support the character of the area. • The proposals have been the subject of a Habitats Regulations Assessment which has assessed the impact of development on biodiversity and the SSSI. • The Council is separately preparing a new minerals and waste plan which will address the need to protect future minerals reserves; moreover the existing workings are subject to

	<p>Suggestions for guiding future development were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • waste water network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage infrastructure may be required. • the site is subject to significant flooding from Bray Lake due to Thames level controls. Where flood risk is shown as a key consideration the site pro forma should detail whether the land is within Flood Zone 2 or 3. • subject to retention of the green gap between settlements, building should be low profile and designed to mitigate the impact on long distance views and residents on the main road. • public access to Bray Lake should be retained and the existing footpath adopted as a PROW. • traffic management measures and junction improvements at the Bray Roundabout to the junction of Monkey Island Road are required as although the closure of the Summrleaze facility will reduce HGV traffic, other vehicle movements will increase. • further development to the east of Monkey Island will be resisted and the development should be landscaped to form the boundary of the Green Gap. • special account should be taken of the bats found in the TVERC records around Bray Lake, and other biodiversity, particularly any protected species including Pennyroyal Mentha pulegium in the field adjacent to Bray Pennyroyal Field SSSI • request that the site should be renamed "Land West of Monkey Island Lane" . • provision of sensitively located buildings along the lakeside edge should be included within the allocation considerations. 	<p>existing planning permissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider. • The site proforma notes the need to reduce flood risk. • Future proposals will need to ensure sensitive design to ensure that impact on long distance views are and edge treatments achieve an appropriate transition to the countryside and the lake. • Links to the path around the lake must be maintained and connections made to the public rights of way network. • Ecology and protected species are specifically flagged as key issues and there is a requirement for sensitive design to conserve the biodiversity of the area.
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • key consideration of air quality should be removed. 	
<p>HA24</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">87</p>	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the site is available and achievable within five years. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • failure to include biodiversity clauses within the proforma. • the irregular size and shape of the proposed site boundary which does not make best use of previously developed land available for development. The allocation could be increased from 80 to 130 dwellings through modest changes to the site boundaries to include all PDL. • the sequential approach to site selection has not been applied. • the current aggregates business is operation. Flooding and remediation may cause viability and deliverability issues. <p>Suggestions for guiding future development were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where flood risk is shown as a key consideration the site proforma should detail whether the land is within Flood Zone 2 or 3. • compliance with the principles of the Maidenhead Waterways Framework SPD; Contribute to the implementation of the Maidenhead Waterway project; Provide pedestrian and cycle links through the site and alongside the Maidenhead Ditch section of the waterway route; Maximise views to the waterway, areas of public realm adjoining the waterway. • provision of Green Corridors in order to enhance biodiversity and connect any green spaces on site and right across the site to the land each side (avoid fragmentation) Key considerations: Trees and Hedgerows, Protected species. • provision for sensitively located buildings along the lakeside 	<p>This Green Belt site is allocated for residential development for approximately 130 units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has been assessed as making a low contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development. • The central and southern parts of the site are located in flood risk 3a. The site proforma notes the need to provide suitable mitigation for development land located in flood zone 3A. Additionally, flood risk betterment is required on site incorporating appropriate flood risk reduction measures and ensuring that the exceptions test is met. • Conserving biodiversity is identified as a key consideration for any future development. This may, if appropriate include maintenance of connections between greenspaces to conserve biodiversity. • A requirement for appropriate edge treatment and transition to the countryside has been included in the proforma. • The proforma requires the maintenance and protection of the exiting tree belt around the perimeter of the site but there is no specific mention of a buffer to woodlands.

	<p>edge should be included</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> request that the need for flood betterment and provision of a buffer to the woodland is removed from the policy requirements. 	
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Windsor

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
<p>HA26</p> <p>88</p>	<p>Support for :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> support for residential development. But the site capacity should be increased approximately 90 dwellings. support but as the allocation HA26 extended to the north to include the whole Vale Road Industrial estate, the site should be allocated for mixed use employment compatible with residential use and residential development of approximately 130 dwellings. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the retention of commercial space for light industrial use was of concern due to the scarcity of such sites in Windsor for new housing. impact of the development on the highway the majority of the site appears to be within flood zone 3. Question the deliverability of 80 dwellings especially if only part of the site is suitable for building. capacity limited by site contamination. <p>Suggestions for guiding future development were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> disruption and pollution during the demolition and 	<p>This brownfield land site is allocated for residential development for approximately 100 units as part of a mixed use development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An indicative capacity of approximately 80 residential units is considered suitable. The BLP needs to balance the need to meet housing need with the equally important need to ensure that suitable employment premises are available to meet the needs of the economy. The allocations proforma flags the need to achieve flood risk betterment on site incorporating appropriate flood risk reduction measures and ensuring that the exceptions test is met. It is not considered that this will adversely affect deliverability. The provision of the community facility on site is a key consideration. It is required that pedestrian, cycling and vehicular access is provided onto Vale Road.

