

NOTICE
OF
MEETING

**PLACE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
PANEL**

will meet on

Monday 9 January 2023

At 5.00 pm

In the

Council Chamber - Town Hall, Maidenhead and on [RBWM YouTube](#)

To: Members of the Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel

Councillors John Bowden (Chairman), Helen Taylor (Vice-Chairman), Greg Jones, Maureen Hunt, Sayonara Luxton, Shamsul Shelim, Leo Walters, Joshua Reynolds, Mandy Brar, Gurch Singh, Jon Davey, Margaret Lenton (Wraysbury Parish Council) and Pat McDonald (White Waltham Parish Council)

Substitute Members

Councillors Gerry Clark, Gary Muir, Julian Sharpe, Catherine Del Campo, John Story, Chris Targowski, Helen Price, Amy Tisi, Geoff Hill and Simon Werner

Kirsty Hunt – Service Lead – Electoral and Democratic Services - Issued: 29th December 2022

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting. The agenda is available on the Council's web site at www.rbwm.gov.uk or contact the Panel Administrator **Oran Norris-Browne** Oran.Norris-Browne@RBWM.gov.uk

Recording of Meetings – In line with the council's commitment to transparency the Part I (public) section of the virtual meeting will be streamed live and recorded via Zoom. By participating in the meeting by audio and/or video, you are giving consent to being recorded and acknowledge that the recording will be in the public domain. If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to Democratic Services or Legal representative at the meeting.

AGENDA

Part I

<u>Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page No</u>
1.	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u> To receive any apologies for absence.	-
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To receive any declarations of interest.	3 - 4
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 14 November 2022 as a true and accurate record.	5 - 12
4.	<u>Call In - South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document</u> 1) After the Chair opens the meeting the Members who asked for the decision to be called in will be asked to explain their reasons for the request and what they feel should be reviewed; 2) On matters of particular relevance to a particular ward, ward division Members who are not signatories to a call-in have the opportunity to make comments on the call-in at the meeting, such speeches not to exceed five minutes each. Ward Members will take no further part in the discussion or vote. Ward Members must register their request to speak by contacting Democratic Services by 12 noon on the day prior to the relevant hearing; 3) The relevant Cabinet Member for the portfolio (or holders if more than one is relevant) will then be invited to make any comments; 4) The relevant Executive Director or his representative will advise the Panel on the background and context of the decision and its importance to achieving Service priorities; 5) Panel Members will ask questions of Members and officers in attendance; 6) The Cabinet Member(s) will be invited to make any final comments on the matter; 7) The Panel votes on a decision.	13 - 282

MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

Disclosure at Meetings

If a Member has not disclosed an interest in their Register of Interests, they **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as they are aware that they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) or Other Registerable Interest. If a Member has already disclosed the interest in their Register of Interests they are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed.

Any Member with concerns about the nature of their interest should consult the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

Non-participation in case of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)

Where a matter arises at a meeting which directly relates to one of your DPIs (summary below, further details set out in Table 1 of the Members' Code of Conduct) you must disclose the interest, **not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room** unless you have been granted a dispensation. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (as agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest, just that you have an interest. Dispensation may be granted by the Monitoring Officer in limited circumstances, to enable you to participate and vote on a matter in which you have a DPI.

Where you have a DPI on a matter to be considered or is being considered by you as a Cabinet Member in exercise of your executive function, you must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest and must not take any steps or further steps in the matter apart from arranging for someone else to deal with it.

DPIs (relating to the Member or their partner) include:

- *Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.*
- *Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from the council) made to the councillor during the previous 12-month period for expenses incurred by him/her in carrying out his/her duties as a councillor, or towards his/her election expenses*
- *Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.*
- *Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the council.*
- *Any licence to occupy land in the area of the council for a month or longer.*
- *Any tenancy where the landlord is the council, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest in the securities of.*
- *Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where:*
 - a) *that body has a place of business or land in the area of the council, and*
 - b) *either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body or (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.*

Any Member who is unsure if their interest falls within any of the above legal definitions should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

Disclosure of Other Registerable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to one of your Other Registerable Interests (summary below and as set out in Table 2 of the Members Code of Conduct), you must disclose the interest. **You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation.** If it is a 'sensitive interest' (as agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Other Registerable Interests:

- a) any unpaid directorships
 - b) any body of which you are a member or are in a position of general control or management and to which you are nominated or appointed by your authority
 - c) any body
 - (i) exercising functions of a public nature
 - (ii) directed to charitable purposes or
 - (iii) one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union)
- of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management

Disclosure of Non- Registerable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to your financial interest or well-being (and is not a DPI) or a financial interest or well-being of a relative or close associate, or a body included under Other Registerable Interests in Table 2 you must disclose the interest. **You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting** but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer) you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **affects** –

- a. your own financial interest or well-being;
- b. a financial interest or well-being of a friend, relative, close associate; or
- c. a financial interest or well-being of a body included under Other Registerable Interests as set out in Table 2 (as set out above and in the Members' code of Conduct)

you must disclose the interest. In order to determine whether you can remain in the meeting after disclosing your interest the following test should be applied.

Where a matter (referred to in the paragraph above) **affects** the financial interest or well-being:

- a. to a greater extent than it affects the financial interests of the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision and;
- b. a reasonable member of the public knowing all the facts would believe that it would affect your view of the wider public interest

You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer, you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Other declarations

Members may wish to declare at the beginning of the meeting any other information they feel should be in the public domain in relation to an item on the agenda; such Member statements will be included in the minutes for transparency.

Agenda Item 3

PLACE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

MONDAY, 14 NOVEMBER 2022

PRESENT: Councillors John Bowden (Chairman), Greg Jones, Maureen Hunt, Sayonara Luxton, Shamsul Shelim, Leo Walters, Mandy Brar, John Baldwin, Gurch Singh, Jon Davey and Parish Councillors Margaret Lenton & Pat McDonald

Also in attendance: Councillors Phil Haseler, David Hilton (Virtually), Gurpreet Bhangra (Virtually) and Donna Stimson (Virtually)

Officers: Oran Norris-Browne, Chris Joyce (Virtually), Tim Golabek (Virtually) and Ben Crampin (Virtually)

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN

A motion was put forward by Councillor Luxton to elect Councillor Bowden as Chairman for the remainder of the municipal year 2022/23. This was seconded by Councillor Hunt.

A second motion was put forward by Councillor Davey to elect Councillor Walters as Chairman for the remainder of the municipal year 2022/23. This was seconded by Councillor Baldwin.

A named vote was taken on the first motion that was put forward and seconded, which was Councillor Luxton's motion.

Election of Councillor Bowden as Chairman for remainder of municipal year 2022/23 (Motion)	
Councillor John Bowden	For
Councillor Greg Jones	For
Councillor Maureen Hunt	For
Councillor Sayonara Luxton	For
Councillor Shamsul Shelim	For
Councillor Leo Walters	For
Councillor Mandy Brar	Against
Councillor John Baldwin	Against
Councillor Gurch Singh	Against
Councillor Jon Davey	Against
Parish Councillor Margaret Lenton	No vote recorded
Parish Councillor Pat McDonald	No vote recorded
Carried	

AGREED: That Councillor Bowden be elected as Chairman for the remainder of the municipal year 2022/23.

Councillor Davey's motion was not voted upon due to the first motion passing.

Councillor Baldwin asked if the newly elected Chairman was going to forgo his Special Responsibility Allowance, in the wake of a 10th cabinet member being appointed. Oran Norris-Browne, Democratic Services Officer, said that this was the Chairman's decision, and it was not a matter for the panel members to discuss.

A motion was then put forward by Councillor Shelim to elect Councillor Taylor as Vice-Chairman for the remainder of the municipal year 2022/23. This was seconded by Councillor Luxton.

Discussions then took place as to whether or not Councillor Taylor could be nominated as she had given her apologies for the meeting. Oran Norris-Browne confirmed that this was allowed as she was still a panel member. Councillor Baldwin raised a point of order and asked how the panel could nominate someone without them being present to accept the nomination. It was stated that this was allowed, and subsequently Councillor Davey received confirmation from Councillor Taylor that she was happy to be elected via telephone communication. This ended the debate.

A named vote was taken.

Election of Councillor Taylor as Vice Chairman for remainder of municipal year 2022/23 (Motion)	
Councillor John Bowden	For
Councillor Greg Jones	For
Councillor Maureen Hunt	For
Councillor Sayonara Luxton	For
Councillor Shamsul Shelim	For
Councillor Leo Walters	For
Councillor Mandy Brar	Abstain
Councillor John Baldwin	Abstain
Councillor Gurch Singh	Abstain
Councillor Jon Davey	For
Parish Councillor Margaret Lenton	No vote recorded
Parish Councillor Pat McDonald	No vote recorded
Carried	

AGRED: That Councillor Taylor be elected Vice-Chairman for the remainder of the municipal year 2022/23.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Taylor.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Panel Members declared an interest in agenda item 7 as all of their Wards were at risk of flooding.

ACTIONS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

All actions had been completed in June 2022.

MINUTES

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting held 21 June 2022 were a true and accurate reflection.

CALL IN - DRAFT ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGEPOINT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Councillor Davey who was one of the three Councillors who had called in the Draft Electric Vehicle ChargePoint Implementation Plan began by reading out the reason provided within the report as to why they had decided to call in the decision.

Councillor Baldwin who was the second of the three members that called in the decision, stated that he was present at cabinet when the draft plan was passed, and he had listened closely to the debate. He added that the previous Lead Member for Transport & Infrastructure had said that any future policy that came forward, would be informed by the data from the trial. He said that no data was present, and that cabinet had not been informed sufficiently to approve the draft plan.

Councillor Baldwin expressed concern that when the draft plan went out to public consultation in the future, the public would be commenting on a plan that did not have the full facts and data that were required to give sufficient feedback. Instead of asking residents to comment on evidence-based suggestions, he said it appeared that the Council were asking residents what the policy should be instead.

Councillor Baldwin said that going forward, the strains on the revenue budget, which were already tight, could only be offset if capital receipts were converted into revenue flows, such as CIL contributions. The figure quoted in the report was between £250,000 and £500,000. He was astonished that cabinet unanimously agreed to the draft policy. He said that the report needed to include further data from the trial and be referred back to cabinet for reconsideration. He said that it was an example of bad policy that would negatively affect the borough for years to come.