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
68	<p>construction phase should be minimised for existing residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no concern re wastewater capacity in relation to this site. But public sewers traverse the site and need for prior approval for works within 3 meters should be noted. • there is an Islamic Prayer Room on site which is required to be relocated within Windsor as part of the redevelopment therefore no need for a community facility on the site. • access is to be retained through to adjoining land to the north to allow for flood escape, future development of the site to the north or retention as commercial uses providing employment opportunities as appropriate. • there is no need for public open space on site as there is extensive public open space adjoining the site on the Clewer Memorial Recreation Ground. However a play space set in an area of open space can be supplied. • contamination on site is not likely to be significant. • noise will not be a consideration once the site is redeveloped for residential purposes. • access is not a key consideration as the access road already exists and will be upgraded. 	
HA27	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the redevelopment of the site for residential use. <p>Objection to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on the SAC • heritage impacts <p>Suggestions for guiding future development were:</p>	The site is no longer proposed as a housing allocation

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no concern re waste water capacity in relation to this site. Public sewers traverse the site and no building works will be permitted within 3 metres of the sewers without prior approval. • the sensitivity to the Royal Estate Windsor 	
HA28 06	<p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the loss of car parking capacity for the station • impact on the historic environment and distant views to Windsor Castle and Home Park • need to maintain the riverside within the public realm. • the sequential approach to site selection has not been applied. <p>Suggestions for guiding future development were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proforma should reflect the need for the development of the site to have regard to the setting of the Windsor Town Centre Conservation Area. • designed sensitively to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the area. Add key considerations: trees and biodiversity. 	<p>This brownfield land site is allocated for residential development for approximately 30 units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An indicative capacity of 30 residential units is considered suitable. The site allocation has taken account to the need to meet the assessed need for homes during the plan period including consideration of transport policies such as station parking need. • Requirements for future development include sensitive design to take account of distant views including from the Thames and support and enhance the character of Windsor and the Town Centre Conservation Area. • Trees must be retained in order to maintain a green corridor along the river which will enhance provision for biodiversity in addition to landscape trees.
HA29	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • development of the site for housing. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • heritage impact and AQMA may limit deliverability. 	<p>This brownfield site is allocated for approximately 35 residential units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicative capacity is considered suitable taking into account site constraints including heritage concerns. • Requirements include the need for sensitive design to take account of the Inner Windsor conservation area, the Trinity Place and Clarence Crescent Conservation area and the associated listed and important non-listed buildings.

Ascot Sunninghill and Sunningdale

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
<p>HA30</p> <p>92</p>	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> support the site as deliverable. A site capacity of 50 dwellings is deliverable. <p>Objection to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> exceptional circumstances for the removal of the site from the Green Belt have not been demonstrated . Release of land from the Green Belt – development should only accord with what is permitted under green belt policies. indicated capacity for this site is too high and will impact adversely on the semi-rural character of the area. development will adversely impact the existing transport and education infrastructure which cannot support any further development. site pro-forma should be in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan particularly with regard to detailed design policies. redevelopment of the station car park would exacerbate existing car parking issues in the area. the allocation should include small scale retail and a requirement to improve the pedestrian walkway under the railway bridge and the drop off circle in front of the station. impact on SPA may require mitigation. <p>Suggestions for guiding future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CiL receipts should be retained in the area in which they are generated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This brownfield Green Belt site is allocated for 35 residential units with a requirement to increase the amount of public carparking currently available. The site has been assessed as making a strong contribution to preventing settlements merging in the green belt purpose analysis Edge of Settlement Study (2016). The site is however separated effectively from development to the south by the railway line and is previously developed land. In addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development. The site allocation has taken account to the policy requirements to meet the assessed need for homes during the plan period. This includes consideration of the green belt policies in respect of this site and consideration of transport policies such as station parking need. It is required that future development should be designed to act as a gateway to Ascot and to ensure that there are quality improvements to the public realm. The design must take account of long distance views and to retain mature trees to enhance the character of new development Enhanced pedestrian and cycle access to and through the station from Station Hill is required. A financial contribution to mitigate the impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area is required.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighbourhood plan policies, particularly regarding design, should be specified within the site pro-forma. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CIL payments are an important means of funding infrastructure and the distribution of a share to the community is set through National planning policy
<p>HA31</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">93</p>	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site could accommodate a minimum of 15 dwellings and is available and deliverable within five years. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> exceptional circumstances for the removal of the site from the Green Belt have not been demonstrated . Release of land from the Green Belt – development should only accord with what is permitted under green belt policies. it would not be possible to establish clear defensible Green Belt boundaries if the site was removed from the Green Belt. indicated capacity for this site is too high and will impact adversely on the semi-rural character of the area. development will adversely impact the existing transport and education infrastructure which cannot support any further development. the spatial distribution does not recognise existing constraints to development site pro-forma should be in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan particularly with regard to detailed design policies. the level of development proposed for the site to be 	<p>This green belt site is proposed for residential development with a limited capacity of approximately 10 residential units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This includes consideration of creating defensible Green Belt boundaries through the design of future development. Design is required to be of a high quality and support the character of Ascot including long distance views into the sight. Valuable trees must be retained including at the boundaries of the site. Impact on highways of future development has been as part of the traffic impact study. Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider. CIL payments are an important means of funding infrastructure and the distribution of a share to the community is set through National planning policy. Other issues will be considered as part of the usual range of concerns considered through the application of all development plan policies including the neighbourhood plan for this area, as part of the development management process.