Councillor Singh who was the third member of three who signed the call-in, expressed his concern over the lack of detail that was present within the draft report that went to cabinet. He said that the Council had an obligation to achieve the best value for money. He wished for the report to go back to cabinet with the correct data, to be reconsidered.

Councillor Singh said that this decision would impact residents for the next 10-20 years and the fact that this power had been delegated to just one officer and one councillor, was greatly concerning. He added that there was no mention of covering costs through CIL payments, although did acknowledge the struggles of the borough financially.

Councillor Davey said that there were roughly 150,000 people within the borough and potentially around 50,000 vehicles. 500 permits had been issued for electric vehicles. This equated to 1% of vehicles within the borough being electric. He enquired about the use of hydrogen energy, instead of electric.

Councillor Davey said that no traffic regulation orders had been made, and therefore that issue would need to be sorted out. He said that if the suppliers were installing the planned works at their expense, they would be looking to make the best profit and not care about the borough's needs.

Councillor Davey said that with the threat of blackouts and 5G technology, why was hydrogen energy not being looked at. He also expressed great concern over air quality within the borough. He said that hydrogen cars would be lighter and therefore would produce less pollution. He also said that the borough was meant to be a borough of innovation and that they should be attracting companies such as River Simple to build their factories within the borough.

Councillor Haseler, Lead Member for Planning, Parking, Highways & Transport, firstly stated that hydrogen cars could one day play a key role in transport, however the borough were currently following Government guidance around the cut-off point of 2030 for fossil fuel vehicles. He then read out an extract that he gave to cabinet in October 2022, when the draft plan was agreed. This was done to provide members who did not attend cabinet, some clarity over the details of the report.

Chris Joyce, Head of Infrastructure, Sustainability & Economic Growth, said that there would be a consultation and policy document available to those taking part in the consultation. Therefore, consultation would not be based solely on the report that went to cabinet. The intention would be to share this with all members for comment before it went to public consultation. He added that no policy was being made at this point, and instead consultation would occur to get the views of many.

Chris Joyce said that he was happy to work with the Chairman in regard to bring a paper to the panel after the public consultation had ended. He added that the cost to residents for charging was an impossible thing to predict. Principles could be set out, within the plan, but it would be difficult to predict the cost. Existing resources would be used for the consultation process, with the only opportunity cost being the time of officers. However, Chris Joyce noted that this time would be well spent due to it being a key goal within the Corporate Plan and for Central Government.

Chris Joyce made reference to the point raised about the Council potentially owning and maintaining the infrastructure. He did not recommend this as it would potentially cause a significant increase on internal capabilities. The risk could outweigh the reward in doing this. In response to hydrogen, he noted that it would play a key role in the future, but it did not play a role currently. Electric vehicles played a better role currently in reducing the carbon output. Air quality was noted; however, it was outside of the scope for the panel's decision.

Chris Joyce said that the consultation was an opportunity to let all members have their say on the draft report. If the panel voted for the plan to go back to cabinet, then this would potentially elongate and delay the process further.

Councillor Walters asked about hybrid cars and whether or not these would be included within the plan. He also expressed concern about what he had heard from Los Angeles where increased use of electric vehicles had added a greater strain on the grid. Chris Joyce explained that there were 2 types of hybrid vehicles. One was electric and could plug in to the EV charging points that had been proposed and the other was recharged via the petrol engine. He acknowledged the concerns that members had about greater strain on the grid, however he said that smart charging was to be encouraged, where charging occurred at non-peak hours.

Councillor Hunt said that she had listened carefully to both Councillor Baldwin and Councillor Davey's points and agreed with their concerns over a potential lack of data being made available for the public to consider. She also asked why hydrogen vehicles were not being focussed upon more. Chris Joyce replied by saying that there was currently not much of a market for hydrogen vehicles, however in the future if the market grew, then the borough would certainly look into this.

Councillor Shelim asked for some clarity over what the process was for the draft plan.

Councillor Haseler provided this clarity and stated that once members had commented, it would go out for public consultation. Once this had ended, a final paper would be made and presented back to cabinet for final approval. Councillor Shelim thanked Councillor Haseler for clarifying the process.

Councillor Baldwin questioned what the mechanism was for allowing members to discuss a post-consultation paper. Chris Joyce said that the consultation material would be shared with members before it went out to public consultation for their comments and feedback on the contents of the document and questions that will be asked to the public. It would be shared with members in the same way as it had been in the past.

Councillor Baldwin then asked for clarity as to what cabinet had actually agreed to with regards to the next steps of the draft paper. Chris Joyce confirmed that cabinet had delegated

authority to himself and Councillor Haseler to carry out the process that he had just discussed. The process was finalising the plan based upon the consultation feedback and then a paper would be written with the final policy document attached, for cabinet to approve.

Councillor Davey said with regards to AUX, he felt that the Council would have to find a lot of the money itself. He said that if the members were able to see more detail before it went to public consultation, then he would be happy. He also added that there was a cost to this, even though it may be less than if an external entity was used.

Councillor Singh said that he was concerned about how the draft plan had been put together. He asked when the draft plan had been put together. Tim Golabek, Service Lead for Transport & Infrastructure, said that early engagement began in Spring 2022. After that, options were discussed about moving forward and the draft plan had been worked on over the last 3-4 months.

Councillor Singh said that the trial sites had been chosen by Chris' predecessor in 2019 when a climate emergency had been declared. He asked if the LEVI funding had been completed and submitted to Central Government. Chris Joyce said that innovative solution applications would potentially reopen early 2023, but it had not yet been applied for as Central Government had not yet asked local authorities to come forward.

Councillor Singh asked what the deadline was for completion of AUX funding. Chris Joyce said that there was no specific deadline, and the last application was made in 2019. With the plan adopted, he said that the borough would look to maximise opportunities on offer from the government for the borough. The most appropriate pot of money would be applied for, if and when the final plan was approved by cabinet.

Chris Joyce questioned the relevance of these points towards the decision that was made by cabinet and called-in by the three members.

Councillor Singh asked if Councillor Haseler would be willing to bring the paper before the panel before it went back to cabinet. Councillor Haseler said that he did not see the point in this as members would have ample opportunity to provide comments and feedback and that this would not be productive.

Councillor G. Jones asked if residents would have a choice of electricity suppliers when it came to EV charging. Councillor Haseler said that the Council would enter into agreements with various suppliers and that a choice would likely not be on offer.

Councillor G. Jones said that this could result in negative impacts on house prices due to the availability of electricity in various areas. Councillor Haseler said that he understood the point being made, however this was a hypothetical situation. Chris Joyce added by saying that consistency of electric prices would be important and focussed upon.

Parish Councillor Margaret Lenton asked if villages would be included in this and what impact this would have on the planning process. Chris Joyce said that the packages on offer would be a mix of both urban and rural offerings, so all areas would be covered. EV charging points had also been incorporated into building regulations going forward too.

Councillor Brar asked how many suppliers were being looked at and why had it taken the borough since 2019 and beyond to work on the plan. Chris Joyce said that the plan had been developed as a result of the Government's push to have a plan and outlined a few projects that had occurred around the borough with EV charging so far. 12 suppliers had been engaged with to inform them of the plan and procurement would be discussed on an individual project base.

Councillor Brar asked if the rural areas were going to be included within the plan. Chris Joyce confirmed that they were included.

Councillor Baldwin asked if funding had been committed too and sites had been identified in 2019, why was it only being looked at now in 2022. Chris Joyce said that he could not comment on things that had occurred before he had joined the Council. Since joining he had been moving things forward and stated that changes within the structure of the Council and Covid-19, were probably factors that had played a role in this.

The Chairman stated that EV charging points were currently present at various petrol stations around the borough. He added that the main railway went through Maidenhead which now had overhead electrical cables to power the trains. When the brakes were in use, the particles would contribute to the air pollution that had been discussed within the meeting. He said that 52% of power generation was currently done through gas.

Councillors Davey, Baldwin and Singh then summarised their positions following the discussions that had taken place during the meeting. They agreed that it was satisfactory that members were consulted before the public consultation occurred and if it was felt that the public had not been listened too, then the panel were able to call-in the decision back to the panel once more.

Councillor Haseler then summarised his position as Lead Member.

A motion was then proposed by Councillor Davey for the Place Overview & Scrutiny Panel to take no further action, but with the draft paper being shared with all members and the 2 co-optees on the Panel, 7 working days prior to the commencement of the public consultation. This was seconded by Councillor Singh.

A named vote was taken.

Call In - Draft Electric Vehicle Chargepoint Implementation Plan (Motion)	
Councillor John Bowden	For
Councillor Greg Jones	For
Councillor Maureen Hunt	For
Councillor Sayonara Luxton	For
Councillor Shamsul Shelim	For
Councillor Leo Walters	For
Councillor Mandy Brar	For
Councillor John Baldwin	For
Councillor Gurch Singh	For
Councillor Jon Davey	For
Parish Councillor Margaret Lenton	No vote recorded
Parish Councillor Pat McDonald	No vote recorded
Carried	

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Place Overview & Scrutiny Panel to take no further action, but with the draft paper being shared with all members and the 2 co-optees on the Panel, 7 working days prior to the commencement of the public consultation.

RESIDENT SCRUTINY TOPIC SUGGESTION - RIVER THAMES SCHEME AND FLOOD RELIEF IN WRAYSBURY

Prior to the discussions on this item, the Chairman adjourned the meeting for a 5-minute comfort break at 21.00. The meeting resumed at 21.05. Councillors Baldwin, Luxton and Walters along with Parish Councillors McDonald and Lenton left the meeting at this time and took no further part in it.

The panel considered the resident scrutiny topic report on the River Thames scheme and flood relief in Wraysbury.

Chris Joyce provided a brief introduction to the report and stated that the River Thames scheme had been discussed many times during meetings in RBWM and encouraged the panel to focus more on developing a scope on the Datchet to Hythe End Flood Improvement Plan and challenge the process of both the borough and the Environment Agency.

Councillor Davey said that there needed to be some work within that area and that if any works occurred, then Councillor Larcombe be included on them due to flooding being fundamental to him and residents within his ward of Datchet, Horton and Wraysbury.

Ben Crampin, Flood Risk Manager, said that the Datchet to Hythe End Flood Improvement Plan was currently with the Environment Agency and was going through their programme network. The first stage of this was for the plan to go through the strategic outline case. This had been and will be shared through various channels such as through the Flood Liaison Group. Following March 2023, engagement would then start with Ward Councillors at some point after the Local Elections in May 2023. Public consultation would also then occur.

Chris Joyce said that Ben had done a lot of good work such as delivering short term improvements, which would hopefully alleviate the flood risk within the borough.

Councillor Singh asked for further detail on the quick wins that had been discussed.

Ben Crampin said that there were currently 3 projects that were underway. One regarded the Wraysbury Drain and its risks, which Councillor Larcombe was heavily involved in. The 2nd was the Datchet Barrel Arch, which the borough were working closely with the Parish Council. The third was a project to identify the feasibility of installing a flat valve to alleviate the flood risk towards Datchet. These were ongoing investigations.

Councillor Singh expressed concern over the £50 million that had been commissioned by the borough in the past. He wished for reports to come before the panel to show what was being done to protect residents and their possessions from flooding. He expressed concern over the political issues that may be caused by this.

Chris Joyce said that this was the reason for the recommendation that had been put forward within the report, so that the panel could really add some value to the scheme.

Councillor Hunt asked if the £10 million was going to just be for short term improvements. Chris Joyce said it was not and that it was for the whole programme including both short term and long-term things.

Councillor Brar said that £50 million was originally committed and questioned why it was now only committing £10 million? She also asked if this scheme would be extended to other parts of the borough. Chris Joyce said that the £50 million commitment pre-dated his time at the Council, and it had also been discussed many times at borough meetings, so he would not discuss it now. The scheme was a capital programme, but it did not prevent the borough from bringing forward other flood alleviating projects across the whole borough.

Councillor Davey said that discussing the scheme before May 2023 would not be beneficial due to it potentially becoming a political discussion. He asked for it to be discussed post May 2023.

Chris Joyce asked if it was worth the panel nominating a panel member to lead on creating the scoping document in conjunction with officers. Councillor Singh asked for clarity. Oran Norris-Browne offered this after discussing with the Chairman and he stated that this was to be discussed in the work programme section offline.

Councillor Hunt asked for clarity around the wording of the recommendation made by officers. Chris Joyce provided this and all members understood.

Councillor Davey, Councillor Singh and Councillor Hunt nominated Councillor Bowden to lead on the recommendation. He accepted this.

ACTION: Councillor Bowden to complete scoping document on the Datchet to Hythe End Flood Improvement Programme.

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Place Overview & Scrutiny Panel notes the report and develops the scope for an alternative future item to scrutinise the Datchet to Hythe End Flood Improvement Programme being developed by the Environment Agency and the Council.

WORK PROGRAMME

As it had passed 21.30, the Panel agreed to discuss the work programme offline via email.

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY: That the last agenda item titled 'Work Programme' be addressed offline via email.

The meeting, which began at 7.00 pm, finished at 9.35 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

Report Title:	Member Call In – South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No - Part I
Meeting and Date:	Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel – 9 January 2023

REPORT SUMMARY

In accordance with Part 4 A16 of the Constitution, the Cabinet decision made on 15th December 2022 relating to the item South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document has been called in for review by the Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

1. REASON(S) FOR CALL IN

1.1 The call-in notice, received on 23rd December 2022, stated the following reasons for calling in the decision:

- Members of the public have contacted their ward councillors to object that the time and place of the Cabinet meeting was not notified to the public lawfully.
 - Part 4-16: Respect for article 6 human rights/presumption to favour openness of decision making. Consideration of legal implications.
- RBWM has varied the overall evidence base and timeframe for delivery of the site, extending it from 2033/34 to 2041, which has implication for a number of BLP policies. There is no comprehensive site-wide masterplan.
 - Part 4-16: Clarity of aims and desired outcomes in compliance with the councils adopted plans and strategies. Consideration of legal implications and equalities.
- The SPD is a document prepared by the LPA which encompasses environmental, design and economic objectives which are relevant to the development of land. The Cabinet have purported to adopt a document that is a de facto Development Plan Document without independent examination or final approval by Full Council.
 - Part 4-16: Consideration of due consultation. Clarity of aims and desired outcomes in compliance with the councils adopted plans and strategies. Consideration of legal implications.

2. MEMBERS CALLING IN THE REPORT

2.1 The call-in notice was signed by the following Members:

- Councillor Gurch Singh
- Councillor Geoffrey Hill
- Councillor Helen Price

3. PANEL OPTIONS

3.1 Having considered the Call-In, the Overview and Scrutiny Panel may decide:

- i. to take no further action, in which case the decision will take effect immediately;
- ii. to refer the decision back to the decision-maker for reconsideration, setting out the nature of the Panel's concerns. The decision-maker must then re-consider the matter, taking into account the concerns of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel, before making a final decision. In the case of Cabinet as the decision maker, the Leader can call a Cabinet meeting within 5 working days to expedite the process or refer the item to the next appropriate scheduled meeting. In the case of any decision maker, consideration must take place within a maximum of 28 days;
- iii. if the decision is considered to be outside of the budget or policy framework, to refer the matter to next scheduled ordinary full Council or an extraordinary full Council meeting within 28 days if appropriate, in which case paragraph (3.3) below will apply;

3.2 If, following a call-in, the Overview and Scrutiny Panel does not meet within 10 clear working days of receipt of the decision to call-in, or does meet but does not refer the matter back to the decision making person or body, or Full Council under iii above, the decision shall take effect immediately.

3.3 If the matter was referred to Council and the Council does not object to a decision which has been made, then no further action is necessary and the decision will be effective in accordance with the provision below. However, if the Council does object, it has no locus to make decisions in respect of an executive decision unless it is contrary to the Policy Framework, or contrary to or not wholly consistent with the Budget. Unless that is the case, the Council will refer any decision to which it objects back to the decision making person or body, together with the Council's view on the decision. That decision making body or person shall choose whether to amend the decision or not before reaching a final decision and implementing it. Where the decision was taken by the Cabinet as a whole or a committee of it, a meeting will be convened to reconsider within 5 clear working days of the Council request. Where the decision was made by an individual, the individual will reconsider within 5 clear working days of the Council request.

- 3.4 If the Council does not meet, or if it does but does not refer the decision back to the decision making body or person, the decision will become effective on the date of the Council meeting or expiry of the period in which the Council meeting should have been held, whichever is the earlier.

4. APPENDICES

4.1 This report is supported by two appendices:

- Appendix A – Cabinet Report
- Appendix B – Extract from Cabinet Minutes

5. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

5.1 This report is supported by two background documents:

- [Council Constitution - Part 4A - Purpose and Procedure Rules for Overview & Scrutiny](#)
- [Cabinet Agenda - December 2022](#)

Report Title:	South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No – Part I
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Haseler, Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways and Transport
Meeting and Date:	Cabinet - 15 December 2022
Responsible Officer(s):	Adrien Waite, Head of Planning
Wards affected:	Bray, Oldfield and Cox Green



REPORT SUMMARY

This report seeks approval for the adoption of the South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

The Borough Local Plan identifies the South West Maidenhead area for major housing and employment development. The adoption of the SPD will help to coordinate development across the area, providing more detail to supplement the policies and proposals in the Local Plan. It will be an important material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Development in the South West Maidenhead area will help in delivering on key Corporate Plan goals. In addition to goals relating to housing delivery and provision of affordable homes, the Corporate Plan includes a specific goal which states:

Enable delivery of the key social, physical and green infrastructure to support new development at the Desborough / South West Maidenhead site (AL13 in the Borough Local Plan), including strategic highway improvements, public transport, cycling and walking infrastructure, new primary and secondary schools, community facilities and open space.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Approves the adoption of the South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document, as set out in Appendix B.**
- ii) Delegates authority for minor changes to the Supplementary Planning Document to be made prior to publication to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways and Transport**

2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Options

Table 1: Options arising from this report

Option	Comments
<p>Adopt the South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) with the recommended changes, and delegate authority for further minor changes to be made prior to publication to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways and Transport</p> <p>This is the recommended option</p>	<p>Policy QP1b of the Borough Local Plan indicates that a Development Framework SPD will be produced.</p> <p>The SPD provides the opportunity to ensure that development in the area comes forward in a strategic and comprehensive manner. It sets design principles to ensure coordinated and high quality development across the area, outline other key requirements and principles for development, and set out the infrastructure requirements for development of the area and how they can be delivered in a timely manner.</p>
<p>To not adopt the South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) with the recommended changes and not delegate authority for further minor changes to be made prior to publication to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways and Transport</p> <p>This is not a recommended option</p>	<p>This approach would result in an uncoordinated approach to development across the area. It is likely to result in a lack of coordination of key infrastructure provision with the risk that not all infrastructure is provided, or it is not provided for in a timely manner. It also risks the lack of joined up thinking in relation to key design principles across the area.</p>
<p>To delay the adoption of the SPD</p> <p>This is not a recommended option</p>	<p>This would increase the risk that planning applications would have to be determined before the SPD is finalised.</p>

- 2.1 The core aim of the spatial strategy (Policy SP1) of the Borough Local Plan is to focus new development on the three strategic growth areas of Maidenhead, Ascot and Windsor, to make best use of infrastructure and services, and to provide a sustainable approach to growth. Within Maidenhead, the South West Maidenhead area is one of two strategic growth locations identified in the town.