	<p>expressed as a maxima,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> development may impact adversely on the SSSI and mature trees. <p>Suggestions for guiding future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CiL receipts should be retained in the area in which they are generated for local improvement and the prioritisation of provision of affordable housing on site. waste water network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage infrastructure may be required. designed sensitively to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the area. Add key considerations: Trees and biodiversity. 	
<p>HA32 94</p>	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposals particularly the restriction of the allocation to the currently developed area. The NP supports allocation for residential development in principle, subject to green belt policies in relation to previously developed land. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> exceptional circumstances for the removal of the site from the Green Belt have not been demonstrated and the contribution to the green belt has not been adequately assessed. it would not be possible to establish clear defensible Green Belt boundaries if the site was removed from the Green Belt. the proforma should take account of the current planning application. indicated capacity for this site is too high and will impact 	<p>This previously developed land in the green belt is allocated for residential development for 250 in addition to re-provision of hospital facilities on site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The capacity takes account of the requirement to provide on site public open space, a landscape buffer to the woodland and the provision of a bespoke SANG to mitigate the impact of residential development on the Thames Basin Heaths special protection area. All these factors will have the effect of limiting the overall capacity of this site and preserving the openness of the area. There will be a requirement for future development to enhance the setting of the scheduled ancient monument through development of a landscape buffer. Impact on highways of future development has been as part of the traffic impact study.

95	<p>adversely on the semi-rural character of the area. The level of development proposed for the site should be expressed as a maxima and reduced to circa 175 dwellings to allow provision of adequate parking on site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • development will adversely impact the existing transport and education infrastructure which cannot support any further development. • site pro-forma should be in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan particularly with regard to detailed design policies. • provision of SANG and protection of the woodland may limit deliverability of the site <p>Suggestions for guiding future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • future development should be guided by a masterplanning approach for the hospital redevelopment and residential development • the new GP surgery should not be co-located at the hospital but consideration should be given to locations next to the shops to make best use of linked trips • the gateway location of the site and impact on the street scene merit specific mention on the pro-forma as per neighbourhood plan design criteria. • Scheduled Ancient Monument of Bell Barrow on Bowledge Hill should be conserved and the setting enhanced. • Waste water network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage infrastructure may be required. • the proforma should include the mix of housing types, building positioning should respect the gateway 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider. • The impact of proposed development on utilities and community infrastructure including schools provision have been considered as part of the IDP. • Replacement or retained health facilities should be part of any new development. • Conserving biodiversity is identified as a key consideration for any future development. • The site is identified in the neighbourhood plan as a potential development site. The policy intention is to ensure that the areas which are not currently developed remain subject to the green belt policies. But to secure as far as possible the continued existence of health care facilities on the site. Land not required for hospital re-provision is envisaged as being available for housing subject to a number of detailed requirements. • Other issues will be considered as part of the usual range of concerns considered through the application of all development plan policies including the neighbourhood plan for this area, as part of the development management process. • CIL payments are an important means of funding infrastructure and the distribution of a share to the community is set through National planning policy
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>location, the need for substantial green landscaping, in keeping with the overall green and leafy character of the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development needs to be designed sensitively to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the area; provision of Green Corridors to enhance biodiversity and connect any green spaces on site. <p>Add key requirements for trees and biodiversity.</p>	
96	<p>HA33</p> <p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • development of up to 100 units, to include the Manor House and land to the south west of the Manor House. The site should be recognised as a major PDL site in the Green Belt. <p>Objection to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptional circumstances for the removal of the site from the Green Belt have not been demonstrated and the contribution to the Green Belt has not been adequately assessed. Inclusion in the BLP is considered premature. • Development of the site should support the focus on the educational and research purposes of the site. • It would not be possible to establish clear defensible Green Belt boundaries if the site was removed from the Green Belt. <p>Suggestions for guidance of new development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proforma should take account of the current planning application. • Indicated capacity for this site is too high and will impact adversely on the semi-rural character of the area. The site should be developed for approximately 25 dwellings. • Development will adversely impact the existing transport 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This previously developed land within the green belt is allocated for residential development for approximately 75 units . • The allocated site boundary has altered from the reg 18 plan by the inclusion of land to the south and exclusion of the main campus and business park area. The site is therefore now concentrated around the residential accommodation areas and including Manor House. • The capacity also takes account of the requirement to conserve and protect the setting of the listed buildings, provide on site public open space, a landscape buffer to the woodland and the provision of a bespoke SANG to mitigate the impact of residential development on the Thames Basin Heaths special protection area. All these factors will have the effect of limiting the overall capacity of this site and preserving the openness of the area. • It is required that valuable trees on site should be retained especially near the boundaries of the site where these will be important in defining the defensible boundaries of the site and green belt in the future. • The proposals have been the subject of a Habitats regulations assessment which has assessed the impact of development on

97	<p>and education infrastructure which cannot support any further development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site pro-forma should be in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan particularly with regard to detailed design policies. • The appropriateness of the bespoke SANG is open to challenge. Provision of SANG and protection of the woodland may limit deliverability of the site 	<p>biodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future development will be required to be designed sensitively to conserve biodiversity in the area as well as to conserve and enhance the setting of the listed buildings and other heritage assets. • The land is identified in the neighbourhood plan. Policies seek to support the research and business functions by allowing development, subject to a development brief. The majority of the site is required to be retained in education and research. This will be facilitated by the alteration of the site boundary. Improvements to the environment will also be facilitated by the proposed residential development. • A requirement is included in the proforma to provide pedestrian and cycle links and improve connectivity and a new bridleway. • CIL payments are an important means of funding infrastructure and the distribution of a share to the community is set through National planning policy • Other issues will be considered as part of the usual range of concerns considered through the application of all development plan policies including the neighbourhood plan for this area, as part of the development management process.
HA34	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • up to 50 modest homes could be developed on the site provided these were available as affordable housing to local people. • in principle support for inclusion in the BLP but object to the number of dwellings proposed with Neighbourhood Plan policies taking precedence in order to ensure appropriate scale of development to meet local 	<p>This previously developed land within the green belt site is allocated for residential development for 230 units which may include specialist accommodation for elderly people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The capacity also takes account of the requirement to provide on site public open space, a landscape buffer to the woodland and the

98	<p>character and for the built footprint to be set back from the site boundaries with extensive landscaping. The site should be developed as appropriate PDL development within the Green Belt and should not be removed from the designation. The site was not included in the Edge of Settlement Analysis and the contribution to Green Belt has not been assessed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • site capacity of 250 dwellings. The site proforma should reflect the suitability of the site for specialist accommodation for older people in the pro-forma. An extension to the allocation to include the PDL car park and a further area reflecting topographical constraints should be included. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • exceptional circumstances for the removal of the site from the Green Belt have not been demonstrated and the contribution to the Green Belt has not been adequately assessed. Inclusion in the BLP is considered premature. • indicated capacity for this site is too high and will impact adversely on the semi-rural character of the area. The site should be developed for approximately 25 -30 dwellings at a density of not more than 50dph to reflect the character of the area. • The density of the development proposed cannot be implemented in compliance the Neighbourhood Plan policy for the development to take the form of Villas in a Woodland Setting or Leafy Residential Suburbs. • development will adversely impact the existing transport and education infrastructure which cannot support any 	<p>provision of a bespoke SANG to mitigate the impact of residential development on the Thames Basin Heaths special protection area. All these factors will have the effect of limiting the overall capacity of this site and preserving the openness of the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The suitability of this site for residential development for older people is acknowledged in the allocation. • The extent of the site allocation takes into account the sensitive conservation and heritage issues relating to the balance of the wider site. • A bespoke SANG will be created to mitigate the impact of the development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area including any necessary contribution required to satisfy the Habitat Regulations. • Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider. • The impact of proposed development on utilities and community infrastructure including schools provision have been considered as part of the IDP. • CIL payments are an important means of funding infrastructure and the distribution of a share to the community is set through National planning policy • The site is identified in the neighbourhood plan for redevelopment with a strong preference for employment provision unless it can be demonstrated that this would not be viable. Given the suitability of the site for housing and to meet the assessed need across the area housing is proposed along with measures to ensure provision of the environmental benefits also set out in the neighbourhood plan policies. • Other issues will be considered as part of the usual range of concerns considered through the application of all development
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

66	<p>further development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • site pro-forma should be in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan particularly with regard to detailed design policies. • the appropriateness of the bespoke SANG is of challengeable. • bespoke SANG should be included in the list of requirements although a SANG may limit deliverability of units.. <p>Suggestions for guiding future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site includes part of the Grade II registered historic park and garden of Sunningdale Park. Support recognition of the need to conserve and enhance the historic parkland and its setting but note that the identified site is actually within the registered parkland. • Waste water network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage infrastructure may be required. 	<p>plan policies including the neighbourhood plan for this area, as part of the development management process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIL payments are an important means of funding infrastructure and the distribution of a share to the community is set through National planning policy
HA35	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While recognising the need for new homes, it is considered that the spatial distribution does not recognise existing constraints to development. • Site capacity of up to 80 dwellings is deliverable within five years. The requirement for tree retention should be subject to appropriateness of retention in view of quality and value of the tree. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • level of development too high and destroying the semi-rural character of the area • any future development should be sensitive to green belt 	<p>This site is allocated for residential development on brownfield land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessed capacity for this site is approximately 53 units on this brownfield site. This has taken into account the character of the surrounding area and site constraints such as existing mature trees. • CIL payments are an important means of funding infrastructure and the distribution of a share to the community is set through National planning policy

100	<p>character</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • development not in line with the Neighbourhood Plan town centre allocation for Ascot. • CiL receipts should be retained in the area in which they are generated <p>Suggestions for guiding future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site pro-forma should be in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan particularly with regard to detailed design policies. • The number of units could be increased subject to access to Cavendish Meads and Bridge Road being secured. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The neighbourhood plan indicates this as a development site subject to detailed requirements regarding traffic impact, a mix of dwellings across the site, open space, pedestrian and cycle route provision and other matters to be developed through a development brief. • The proforma requires the provision of vehicular access plus pedestrian and cycle access to Bridge Road and High Street • Other issues will be considered as part of the usual range of concerns considered through the application of all development plan policies including the neighbourhood plan for this area, as part of the development management process.
HA36	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site allocation should be for car parking and small scale retail as well as residential development to be consistent with the pro-forma for Ascot Station Car Park. Provision of open space should also be included. • Land to the west of HA36 site is promoted as a logical extension to the Broomhall car park redevelopment for 55 units. The Site requirements for HA36 are not considered deliverable without allocation of this adjacent parcel. The requirements for on site parking, retail units, enhanced vehicle access and SANG provision will need to be reviewed without allocation of the adjacent land. 	<p>This site is allocated for residential development on brownfield land..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessed capacity for this site is approximately 28 units on this brownfield site. This has taken into account the proximity to Sunningdale station and also the constraints including the requirement that the amount of public carparking currently available should be increased over and above the amount that would normally be required to serve the new residential and employment space • This site is identified in the neighbourhood plan as providing a potential opportunity to support the district centre through a mixed use