- 2.2 The Borough Local Plan provides the policy framework within which development can come forward in the South West Maidenhead area. Specific policies and proposals for the area are:
- Policy QP1b – South West Maidenhead strategic placemaking area. This sets out the overall approach to the development of the area, including a series of key principles and requirements for the area
 - The following site allocations and accompanying “proformas” at Appendix C of the Plan which sets out site specific requirements and considerations:
 - Site AL13 – Desborough, Harvest Hill Road, South West Maidenhead – housing allocation for approximately 2,600 homes, two schools and a new local centre
 - Site AL14 – “The Triangle site” – allocated for industrial and warehousing development
 - Site AL15 – Braywick Park – allocated for mixed use strategic green infrastructure accommodating indoor and outdoor sports facilities, public park, special needs school and wildlife zone
- 2.3 Policy QP1b states that to ensure the development of the placemaking area as a whole comes forward in a strategic and comprehensive manner, planning applications on individual land parcels should accord with the principles and requirements set out in the Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), incorporating a masterplan and approach to the approval of design codes; phasing of development and infrastructure delivery for the area as a whole. The policy indicates that the SPD will be produced by the Council in partnership with the developers, landowners, key stakeholders and in consultation with the local community.
- 2.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) defines Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) as, *Documents which add further detail to the policies in the development plan. They can be used to provide further guidance for development on specific sites, or on particular issues, such as design. Supplementary planning documents are capable of being a material consideration in planning decisions but are not part of the development plan.* They are therefore important documents in helping to deliver the policies and proposals set out in the Borough Local Plan. But it is important to emphasise that SPDs do not create new policy, do not replace existing policy in the Borough Local Plan and cannot amend existing policy in the Borough Local Plan.
- 2.5 The Draft South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document was published (under Regulation 13 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, as amended) for six weeks consultation from 6 July to 17 August 2022. More details on the consultation and the responses made can be found in Section 8 below.
- 2.6 Following the consultation, officers have amended the draft SPD to take account of representations received and new evidence.
- 2.7 The final SPD:

- Sets out design principles for the area
- Includes an illustrative framework masterplan
- Sets out a range of other requirements and principles for development in the South West Maidenhead area, particularly AL13 site and covers a range of matters including:
 - Community needs
 - Connectivity and
 - Sustainability and Environment.
- Sets out the infrastructure requirements for the development of the area and how this infrastructure should be funded and delivered.

2.8 The changes made to the SPD following consultation on the draft SPD are summarised below:

- Wording reviewed to ensure consistency with the role of SPDs and to ensure appropriate policy references are clear.
- Greater clarity on the requirement for a central green space (as part of the Illustrative Framework Plan in the SPD) and its importance in the transition zone between the two neighbourhoods.
- Ensuring guidance refers to the importance of building heights “stepping down” towards the edge of the development and clearer cross referencing to the Tall Buildings SPD
- A number of other detailed updates and clarifications in the design section
- Greater clarity on housing mix guidance and provision of further information to support the approach
- Further evidence to support the affordable housing size mix guidance in the SPD.
- Further information on the need for the schools, the timing of when they are needed and updated cost estimates.
- New sub-section on playing pitches within the section on open space, highlighting the likely need for contributions to off-site playing pitch provision
- Greater clarity on biodiversity net gain and emphasising the importance of securing best biodiversity outcomes
- Further detail and clarification on the potential approaches to infrastructure delivery, the policy basis, and the respective roles of the community infrastructure levy and section 106 agreements
- An update on expected infrastructure costs, including indexing of costs to the present day, and inclusion of land costs for land for community uses (mainly schools)

- 2.9 It is important to emphasise that this SPD does not include a detailed design for the development areas, or individual parcels of land within them, but sets the framework within which individual planning applications can come forward.
- 2.10 The final SPD is accompanied by a Strategic Environmental Assessment report (background paper) and a Consultation Statement (Appendix C) that summarise all engagement and consultation undertaken in the preparation of the SPD and a response to the comments made on the draft SPD. In addition, as part of checking the deliverability of the development in the light of changes nationally and the guidance in the SPD, an update to the Borough Local Plan viability assessment of the AL13 housing site was undertaken. This showed that the site continues to be viable (also a background paper).

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 The key implication of adopting an SPD for the South West Maidenhead area is the ability to coordinate development and its associated infrastructure provision across the area and ensure a comprehensive approach. There are multiple landowners and potential developers with an interest in the sites allocated in the South West Maidenhead area. It is critical that they deliver both on the key design and other principles set out in the SPD and make timely and proportionate contributions to the delivery of the necessary supporting infrastructure. The SPD provides the framework for infrastructure funding such as section 106 contributions alongside the Community Infrastructure Levy, thereby supporting the delivery of key infrastructure. This supports the Corporate Plan Priority relating to ‘Quality Infrastructure’.
- 3.2 As well as taking forward the proposals in the Borough Local Plan, work on the SPD has been integrated with broader strategic work on a range of other areas such as the Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan, the Bus Service Improvement Plan, school place planning, and delivery of the Housing Strategy. This joined-up approach will help to ensure a more coordinated and comprehensive approach to delivery of development and infrastructure in the area.
- 3.3 Whilst SPDs are not part of the statutory development plan (such as the Borough Local Plan) with its associated planning status and weight in decision making, they are an important material consideration when determining planning applications. As noted above the preparation of this SPD is specifically referred to in the Policy for the South West Maidenhead area, Policy QP1b.

Table 2: Key Implications

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
Adoption of the South West Maidenhead SPD	SPD not adopted or adopted in early 2023	SPD adopted on 15 December 2022	n/a	n/a	SPD adopted in December 2022

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

4.1 The production of the SPD has cost approximately £172,000. This is funding:

- Specialist Design and Masterplanning advice
- Infrastructure planning evidence
- Planning Policy advice and Project Management
- Strategic environmental assessment
- Some other specialist officer advice.

4.2 The work has been funded by a planning performance agreement with the main landowner/developer interests. The preparation of the SPD is within existing budgets. The cost of the vast majority of officer time is being carried by the Council from within existing resources with a small amount funded from the planning performance agreement.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The SPD does not form part of the statutory development plan but will be an important material consideration in making planning decisions.

5.2 There is a statutory process for preparing an SPD. Regulations 11 to 16 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 set out these requirements.

5.3 The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (SEA Regulations) also require the Council to consider whether or not Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the SPD should be undertaken. Following consultation with the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England it was agreed that SEA should be carried out for this SPD. The SEA Report has been listed as a background document accompanying this report.

5.4 There are no direct legal implications as a result of this report.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1 The headline risks are set out in Table 3 below:

Table 3: Impact of risk and mitigation

Risk	Level of uncontrolled risk	Controls	Level of controlled risk
Poor quality and uncoordinated development and infrastructure provision as there is no relevant guidance in the	High	Adopt the South West Maidenhead Development Framework SPD	Low

form of a South West Maidenhead SPD			
-------------------------------------	--	--	--

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 7.1 Equalities. The Equality Act 2010 places a statutory duty on the council to ensure that when considering any new or reviewed strategy, policy, plan, project, service or procedure the impacts on particular groups, including those within the workforce and customer/public groups, have been considered. A EQIA (Equalities Impact Assessment) Screening has been completed and is available in Appendix A.
- 7.2 Climate change/sustainability. The allocation of major development in the South West Maidenhead area has been the subject of a full sustainability appraisal process as part of the preparation of the Borough Local Plan, and the allocation of development sites in the South West Maidenhead area were found to be “sound” by an independent planning inspector, having regard to the outcome of that sustainability appraisal. The preparation of this SPD was also subject to a strategic environmental assessment (SEA). The SEA Report can be viewed at <https://consult.rbwm.gov.uk/file/6030259>. A post adoption SEA statement will be made available on the Council’s website as soon as reasonably practicable after the SPD is adopted.
- 7.3 Whilst consultation during the preparation of the Borough Local Plan, and engagement and consultation on this SPD (see below) highlighted concerns about the impact on the environment and climate change, including on biodiversity and the potential loss of trees, the SPD sets out more detail on how more sustainable development of the area can be brought forward including:
- Seeking 10% biodiversity net gain
 - Seeking net zero carbon development (operational)
 - Delivery of a green infrastructure network
 - New tree planting
 - Setting out requirements for more sustainable forms of building
 - Provision of new and enhanced walking, cycling and public transport links to provide good alternatives to car travel
 - Provision of schools and local facilities on site to reduce the need for new residents to travel and enhance their ability to reach those facilities by non-car modes.
- 7.4 Data Protection/GDPR. The consultation on the South West Maidenhead Development Framework SPD was undertaken by the council in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 and the General Data Protection Regulation.
- 7.5 The built and natural environment are major determinants of health and wellbeing of the population, and this development should provide opportunities for a healthy living environment which promotes and enables healthy behaviours.
- 7.6 The golf course part of the AL13 housing allocation that forms part of the SPD is part of the Council’s landownership assets.

8. CONSULTATION

8.1 As part of preparing the SPD early public engagement took place in the form of three online events together with the opportunity for people to submit written comments afterwards. There was extensive publicity about the events in advance including writing to nearly 1,000 homes in the vicinity of the main development sites, consulting an extensive list of people on the planning policy consultee database, holding a press briefing (with subsequent articles and publicity about the events on the local media), and regular use of social media to publicise the events.

8.2 At the Regulation 13 consultation stage (consultation on the draft SPD), the Council wrote again to nearly 1,000 local residents and a wide range of consultees on the consultee database. Three staffed drop-in sessions were held in different weeks during July 2022, two at the Maidenhead Library and one at the Braywick Leisure Centre and an online event was held via Microsoft Teams. About 90 written representations were received from residents and other stakeholders. These made a wide range of comments, ranging from opposition to the principle of development, through to more technical comments on the SPD. A Consultation Statement has been produced summarising all engagement and consultation undertaken in the preparation of the SPD. It also summarised the responses received and provides a response to the issues raised. Some of the key issues raised included:

- Concerns around loss of trees/greenspace/biodiversity
- Concerns re density and building heights, especially at the northern end of the golf course
- Impact on Harvest Hill Road
- Comments on proposed housing mix
- The approach to biodiversity net gain and carbon neutral development
- The approach to infrastructure delivery and funding

8.3 Engagement has also taken place with landowner/developer interests, ensuring that they can take account of emerging thinking on the SPD as they start to prepare planning applications. Some engagement also took place with some infrastructure providers to understand the impact of development on infrastructure and to consider appropriate mitigation/enhancements.

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

9.1 Implementation date if not called in: 29 December 2022. The full implementation stages are set out in Table 4.

Table 4: Implementation timetable

Date	Details
15 December 2022	Cabinet decides whether to approve South West Maidenhead SPD.
29 December 2022	South West Maidenhead SPD comes into force, following Call In period.