101	<p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • level of development too high and destroying the semi-rural character of the area • release of the Green Belt has not been justified • the development would not be in line with the Neighbourhood Plan policies • Retention of CIL receipts in the local area • concerned with the ability of the highways and community infrastructure to cope with the proposed level of development • The level of development proposed for the site should be expressed as a maxima. • Concern about the impact on car parking provision in the local area • Car parking and small scale retails and public open space should be included. • Provision of SANG may limit deliverability of the site <p>Suggestions for guiding future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the site would be more appropriately used for a new GP surgery. • No concern regarding wastewater infrastructure capacity in relation to this site 	<p>development including small retail units, housing and a medical facility and providing design excellence reflecting the local character..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future development is required to be designed to a high standard which supports the character and function of the area and particularly to take account of the views of the site from Chobham Road. Character and appearance of Sunningdale is listed among the key considerations. • Mature trees on the north west boundary are to be retained. • There is no requirement for SANG provision, but development should include a financial contribution to mitigate the impact of residential development on the Thames Basin Heaths special Protection Area. • The development must ensure that small retail units are provided onto London Road to support the local centre with no loss of retail floorspace. • Enhanced vehicular entrance should be provided. • CIL payments are an important means of funding infrastructure and the distribution of a share to the community is set through National planning policy • The impact of proposed development on utilities and community infrastructure including schools provision have been considered as part of the IDP.
HA37	Objections to:	

102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • level of development too high and destroying the semi-rural character of the area • release of the Green Belt has not been justified • the development would not be in line with the Neighbourhood Plan policies • Retention of CIL receipts in the local area • concerned with the ability of the highways and community infrastructure to cope with the proposed level of development. The number of dwellings proposed will jeopardise the safe operation of the single land access and junction with the A30. • The level of development proposed for the site should be expressed as a maxima. <p>Suggestions for guiding future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add requirements ;Designed sensitively to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the area. Provision of Green Corridors in order to enhance biodiversity. 	<p>This site is allocated for residential development for 37 units on residential garden land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future development is required to be designed to a high standard which supports the character and function of the area particularly at the site boundaries where retention of valuable is a particular requirement. • The impact of proposed development on utilities and community infrastructure including schools provision have been considered as part of the IDP. • CIL payments are an important means of funding infrastructure and the distribution of a share to the community is set through National planning policy • Traffic impact of future development has been assessed through the traffic impact study. • Other issues will be considered as part of the usual range of concerns considered through the application of all development plan policies including the neighbourhood plan for this area, as part of the development management process.
-----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Other areas

Site Ref	Issues	RBWM Council response
HA38	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer support for delivery up to 40 to 50 dwellings within five years • proposal makes best use of previously developed land, will 	<p>This site is allocated for residential development for approximately 40 units on brownfield land.</p>

103	<p>"improve a scar on the landscape"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • capacity could be increased by extension of the site to the adjacent garages. <p>Objection to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the allocation due to the detrimental impact on the village character of Cookham • inability of highways and community infrastructure capacity to cope with proposed development . Walking distance provision of education, health and community needs should be provided. • biodiversity concerns • Contaminated land may impact on the number of dwellings deliverable on the site. <p>Suggestions to guide future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • proposed development must reflect the character if the village. • Waste water network may not be able to support demand anticipated • Site allocation pro-forma should require the development to reflect the surrounding existing developments with regard to building height, density and open space. Sewer capacity constraints should be resolved. • Designed sensitively to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the area Provision of Green Corridors in order to enhance biodiversity. Add key considerations: Trees and hedgerows and Biodiversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future development will be required to be designed to reflect the character of the area and have an appropriate relationship with adjoining land uses. • Potential contamination is a key consideration and future proposals must provide an appropriate solution for this. Mature trees and hedgerows are required to be retained on site to both mitigate the impact of development and to provide an environment for wildlife. • The impact of proposed development on utilities and community infrastructure including schools provision have been considered as part of the IDP. • Traffic impact of future development has been assessed through the traffic impact study. • Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider.
HA39	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development regrettably accepted subject to protection of residential amenity of Strand Park. Design should reflect Strand Park. • The site allocation is supported for residential units. The site is particularly suitable for mobile homes which can support the needs of older people. 	<p>This site is allocated for residential development for 20 units on Green Belt land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has been assessed as making a lower contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development.

104	<p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • detrimental impact the high level of development proposed for Cookham will have on the village character due to the and the lack of highways and community infrastructure capacity in the local area. On site or walking distance provision of education (primary school) , health and community needs should be provided • Loss of Green Belt, loss of green open space contribute to coalescence of Cookham and Maidenhead • sewer capacity • Biodiversity impact concerns were raised with regard to toads and slow worms on site • Wastewater network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage infrastructure may be required. • Flooding concerns. <p>Suggestions to guide future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is particularly suitable for mobile homes which can support the needs of older people. • Site allocation proforma should require development to reflect the existing dwellings on the adjacent Strande Park and the resolution of all flood risks. • A full biodiversity survey should be undertaken with special account taken of the glow worms on site. Their presence also indicates a high quality grassland habitat that may also harbour protected species. Provision of Green Corridors in order to enhance biodiversity. Add: Key considerations: Trees and Hedgerows, Biodiversity, Protected Species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessed capacity for this site is approximately 20 residential units. The design of future development is required to ensure that it provides a suitable edge treatment and transition into the countryside. • Valuable trees, particularly those at the periphery of the site should be retained. • Achieving an appropriate scale of development is noted as a key consideration for future development. • Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider. • The impact of proposed development on utilities and community infrastructure including schools provision have been considered as part of the IDP. • Traffic impact of future development has been assessed through the traffic impact study. • Other issues will be considered as part of the usual range of concerns considered through the application of all development plan policies including housing mix and the protection of biodiversity and the conservation of any protected species as part of the development management process.
HA40	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation is supported. Phase 1 Ecology survey indicates no notable or protected species on site however the northern and western boundary hedges/tree belts should be retained to provide green corridors. Trees will be retained as none 	<p>This site is allocated for residential development on Green Belt land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessed capacity for this site is approximately 200 residential units having taken into account the site constraints and the character of the area.

105	<p>represent constraints to development. Existing highway capacity exists to support the development. Development will be in Flood zone 1 with the incorporation of SUDs features.</p> <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • level of development proposed for the Cookhams is too high. • Impact of development on highways and community infrastructure capacity especially given need for additional education and health provision • unsuitability of the narrow lanes for increased vehicle movements • the loss of green, open space and potential coalescence of Cookham with Maidenhead. Impact on the openness of the Green Belt. • the proposals would be damaging to the character of the Cookhams as they have historically been a collection of villages separated and characterised by green, open space. • re-use of vacant properties and brownfield land should be prioritised over Green Belt release. Less sensitive Green Belt locations would be preferable. • flooding and sewer capacity concerns • Biodiversity impact on protected species including bats. • Retention of mature trees and hedgerows with the development, surface water flooding and preservation of Grade 2 and Grade 3 agricultural land may affect deliverability of the number of dwellings proposed. <p>Suggestions to guide future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wastewater network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage infrastructure may be required. • pro-forma should require the development to reflect the surrounding existing developments with regard to building height, density and open space. • On site or walking distance provision of education, health and community needs should be provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has been assessed as making a moderate contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development. • Future development will be required to be designed sensitively to be of a high quality which supports and enhances the local character of the area. • In particular it is required that the edge treatment and transitions to the countryside should be treated sensitively, open space should be provided on site and opportunities taken for structural planting which will provide a more open character. • Flooding issues relate to surface water management and is listed in the key considerations. • Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider. • Conservation and Enhancement of biodiversity is a also listed as a key consideration. • Provision of connections to the public rights of way network are required as are pedestrian and cycleway paths through the site. These will also provide green corridors for wildlife. • The impact of proposed development on utilities and community infrastructure including schools provision have been considered as part of the IDP. • Traffic impact of future development has been assessed through the traffic impact study. • Other issues will be considered as part of the usual range of concerns considered through the application of all development plan policies as part of the development management process.
-----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site should follow or be developed concurrently with HA38. Wide grass verges should be included adjacent to the main road. • Improvement of the village gateway. Link to community benefit should be explored. • Provision for additional primary school capacity in the village should be demonstrated • Highways capacity within the village would need to be addressed • Designed sensitively to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the area Provision of Green Corridors in order to enhance biodiversity. Add key considerations: Trees and Hedgerows, Biodiversity, Protected Species. 	
<p>HA41</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">106</p>	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting Representation. Mix of uses to be determined with RBWM. M4 upgrade will not affect site deliverability. Flexibility required in development mix to make best use of land. Site may accommodate an alternative link road avoiding the level crossing. Pooled funding from all development in the local area for infrastructure is required. Education provision contributions should be pooled from all allocations in Datchet <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Green Belt land; failure to demonstrate consideration of sequential testing. • Cumulative level of development proposed for Datchet was too high with negative impact on the character of the village • Impact on highways (frequent tailbacks through the village impact on level crossings)and community infrastructure capacity especially health provision. • flooding concerns both for the proposed residents and the 	<p>This site is allocated for residential development as part of a mixed development on Green Belt land. Educational facilities that may include an extension to Churchmead secondary school or relocation of other educational facilities are proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessed capacity for this site is approximately 175 residential units. • The site has been assessed as making a lower contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development. • Flooding is notes as a key consideration. The north west art of this parcel of land is within flood zone 3a and therefore development should be focussed away from this area. • Proposed future development is required to be of a high quality that will support the character of the area. It is required that mature trees particularly at the site boundaries should be retained.