10. APPENDICES

10.1 This report is supported by three appendices:

- Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment Screening
- Appendix B – Final South West Maidenhead Development Framework SPD.
- Appendix C – Consultation Statement

11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

11.1 This report is supported by three background documents:

- Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead – Borough Local Plan 2013-2033.
<https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/home/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/development-plan/adopted-local-plan>
- Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Report
- AL13 site Additional Viability Assessment

12. CONSULTATION

13. Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
<i>Mandatory: Statutory Officers (or deputies)</i>			
Adele Taylor	Executive Director of Resources/S151 Officer	11/11/2022	17/11/2022
Emma Duncan	Director of Law, Strategy & Public Health/ Monitoring Officer	11/11/22	17/11/22
<i>Deputies:</i>			
Andrew Vallance	Head of Finance (Deputy S151 Officer)	15/11/22	15/11/22
Elaine Browne	Head of Law (Deputy Monitoring Officer)	15/11/22	21/11/22
Karen Shepherd	Head of Governance (Deputy Monitoring Officer)	11/11/22	14/11/22
<i>Mandatory: Equalities Officer – to advise on EQiA, or agree an EQiA is not required</i>			
Ellen McManus	Equalities & Engagement Officer	21/11/2022	22/11/2022
<i>Other consultees:</i>			

<i>Directors (where relevant)</i>			
Tony Reeves	Interim Chief Executive		
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place	15/11/22	18/11/22
Kevin McDaniel	Executive Director of People Services	10/11/2022	11/11/2022
<i>Heads of Service (where relevant)</i>			
Alysse Strachan	Head of Neighbourhood Services		
Nikki Craig	Head of HR, Corporate Projects and IT	10/11/2022	17/11/2022
Tracy Hendren	Head of Housing, Environmental Health and Trading Standards		
Anna Richards	Head of Public Health	14/11/2022	14/11/2022
Chris Joyce	Head of Infrastructure, Sustainability and Economic Growth		
Adrien Waite	Head of Planning	11/11/2022	22/11/2022
<i>External (where relevant)</i>			
N/A			

Confirmation relevant Cabinet Member(s) consulted	Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways and Transport	Yes
---	--	-----

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To follow item?
Key Decision Added to Forward Plan 19 October 2022	No	No

Report Authors: Ian Motuel, Planning Policy Manager, 01628 796429 and Ian Manktelow, Principal Policy Planner, 01628 796200

Appendix A - Equality Impact Assessment Screening

Essential information

Items to be assessed: (please mark 'x')

Strategy		Policy		Plan	X	Project		Service/Procedure	
----------	--	--------	--	------	---	---------	--	-------------------	--

Responsible officer	Ian Manktelow	Service area	Planning Policy	Directorate	Place
---------------------	---------------	--------------	-----------------	-------------	-------

Stage 1: EqIA Screening (mandatory)	Date created: 22/11/2022	Stage 2: Full assessment (if applicable)	Date created : n/a
--	-----------------------------	---	--------------------

Approved by Head of Service / Overseeing group/body / Project Sponsor:

"I am satisfied that an equality impact has been undertaken adequately."

Signed by (print): Adrien Waite

Dated: 22/11/22

Guidance notes

What is an EqlA and why do we need to do it?

The Equality Act 2010 places a 'General Duty' on all public bodies to have 'due regard' to:

- Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act.
- Advancing equality of opportunity between those with 'protected characteristics' and those without them.
- Fostering good relations between those with 'protected characteristics' and those without them.

EqlAs are a systematic way of taking equal opportunities into consideration when making a decision, and should be conducted when there is a new or reviewed strategy, policy, plan, project, service or procedure in order to determine whether there will likely be a detrimental and/or disproportionate impact on particular groups, including those within the workforce and customer/public groups. All completed EqlA Screenings are required to be publicly available on the council's website once they have been signed off by the relevant Head of Service or Strategic/Policy/Operational Group or Project Sponsor.

What are the "protected characteristics" under the law?

The following are protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010: age; disability (including physical, learning and mental health conditions); gender reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation.

What's the process for conducting an EqlA?

The process for conducting an EqlA is set out at the end of this document. In brief, a Screening Assessment should be conducted for every new or reviewed strategy, policy, plan, project, service or procedure and the outcome of the Screening Assessment will indicate whether a Full Assessment should be undertaken.

Openness and transparency

RBWM has a 'Specific Duty' to publish information about people affected by our policies and practices. Your completed assessment should be sent to the Strategy & Performance Team for publication to the RBWM website once it has been signed off by the relevant manager, and/or Strategic, Policy, or Operational Group. If your proposals are being made to Cabinet or any other Committee, please append a copy of your completed Screening or Full Assessment to your report.

Enforcement

Judicial review of an authority can be taken by any person, including the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) or a group of people, with an interest, in respect of alleged failure to comply with the general equality duty. Only the EHRC can enforce the specific duties. A failure to comply with the specific duties may however be used as evidence of a failure to comply with the general duty.

Stage 1 : Screening (Mandatory)

1.1 What is the overall aim of your proposed strategy/policy/project etc and what are its key objectives?

To adopt the South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for planning purposes, following public consultation, along with supporting evidence base documents.

The SPD has been prepared to provide clear and specific guidance to help coordinate the development of major sites allocated in the Borough Local Plan in the South West Maidenhead area. It includes design principles, an illustrative framework masterplan, other key requirements and principles for development, and guidance on the provision and delivery of infrastructure that is required as a result of the development.

It does not (and cannot) develop new policy but elaborates on certain policies in the Borough Local Plan. It should be noted that an Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the Borough Local Plan.

1.2 What evidence is available to suggest that your proposal could have an impact on people (including staff and customers) with protected characteristics? Consider each of the protected characteristics in turn and identify whether your proposal is Relevant or Not Relevant to that characteristic. If Relevant, please assess the level of impact as either High / Medium / Low and whether the impact is Positive (i.e. contributes to promoting equality or improving relations within an equality group) or Negative (i.e. could disadvantage them). Please document your evidence for each assessment you make, including a justification of why you may have identified the proposal as "Not Relevant".

Protected characteristics	Relevance	Level	Positive/negative	Evidence
Age	Relevant	Medium	Positive	<p>The Borough Local Plan allocates the South West Maidenhead area for major housing and employment development, and for green infrastructure provision. The Borough Local Plan (Submission Version) was subject to an Equality Impact Assessment in 2017 and also subsequently on adoption, which did not identify any negative impacts for any particular group with protected characteristics.</p> <p>The South West Maidenhead SPD develops the policies and requirements set out in the Borough Local Plan. It does not create new policy.</p> <p>Borough Local Plan Policy 'HO2 Housing Mix and Type' recognises that new homes should support the changing needs of individuals and families at different stages of life, and the expectation is that a proportion of new housing should meet the higher accessibility standards of Requirement M4(2) (Building Regulations). The SPD reinforces the need for different housing types and tenures to meet a range of local needs, including a good mix of family housing and flats.</p> <p>The SPD and subsequent more detailed planning applications will highlight the need to provide for a range of different open spaces to meet the needs of different age groups – e.g., children's playspace, orchards/community gardens, informal walking areas etc</p>

Disability	Relevant	Medium	Positive	<p>The Borough Local Plan allocates the South West Maidenhead area for major housing and employment development, and for green infrastructure provision. The Borough Local Plan (Submission Version) was subject to an Equality Impact Assessment in 2017 and also subsequently on adoption, which did not identify any negative impacts for any particular group with protected characteristics.</p> <p>The South West Maidenhead SPD develops the policies and requirements set out in the Borough Local Plan. It does not create new policy.</p> <p>Borough Local Plan Policy 'HO2 Housing Mix and Type' recognises that new homes should support the changing needs of individuals and families at different stages of life, and the expectation is that a proportion of new housing should meet the higher accessibility standards of Requirement M4(2) (Building Regulations) and also makes provision for a proportion of homes to be of M4(3) standard to meet higher standards for wheelchair users. The SPD reinforces the need for different housing types and tenures to meet a range of local needs, including a good mix of family housing and flats and a proportion of housing that meets the accessibility standards.</p> <p>In addition, the SPD will highlight the importance of connectivity by a range of means travel, including the importance of high quality walking and cycling facilities. Provision of high quality walking and cycling provision, particularly of a segregated nature, and providing good connectivity to local facilities in the</p>
-------------------	----------	--------	----------	--

				local centre on the site could be of benefit to those with physical disabilities in particular.
Gender re-assignment	Not relevant			The SPD will have no impact on this protected characteristic.
Marriage/civil partnership	Not relevant			The SPD will have no impact on this protected characteristic.
Pregnancy and maternity	Relevant	Low	Positive	<p>The Borough Local Plan allocates the South West Maidenhead area for major housing and employment development, and for green infrastructure provision. The Borough Local Plan (Submission Version) was subject to an Equality Impact Assessment in 2017 and also subsequently on adoption, which did not identify any negative impacts for any particular group with protected characteristics.</p> <p>The South West Maidenhead SPD develops the policies and requirements set out in the Borough Local Plan. It does not create new policy.</p> <p>Borough Local Plan Policy 'HO2 Housing Mix and Type' recognises that new homes should support the changing needs of individuals and families at different stages of life, and the expectation is that a proportion of new housing should meet the higher accessibility standards of Requirement M4(2) (Building Regulations) and also makes provision for a proportion of homes to be of M4(3) standard to meet higher standards for wheelchair users. The SPD reinforces the need for different housing types and tenures to meet a range of local needs, including a good mix of family housing and flats and a proportion of housing that meets the accessibility standards.</p>

				In addition, the SPD will highlight the importance of connectivity by a range of means of travel, including the importance of high quality walking and cycling facilities. Provision of high quality walking and cycling provision, particularly of a segregated nature, and providing good connectivity to local facilities in the local centre on the site could be of benefit to those with young children.
Race	Not relevant			The SPD will have no impact on this protected characteristic.
Religion and belief	Relevant	Low	Positive	<p>The Borough Local Plan allocates the South West Maidenhead area for major housing and employment development, and for green infrastructure provision. The Borough Local Plan (Submission Version) was subject to an Equality Impact Assessment in 2017 and also subsequently on adoption, which did not identify any negative impacts for any particular group with protected characteristics.</p> <p>Places of worship are categorised as ‘Community facilities’ and deemed as making a significant contribution to the wellbeing of residents and the sustainability of communities.</p> <p>The SPD makes no specific provision for places of worship but does highlight the scope for the provision of a community facility as part of the local centre. This could have scope to accommodate religious meetings as part of a potential multi-functional facility.</p>
Sex	Relevant	Low	Positive	It will be important to ensure that routes and public spaces at SWM are well lit so that everyone to feel safe. Public safety issues will be addressed in more

				detail at the planning application stage. The principle of designing places with public safety in mind is incorporated into the Borough Wide Design Guide, which the SWM SPD refers to, e.g., see principle 6.2 of the Design Guide.
Sexual orientation	Not relevant			The SPD will have no impact on this protected characteristic.

Outcome, action and public reporting

Screening Assessment Outcome	Yes / No / Not at this stage	Further Action Required / Action to be taken	Responsible Officer and / or Lead Strategic Group	Timescale for Resolution of negative impact / Delivery of positive impact
Was a significant level of negative impact identified?	No	None. At this time, it is considered that the proposed South West Maidenhead Development Framework SPD is unlikely to have a disproportionate impact on any particular group.	Ian Manktelow	Positive impacts will emerge over the lifetime of the delivery of the development – this is likely to be over a period of at least 10 years
Does the strategy, policy, plan etc require amendment to have a positive impact?	No	None	Ian Manktelow	n/a

If you answered **yes** to either / both of the questions above a Full Assessment is advisable and so please proceed to Stage 2. If you answered “No” or “Not at this Stage” to either / both of the questions above please consider any next steps that may be taken (e.g. monitor future impacts as part of implementation, re-screen the project at its next delivery milestone etc).

South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document

ADOPTED – DECEMBER 2022



South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document

1	Introduction	4
	Purpose	4
	Structure and Content of this Development Framework SPD	5
	South West Maidenhead Strategic Placemaking Area	6
2	Community and Stakeholder Engagement	8
	2.1 Process for Community and Stakeholder Engagement	8
	BLP Consultation and Engagement	8
	DFSPD Engagement	8
	2.2 Community Key Issues from DFSPD Engagement	9
3	Planning Policy Framework	10
	3.1 National Policy	10
	3.2 Local Policy	11
	3.3 Supplementary Planning Documents	14
	3.4 Other Relevant RBWM Plans and Strategies	15
4	Area Analysis	16
	4.1 Introduction	16
	4.2 Context and Existing Land Uses	16
	4.3 Landscape Character and Views	16
	4.4 Ecology	17
	4.5 Trees and Hedgerows	17
	4.6 Conservation and Heritage	17
	4.7 Access, Transport and Movement	18
	4.8 Flood Risk	19
	4.9 Ground Conditions	19
	4.10 Services and Amenities	19
	4.11 Utilities	20
	4.12 Noise and Air Quality	20
	4.13 Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT)	21
5	Vision	23
	5.1 The Vision	23
6	Design and Delivery Principles and Requirements	25
	6.1 Introduction	25

6.2	Illustrative Framework Plan	26
6.3	Design Principles	31
	Approach to Placemaking & Creating Distinct Neighbourhoods	32
	Approach to Northern Neighbourhood	37
	Approach to Harvest Hill Neighbourhood (previously referred to as the ‘southern neighbourhood’ within the Borough Local Plan)	38
	Housing and Density	39
	Accommodating family housing (see Figure 7)	39
	School Provision	43
	Approach to the Triangle Site Employment Area	44
	Incorporating Green Infrastructure & Open Space	46
	Approach to the Green Spine	47
	Access, Movement & Wayfinding	54
	Approach to Harvest Hill Road	57
	Next Steps with masterplanning & design control	63
	Site Wide Masterplans	65
	Site Wide Design Codes	65
	Design Review	66
6.4	Other Delivery Principles and Requirements	67
6.5	Community Needs	68
	Housing	68
	Community Infrastructure	71
	Open Space	72
6.6	Connectivity	74
6.7	Sustainability and Environment	81
	Other Issues	86
7	Infrastructure Delivery	88
7.1	Infrastructure Delivery - Policy, Principles and Approach	88
	<u>Step 1 - Infrastructure Needs and Costs</u>	91
	<u>Step 2 - Other Funding Sources</u>	94
	<u>Step 3 - Potential Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts</u>	95
	<u>Step 4 - Addressing the Funding Gap</u>	95
	The Triangle Site (AL14) contributions	96
	The Housing Site (AL13)	98
	Planning Reform	101
7.2	Timing and Phasing	102

7.3 Viability	103
Appendix 1 - Table Illustrating Link Between the Visions, “ High Level” Development Principles, BLP Proforma Requirements, and SPD Principles	104
Appendix 2 - Infrastructure Delivery Schedule	109
Appendix 3 – Affordable Housing and Housing Mix	115
Appendix 4 - Education Provision	119
Plans for new school provision on AL13 South West Maidenhead are for:.....	119
Appendix 5 - Borough Local Plan Policy QP1b and Site Proformas for Sites AL13, AL14 and AL15	123

1 Introduction

Purpose

- 1.1.1 This Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (DFSPD) provides a planning, design, and delivery framework for the South West Maidenhead Strategic Placemaking Area (SWMSPA).
- 1.1.2 It adds detail to the broad principles and requirements set out in the Borough Local Plan (BLP), in particular, as set out in the placemaking policy for the area (Policy QP1b) and in the individual proformas for site allocations AL13 (Desborough, Shoppenhangers and Harvest Hill Roads, South West Maidenhead), AL14 (The Triangle Site, Maidenhead) and AL15 (Braywick Park, Maidenhead). It is important to note that it does not set new policy, nor is it able to change policy in the Borough Local Plan. It does, however, provide updated evidence and further information to assist developers in delivering policy compliant development.
- 1.1.3 This DFSPD has been prepared having regard to national and local planning policy, local infrastructure and environmental considerations and community concerns and aspirations. It has been produced by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (“the Council”) in collaboration with the principal landowners and developers within the South West Maidenhead Strategic Placemaking Area, and in consultation with the community and other stakeholders.
- 1.1.4 The main purposes of the DFSPD are to:
- Explain the planning policy context within which planning applications will be considered;
 - Identify the key constraints and opportunities affecting development within the Placemaking Area;
 - Set out the vision for the development;
 - Establish broad design principles for the Placemaking Area, ensuring a high quality, sustainable and coherent development;
 - Coordinate land uses, and set out the green infrastructure strategy for the area;
 - Define the principal pedestrian, cycling, and public transport routes;
 - Illustrate the above through diagrams and an illustrative framework plan;
 - Identify other key principles and requirements for the development of the area; and
 - Assess in more detail the infrastructure required to support planned development and provide a delivery framework that will ensure the timely and coordinated delivery of necessary supporting infrastructure.

- 1.1.5 This Development Framework has been adopted by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
- 1.1.6 Landowners and developers within the South West Maidenhead Strategic Placemaking Area have prepared, or are preparing planning applications for development of their individual land parcels. This DFSPD has a vital role to play in ensuring that these separate planning applications are coordinated, most importantly, in terms of ensuring the timely delivery of the new infrastructure required to support the development, and to ensure a coherent, high-quality scheme overall.

Structure and Content of this Development Framework SPD


- 1.1.7 The first part of this DFSPD addresses the community engagement undertaken in preparing this SPD (Section 2), the planning policy context (Section 3) and the characteristics of the place-making area (Section 4).
- 1.1.8 The early community engagement has helped shape the development framework and design principles.
- 1.1.9 The second part of this DFSPD, sets out the vision for the South West Maidenhead Placemaking Area (Section 5), the development framework, including design principles and framework masterplan (Section 6), and infrastructure delivery (Section 7).
- 1.1.10 Through discussions and consultation, the Council has been able to develop further in this SPD some of the broad principles and policy approaches set out in the Borough Local Plan. This SPD:
- sets out important design principles for the area, and in particular for key locations in the main housing area such as the green spine and the Harvest Hill Road corridor;
 - provides more clarity on an appropriate broad location for the local centre;
 - provides more information and evidence in relation to the general housing mix for the area and ensures that the affordable housing mix meets the latest identified needs;
 - ensures that development is well connected across the area, and beyond, not just in relation to roads but also critically walking and cycling;
 - provides clarity on the preferred way forward in terms of sustainable travel connections from the Triangle site;
 - sets out an approach to biodiversity net gain including any necessary off-site provision;
 - ensures that development is coming forward in a way that addresses climate change impacts; and

- sets out a preferred approach to the funding of infrastructure in the area.

South West Maidenhead Strategic Placemaking Area

1.1.11 The SWMSPA is defined on the BLP Policies Map and in Figure 3 of the BLP and is also illustrated in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1 – SWMSPA Site



1.1.12 The SWMSPA is in multiple ownerships with both public and private interests represented. The golf course site, north of Harvest Hill Road, is owned by the Council, and the land south of Harvest Hill Road is under the control of a number of different landowners and developers. Together, the land north and south of Harvest Hill Road is allocated in the BLP (AL13) for approximately 2,600 new homes and supporting community infrastructure.

1.1.13 The Triangle Site, south of the A308, is allocated for employment uses (site AL14), and Braywick Park is an existing sports and recreation hub, east of Braywick Road (AL15).

1.1.14 It should be noted that the SWMSPA includes land beyond the three allocations. This is to recognise the need for new development to consider its surrounding

context, and to help ensure that existing and planned development is fully connected.

Supporting documents

- 1.1.15 This DFSPD is accompanied by a Strategic Environmental Assessment¹ (SEA). SEA seeks to ensure that environmental considerations are part of the process of preparing certain plans and programmes.
- 1.1.16 In order to determine whether an SEA is required of this DFSPD, a SEA Screening Report was produced. This concluded that the SPD is likely to have a significant environmental impact on the surrounding area and will therefore require an SEA in relation to air quality, biodiversity, climate change, cultural heritage, landscape, and material assets. An SEA was therefore undertaken, and a report published to accompany this SPD. However, the Screening Report also concluded that a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) is not required, as a significant impact of the SPD on any Natura 2000² sites can be objectively ruled out at this stage.
- 1.1.17 A consultation statement has also been prepared, setting out how the Council has engaged with local communities and other stakeholders in preparing the SPD and the main issues raised. More details on this can be found in Section 2.