107	<p>implications for existing residents due to water displacement. Future development should take await completion of the flood alleviation schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question deliverability of 175 dwellings where there appears to be no ability to provide a safe access route in a flood event. • Air pollution and noise concerns for the proposed residents and as a result of increased traffic and potential expansion at Heathrow. • A primary school could be provided within the grounds of Churchmead School further from the M4 with alternative access. • Provision of a bypass on HA41 and HA42 would benefit the village • Sequential approach to site selection has not been demonstrated. Flooding, preservation of Grade 1 agricultural land, air quality and noise pollution may affect deliverability of the number of dwellings proposed. <p>Suggestions to guide future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste water network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage infrastructure may be required especially in light of cumulative impact from HA41 and HA42. • Housing mix should be specified by the policy. • Add to proforma: Allocated parking for each dwelling, retention of the tree belt to the north and west boundary, flood mitigation features. • Add key considerations: Provision of Green Corridors in order to enhance biodiversity. Trees and Hedgerows, Biodiversity, Protected Species. • Suggestion for masterplanning of all Datchet sites (HA41,42 and 43) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other measures should also be provided to mitigate noise and protect residential amenity and enhance the character of the future development. It is likely that the proposed employment uses will help to provide separation from the motorway. • The impact of proposed development on utilities and community infrastructure including schools provision have been considered as part of the IDP. • Traffic impact of future development has been assessed through the traffic impact study. • Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider. • Other issues will be considered as part of the usual range of concerns considered through the application of all development plan policies as part of the development management process.
HA42	Responses generally similar to HA41 and 43 – Datchet sites with	This site is allocated for residential development on Green Belt Land.

108	<p>similar issues being raised as objections and suggestions for guiding future development.</p> <p>Support for: Following recent site acquisition the site owner confirm that the site is available and achievable for residential uses. Mitigation of flood risk will adversely impact provision of alternative uses (employment) or educational facilities on site.. A financial contribution towards the existing primary and secondary school is considered preferable. Further technical studies will be undertaken with regard to the key considerations identified on the pro forma.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessed capacity for this site is approximately 175 residential units taking into account the site constraints and the character of the area.. • The site has been assessed as making a moderate contribution to preventing the unrestricted sprawl of the built up area but a lower contribution to other green belt purposes in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development. • The entire site is within flood risk zone 2 and therefore flooding is a key consideration in any future development. • In addition to the key considerations and specific requirements mentioned in respect of HA41, the key considerations for this site include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the opportunity to link Slough Road and Riding Court Road ○ heritage ○ air quality and noise.
HA43	<p>Responses generally similar to HA41 and 43 – Datchet sites with similar issues being raised as objections and suggestions for guiding future development. Additional matters raised are listed below.</p> <p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sequential approach to flooding demonstrates that no alternative sites at lower risk of flooding are available to accommodate the proposed development. Agricultural classification is 3b not Grade 1. Land to the south of the 	<p>This site is allocated for residential development for approximately 100 units on Green Belt Land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has been assessed as making a low contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development. • The north west portion of the site is in flood zone 2 although other parts of the site are flood zone 3a and the whole site is susceptible to ground water flooding. The assessed capacity of the site takes

	<p>proposed allocation should be also be included.</p> <p>Objection to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is within Flood Zone 3. Concern that future proposals ensure that the proposed route for the flood relief channel between Datchet and Wraysbury is protected together with other land necessary for strategic flood risk relief. • Car parking concerns especially linked to loss of on site car parking for Eton End School. 	<p>account of the limited area available for development and the need to provide flood risk mitigation as part of a future proposal.</p> <p>In addition to the key considerations and specific requirements mentioned in respect of HA41, the key considerations for this site include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Design ○ Access ○ Noise ○ flooding
HA44	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site capacity should be viewed as a minima. The site is available and fully deliverable within 5 years. • <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller brownfield sites should be prioritised ahead of Green Belt release. • The site will be under the flight path for the proposed third runway at Heathrow. The new development would not benefit from the offer of 125% compensatory home purchase. • Access to the site should not be via Horton Road as this would isolate the new residents from adjacent communities. • biodiversity considerations are not included in the pro-forma • The development would lead to excessive traffic movements through the village. • Highways and community infrastructure capacity has not been assessed in support of the proposal. The existing doctors surgery is at capacity and no suitable premises have been found which will lead to relocation outside of the village. • The site would be unlikely to contribute to the precept for the Parish. • Smaller brownfield sites should be prioritised ahead of Green 	<p>This site is allocated for residential development on Green Belt Land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessed capacity for this site is approximately 100 residential units taking into account the character of the area and site constraints. . Green Belt policies have been fully considered along with other policy requirements including the prioritisation of brown field sites. • The Government’s draft National Planning Policy Statement covering the expansion of Heathrow Airport has not been finalised, therefore the effect of possible flight paths are noted but cannot be given weight at this time. • The impact of proposed development on utilities and community infrastructure including schools provision have been considered as part of the IDP. • Traffic impact of future development has been assessed through the traffic impact study. • Contributions to the parish precept are not a matter for planning consideration • Key considerations for future development include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Design ○ Access