¹In accordance with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA Regulations)

² HRA considers the potential adverse impacts of plans and projects on designated Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), classified Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and listed Ramsar sites. This is in accordance with the Habitats Directive and the Birds Directive. SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites are collectively known as the Natura 2000 network.

2 Community and Stakeholder Engagement

2.1 Process for Community and Stakeholder Engagement

BLP Consultation and Engagement

- 2.1.1 Community and stakeholder consultation and engagement, in relation to development at South West Maidenhead, began with discussions around the emerging Borough Local Plan. At the pre-submission Regulation 19 stage, the Local Plan allocated land north and south of Harvest Hill Road for residential development, but as separate allocations, and the Triangle site was protected for potential employment needs later in the Plan period.
- 2.1.2 A range of comments and concerns were raised in representations to the pre-submission draft Local Plan, some of which were initially discussed at the Stage 1 Local Plan Examination hearing sessions in June 2018. Following the Stage 1 hearing sessions there was a pause in the Examination process, whilst the Council undertook further work to strengthen the Local Plan policies, in particular to ensure a more comprehensive approach that prioritised placemaking.
- 2.1.3 Hyas were appointed by the Council to prepare a Placemaking Study for South West Maidenhead, to inform the development of a cohesive and comprehensive policy framework for the area. As part of this work, two workshops were held in July 2019, with the feedback from these sessions helping to shape the development principles and associated concept proposals.
- 2.1.4 In turn, the Placemaking Study (September 2019) informed revisions to the policy framework for South West Maidenhead. The new policies and associated proforma requirements were published as “Proposed Changes” to the Local Plan, with an opportunity for the local community and other stakeholders to comment.
- 2.1.5 Stage 2 of the Local Plan Examination hearings took place in October-December 2020, with an independently appointed Inspector carefully considering all of the written and oral submissions made in relation to the Plan, its strategy, policies, and site allocations (including as they relate to South West Maidenhead).
- 2.1.6 Following consultation on Main Modifications to the Local Plan (July-September 2021), and receipt of the Final Inspector’s Report in January 2022, the Local Plan was adopted in February 2022.

DFSPD Engagement

- 2.1.7 In the context of the above, three online public engagement events were held in March and April 2022 to help further in understanding the issues, and to share emerging thinking on the content of the SPD. The events took the form of presentations followed by questions in the chat bar, that were either answered

on the night, or had written answers provided on the Council's website afterwards. The three sessions had three different themes as a focus:

1. Community Needs
2. Connectivity
3. Sustainability and Environment

2.1.8 The questions and comments from the chat bar and written responses from an online response form were gathered together and used to help inform the preparation of this DFSPD. Recordings of the live events were made available on the Council's YouTube channel and there were several hundred viewings of the recordings. Links to all of the above can be found on the Council's website via the following link - <https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/home/planning/planning-policy/non-development-plan/placemaking/placemaking-and-south-west-maidenhead>

2.1.9 A draft SPD was then produced, and consultation and engagement on it took place for 6 weeks during July and August 2022. This included three in person drop-in exhibition sessions and an online event. Information was made available on the Council's website together with various ways of commenting on the draft SPD. Written responses to the consultation were wide ranging, including from the general public, various agencies and organisations and also from developers.

2.2 Community Key Issues from DFSPD Engagement

2.2.1 There were a wide range of comments received through this engagement across a large number of themes. At the early engagement stage the greatest level of feedback and comment related to environmental issues including:

- Concern in relation to loss of wildlife on the site
- Concern in relation to the ability to deliver biodiversity net gain
- Loss of trees (and implications for pollution and climate change mitigation)
- Conflicts with the Climate Environment Strategy
- Development needs to be carbon neutral and use renewable sources of energy
- Loss of Green Belt land around Maidenhead
- Concerns about the control of air pollution and odours during construction
- Concerns about flooding on the Triangle site
- Not clear how site can be delivered as sustainable development as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework

2.2.2 Some other notable themes at that stage in relation to other matters, included:

- Concerns regarding the maximum height of the apartment blocks that are likely to be on the site
- Concern for housing affordability and housing mix
- Lack of infrastructure to support the development
- Increased traffic volumes

- Improvements to public transport service needed
- Concern about the road access points and parking
- Need for large amount of social and adaptable housing
- More green open space required for mental health
- Community youth centre provision is needed
- Need for healthcare provision

2.2.3 The draft SPD sought to respond to these various issues, within the context provided by the policies in the Borough Local Plan and the scope of what an SPD can cover.

2.2.4 Many of the main themes from the engagement at the earlier stage were highlighted in responses to the draft SPD as well. In addition, there were more detailed comments about different sections and paragraphs in the draft SPD, and more technical comments on the SPD content including on the approach to infrastructure delivery and funding, housing mix and affordable housing, and concerns that the SPD may be seeking to introduce new policy.

2.2.5 A consultation statement setting out the engagement undertaken, the issues raised and the Council's response to the issues, focusing on the comments received on the draft SPD, will be published alongside this final version of this SPD. This includes setting out how the Council has revised the draft SPD in response to the comments received.

3 Planning Policy Framework

This SPD elaborates on the principles and high-level policy set out in both national and local planning policy documents. The policies and guidance most relevant are summarised below.

3.1 National Policy

3.1.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. It includes a range of high-level policies relating to sustainable development, transport, housing, the economy, design, the environment, and health. The importance of good design and placemaking is expressed throughout the document and is recognised as a key aspect of sustainable development.

3.1.2 The NPPF³ also:

- Emphasises that the delivery of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning process should achieve;

³ NPPF 2021, section 12

- States that plans should set out a clear design vision so that applicants have clarity on what is likely to be acceptable and they also reflect local communities' aspirations;
- Encourages design guides to be prepared at an area-wide, neighbourhood or site-specific scale, either as part of a plan or as supplementary planning documents;
- Supports early engagement on development proposals, so that issues around infrastructure and housing delivery can be resolved at the pre-application stage;
- Seeks measurable net gains for biodiversity;
- States that proposals should pursue opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use; and
- Supports the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate.

3.1.3 The NPPF recommends that Local Planning Authorities make appropriate use of tools for assessing and improving the design of development, including Building for a Healthy Life (BHL, 2020). BHL is the latest edition of Building for Life 12, England's most widely used design tool for creating places that are better for people and nature. BHL can be seen as a 'golden strand' running through the development and planning process and its considerations should be embedded into Local Plans, SPDs and site-specific briefs. It can be used to set expectations for new developments and works best when it is used at the inception of a scheme rather than after or towards the end of the design process. It uses a traffic light system to highlight examples of good practice (green), poor practice (red) and in between (amber).

3.1.4 Another tool is the National Design Guide, which was published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (now known as Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities) in 2021. The National Design Guide, and the National Model Design Code and Guidance Notes for Design Codes illustrate how well-designed places that are beautiful, healthy, greener, enduring, and successful can be achieved in practice. Design Codes are a set of illustrated design requirements that provide specific, detailed parameters for the physical development of a site or area.

3.2 Local Policy

3.2.1 The RBWM Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 (BLP) was adopted in February 2022. The BLP provides a framework to guide development in the Royal Borough to 2033, including a spatial strategy and policies for managing development. Policy QP1b (South West Maidenhead Strategic Placemaking Area) within the BLP designates this area as the focus for a significant proportion of the Borough's housing, employment and leisure growth during the Plan period and adds that it should be delivered as a high quality, well connected sustainable development. The Policy (copied in full at Appendix 3) contains a set of key principles and requirements, including:

- A coordinated and comprehensive approach to the development of the area to avoid piecemeal or ad-hoc proposals;

*South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)*

- Creation of a distinctive, high quality new development;
- Provision of the necessary infrastructure ahead of, or in tandem with the development;
- Provision of a balanced and inclusive community;
- Measures to minimise the need to travel and improved connections;
- Provision of green infrastructure and delivery of biodiversity net gain; and
- Measures to reduce climate change and environmental impacts.

3.2.2 The supporting text for Policy QP1b includes a schematic Framework Plan and Plan Key (Figures 3 and 4 of the BLP). These were produced for the SWM Placemaking Study (October 2019) and are indicative only. Indeed, it should be noted that the ‘red edge’ boundary shown on the Framework Plan is slightly different to that on the Adopted Policies Map, and it is the latter that is correct. The proposed new illustrative Framework Plan (see section 6 of this DFSPD) has a boundary that is consistent with the Adopted Policies Map.

3.2.3 The placemaking area contains three allocations, AL13, AL14 and AL15. Each of these allocations has its own proforma in Appendix C of the BLP (attached at Appendix 3 of this DFSPD, for ease of reference). The proformas set broad development parameters and will help to guide the design and delivery of the sites. A summary of the proforma requirements is provided below:

Site	Uses	Area (ha)	Requirements
AL13	Approx. 2,600 homes, educational, open space, community / retail uses	89.93	20 requirements, including creation of two distinct neighbourhoods.
AL14	General industrial / warehousing uses	25.7	32 requirements. Not all of site will be developed for employment.
AL15	Strategic Green Infrastructure site accommodating indoor and outdoor sport, park, school and wildlife zone	54.1	11 requirements. Emphasis on provision of links to surrounding areas

3.2.4 The BLP includes many other policies that are relevant to this SPD, including:

- SP2 – Climate Change
- QP1 – Sustainability and Placemaking

*South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)*

- QP2 – Green and Blue Infrastructure
- QP3 – Character and Design of New Development
- QP3a – Building Height and Tall Buildings
- HO1 – Housing Development Sites
- HO2 – Housing Mix and Type
- HO3 – Affordable Housing
- ED1 – Economic Development
- TR1 – Hierarchy of Centres
- TR5 – Local Centres
- NR1 - Managing Flood Risk and Waterways
- NR2 - Nature Conservation and Biodiversity
- NR3 - Trees, Woodlands, and Hedgerows
- IF1 – Infrastructure and Developer Contributions
- IF7 - Utilities
- As well as others relating to environmental protection and infrastructure.