110	<p>Belt release.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking and air pollution concerns from increased vehicles movements. • Sequential approach to site selection has not been demonstrated. Flooding may affect deliverability of the number of dwellings proposed. <p>Suggestions to guide future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No concerns re wastewater network in relation to this site • Support for recognition of the need to conserve and enhance the setting of Grade II listed Mildridge Farmhouse Affordable housing levels should be high and design should reflect the area. • Designed sensitively to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the area Provision of Green Corridors in order to enhance biodiversity. Add key considerations: Trees and Hedgerows, Biodiversity, Protected Species. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noise ○ Topography ○ Biodiversity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other issues will be considered as part of the usual range of concerns considered through the application of all development plan policies as part of the development management process.
HA45	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the allocation of the site. Independent HRA screening supports mitigation measures proposed by the RBWM HRA Screening. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • biodiversity considerations not being included in the pro-forma. • Design of the whole development should reflect the surrounding area regardless of tenure. • Objection to the design of the affordable housing <p>Suggestions to guide future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No concerns re wastewater network in relation to this site. • Add requirements: Designed sensitively to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the area Provision of Green Corridors 	<p>This site is allocated for residential development for approximately 27 units on Green Belt Land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessed capacity for this site has been assessed taking into account the site character and constraints. • This site is considered to make a low contribution to the purposes of the green belt and is in a sustainable location for development. • Design of future development is required to be of a high quality which supports the character of the neighbouring residential units. • There is no specific design requirement for affordable housing. • Access to the reservoir east of the site is to be restricted in order to protect its status as an important wildlife site and impact on wildlife is

	in order to enhance biodiversity. Add key considerations: Trees and Hedgerows, Biodiversity, Protected Species.	listed as a key consideration in the proforma.
HA46 111	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential infill at this site <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The whole of this site appears to be located within flood zone 3. It is unlikely therefore that a development of 20 residential units could be supported by required flood mitigation measures. Where flood risk is shown as a key consideration the site proforma should detail whether the land is within Flood Zone 2 or 3. Sequential approach to site selection has not been demonstrated. Wastewater network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage infrastructure may be required. <p>Suggestions to guide future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designed sensitively to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the area Provision of Green Corridors in order to enhance biodiversity. Add key considerations: Trees and Hedgerows, Biodiversity, Protected Species 	<p>This site is allocated for residential development on brownfield land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessed capacity for this site is approximately 11 residential units. The assessed site capacity takes into account the feasibility of providing flood risk measures, but the detail of this will need to be examined during the development management consideration of any future proposal. The requirements for future development include achievement of flood risk betterment on the site incorporating flood risk reduction measures and ensuring that the exceptions test is met. Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider. Other issues such as design to conserve biodiversity will be considered as part of the usual range of concerns considered through the application of all development plan policies as part of the development management process.
HA47	<p>Support for :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infill residential development <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where flood risk is shown as a key consideration the site proforma should detail whether the land is within Flood Zone 2 or 3. Objection from Environment Agency Due to the lack of safe access and egress route. It is unlikely therefore that a development of 11 residential units could be supported by required flood mitigation measures. 	<p>The site is allocated for residential units on brown field land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessed capacity for this site is approximately 11 residential units. The assessed site capacity takes into account the feasibility of providing flood risk measures, but the detail of this will need to be examined during the development management consideration of any future proposal. The requirements for future development include achievement of flood risk betterment on the site incorporating flood risk reduction measures

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wastewater network capacity may be unable to support the demand anticipated and local upgrades to the drainage infrastructure may be required. Sequential approach to site selection has not been demonstrated 	<p>and ensuring that the exceptions test is met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste water capacity will require detailed negotiation with infrastructure provider.
112	<p>HA48</p> <p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The allocation is supported but a wider site, capable of accommodating 30 to 35 dwellings is available. Adjoining landowners support inclusion of the wider site for comprehensive development. <p>Objections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site will be subject to significant noise from aircraft operating at a height of 75-90metres approximately half a kilometre away following the end of the Cranford agreement. The site is not deliverable within the plan period. Biodiversity considerations have not been included in the proforma The design should be sensitive to the lakeside SSSI which should be removed from the allocation area. Wraysbury has experienced serious flooding. Parts of the site are within flood zone 3a. The remainder of the parcel is in flood zone 2 and the whole parcel susceptible to ground water flooding. Mitigation measures will be required which will significantly limit the developable area of the site. Sequential approach to site selection has not been demonstrated. Flooding may affect deliverability of the number of dwellings proposed. <p>Suggestions to guide future development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capacity. Support the requirement to conserve and enhance the setting of Grade II listed Tithe Farm Cottage Farmhouse. 	<p>The site is allocated for residential units on brown field Green Belt land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessed capacity for this site is approximately 30 residential units. The site boundary has been extended to include the adjoining land to the west to allow for a more comprehensive development. Although some areas in the eastern part of the site are in zone 3a, most of this site lies within flood risk 2 zone. The assessed site capacity takes into account the feasibility of providing flood risk mitigation measures, but the detail of this will need to be examined during the development management consideration of any future proposal. This site was assessed as making a lower contribution to all the purposes of the Green Belt in the Edge of Settlement Study (2016), and, in addition to its sustainable location it is considered an appropriate site for development. It is required that future development should conserve and enhance the setting of the nearby listed buildings The site area does not include the special protection area.

This page is intentionally left blank