3.2.5 It is important to note that this SPD provides more detailed guidance to supplement the Local Plan Policy QP1b, but it cannot change the BLP policies.

3.2.6 Policy HO1 provides for at least 14,240 dwellings in the Plan period up to 2033 and allocates a number of sites, including AL13. The proforma for AL13 is part of Policy HO1 and therefore has full policy weight. However, HO1 adds that in meeting the proforma requirements, flexibility may be applied to allow for changes in circumstance or to enable alternative solutions that would deliver the same (or preferably better) planning outcomes.

3.2.7 Policy HO2 sets out that an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes should be provided, in accordance with the evidence in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2016, or successor documents, unless an alternative mix is more appropriate. Many of the sites delivered in the Borough (and particularly in Maidenhead) since 2013 have been urban sites that are best suited to high density flatted schemes. There is an opportunity to provide an appropriate mix of family housing and flats on the AL13 site in order to achieve a mixed community whilst accommodating approximately 2,600 homes. HO2 also sets out a requirement that on greenfield sites of 100 or more net new dwellings, 5% of the market housing should be provided as fully serviced plots for custom and self-build dwellings, and these plots must be made available and appropriately marketed for 12 months.

3.2.8 Policy ED1 seeks to make provision for at least 11,200 net new jobs across a range of floorspaces, by promoting flexible working practices, encouraging the more intensive use of existing employment sites and by making some new employment allocations. It allocates the Triangle site AL14 for new industrial and warehousing space but adds that due to flood risk and other constraints, not all of the site will be developed for employment purposes. Policy ED1 adds, in clauses 8 and 9, that given the shortage of industrial space in the Borough and limited scope to allocate new sites, the priority (across RBWM) should be to deliver smaller 'flexible' units that meet the

needs of the Borough's firms, with mezzanine floors where possible above industrial units. Clause 10 states that at the Triangle site, larger units (e.g. B8 distribution units) should only be permitted where they are required to secure the delivery of a mix of units as part of a comprehensive scheme, with a high standard of design to reflect the 'gateway' nature of the site. The proforma for AL14 setting out detailed site-specific requirements is part of Policy ED1.

- 3.2.9 The Borough Local Plan was supported by a detailed evidence base. A [Placemaking Study](#) for South West Maidenhead was prepared by consultants Hyas, and this was published in 2019 and informed Policy QP1b and the proformas for AL13-15. Two stakeholder workshops were held in July 2019 to inform the study. A wide range of other evidence base documents were produced for the BLP, including Sustainability Appraisal, Habitats Regulation Assessment (including air quality), Green Belt analysis, Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA), Strategic Highways Modelling, Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), Tall Buildings Strategy, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Viability.
- 3.2.10 With regards to other Local Plans, the Council is preparing a Joint Central and Eastern Berkshire (JCEB) Minerals and Waste Plan with Wokingham, Bracknell and Reading Councils. This is at an advanced stage of production. Following a public examination, the Inspector's report was published in November 2022 and the Plan was also adopted by the Borough Council in November 2022. It now supersedes the existing Minerals Local Plan 1997/2000 and Waste Local Plan 1998. Amongst other things, the JCEB Minerals and Waste Plan encourages the prior extraction of sand and gravel deposits when this is viable and practicable within Minerals Safeguarding Areas (MSA) as part of large development proposals. The proforma for site AL13 requires that a minerals assessment is undertaken to assess the viability and practicality of prior extraction of minerals.

3.3 Supplementary Planning Documents

- 3.3.1 In June 2020, the Borough Council adopted the Borough Wide Design Guide as a Supplementary Planning Document. This supports the BLP policies by setting out in detail what the Council considers to be design excellence in the Royal Borough. Developers are expected to take the Design Guide into account when designing new development proposals in the Borough. It will also be used by development management officers in assessing future planning applications at South West Maidenhead. The SWMSPD does not, therefore, seek to repeat this detailed design guidance.
- 3.3.2 Several other SPDs are expected to be produced and adopted to support the Borough Local Plan, including a Building Heights and Tall Buildings SPD, a Sustainability and Climate Change SPD, a Parking SPD and an Affordable Housing and Planning Obligations SPD. The Building Heights and Tall Buildings SPD was published for consultation in August 2022 and is expected to be adopted early in 2023. It is anticipated that the other SPDs will progress further during 2023.

3.4 Other Relevant RBWM Plans and Strategies

3.4.1. In addition to the BLP, its evidence base, and other SPDs, there are several other plans and strategies relevant to this SPD. In February 2021, the Council adopted the Environment and Climate Strategy 2020-2025, and in March 2021, a Position Statement on Sustainability and Energy Efficient Design was published as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Position Statement sets out guidance and requirements which will be sought on new developments in order to deliver on the requirements set out in the NPPF, national and local commitments towards climate change and the Council's Environment and Climate Strategy. Amongst other things, it indicates that all development should be net-zero carbon unless this would not be feasible.

3.4.2. Other relevant RBWM corporate strategies include:

- Corporate Plan (2021-26)
- Housing Strategy (2020-2025)
- Biodiversity Action Plan (at an advanced stage of preparation)
- Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)
- Bus Service Improvement Plan

4 Area Analysis

4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 This section of the SPD sets out the context, constraints and existing uses of the SWMSPA, with an analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats associated with development within the area.
- 4.1.2 The site analysis has been primarily informed by work undertaken by Hyas during the production of the South West Maidenhead Placemaking Study, which was prepared against the policies in the submission version of the BLP. Further studies and assessments have also been completed by the promoters and landowners of the sites that make up the SWMSPA.
- 4.1.3 However, further analysis and assessment of the various sites within the SWMSPA will be required at the planning application stage. It should be noted that this is a high-level study and some of the details provided within the SPD may develop and evolve following further work.

4.2 Context and Existing Land Uses

- 4.2.1 The SWMSPA is a large area of land to the south-west of Maidenhead railway station, extending from the railway line southwards to the M4.
- 4.2.2 The land is currently used for a mix of open space, leisure, residential and employment activities. A large part of the northern and central part of the area comprises Maidenhead Golf Course, with Braywick Park and Ockwells Park forming two separate, significant green open spaces to the east and south-west of the SWMSPA respectively. The land falls away to the south of the Golf Course to the Triangle site in the south of SWMSPA which is an undeveloped site bounded by the A308(M), Ascot Road and the M4 motorway.

4.3 Landscape Character and Views

- 4.3.1 Maidenhead is renowned for being a green town with leafy approaches benefitting from the rich landscape backdrop of the Thames Valley to the east and north, the Chilterns margins to the north-west and wider open countryside to the west and south.
- 4.3.2 The key characteristics of the SWMSPA are a diverse rural landscape with mixed farmland, remnant woodland areas and copses including some of ancient origin. There are historic designed landscapes with mature parkland trees and rural lanes with grass verges, ditches, and hedgerows, along with vernacular building forms with red brick, timber frames and weatherboard details with brick boundary walls of manor estates and numerous footpaths and bridleways.

4.4 Ecology

- 4.4.1 Bray Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is located to the east of the Braywick Park allocation AL15. Great Thrift Wood SSSI is just outside of the SWMSPA area. There are also several Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and Local Nature Reserves (LNR) within and close to the area, including The Gillet LNR (near the railway station), Braywick Park LNR and LWS and Ockwells Park LNR.
- 4.4.2 Appropriate biodiversity mitigation measures will be required and assessed through the planning applications process.

4.5 Trees and Hedgerows

- 4.5.1 There are Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) in place across the SWMSPA, including along the western boundary near Shoppenhangers Road. Towards the south of the site, there are several large TPO areas.
- 4.5.2 There are also several large mature groups of trees between the fairways on Maidenhead Golf Course, including the ancient woodland of Rushington Copse. There is some broadleaved woodland along the eastern edge of the AL13 site. There is also a tree copse on the Triangle site, which is also identified as an ancient woodland on the Ancient Woodland Inventory. In addition, there are tree belts along the motorways in this area. There are also trees on Harvest Hill Road that are on the Ancient Tree Inventory.

4.6 Conservation and Heritage

- 4.6.1 There are several heritage designations on or near the SWMSPA. For example, there is the Grade II listed 'Clocktower' approximately 280m to the northeast of the AL13 site at Maidenhead Railway Station. The Sustainability Appraisal produced for the BLP did not anticipate that there would be any impact on this asset, particularly as the elevated railway at Maidenhead Railway Station prevents views to the development.
- 4.6.2 Approximately 70m south of AL13, on the south side of the A308(M) within the AL14 site, there is 'Mesolithic site, Moor Farm, Holyport', a monument scheduled under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. The site proforma for AL14 requires that the development retain, conserve, and enhance the setting of this scheduled ancient monument.

Figure 2 - Mesolithic site, Moor Farm, Holyport, Bray Wick



(Modern Ordnance Survey mapping: © Crown Copyright and database right 2018. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Licence number 100024900.)

4.7 Access, Transport and Movement

- 4.7.1 Several key local roads into Maidenhead Town Centre run through the area which is well located in relation to the A404(M), A308(M) and the M4.
- 4.7.2 Development in the SWMSPA will need to address the impacts of the development including tackling congestion, improving connectivity and permeability north-south and east-west, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists through the area and into the surrounding town and local communities. The northern part of the SWMSPA adjoins the Maidenhead Town Centre Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and, as development in such proximity to the AQMA may worsen emissions in the area, mitigation measures such as designing for greater walking and cycling and enhanced public transport should be maximised to reduce negative impacts on air quality.
- 4.7.3 North-south connections are currently provided by the existing road corridors of Shoppenhangers Road and Braywick Road. Opportunities for accommodating bus or cycle lanes will need to be investigated further. Further south, the AL14 site (allocated for industrial and warehousing uses) is separated from the AL13 housing allocation by the A308(M).
- 4.7.4 East-west connections from the SWMSPA out to adjoining areas, especially Braywick Park and south-west to Ockwells Park are currently limited.

4.8 Flood Risk

- 4.8.1 The AL13 part of the SWMSPA is almost completely within Flood Zone 1, according to the Flood Map for Planning 2020. The development passes the Sequential Test for allocation for residential and educational facilities use as no sites at lower risk are reasonably available.
- 4.8.2 About 36% of AL14 is in Flood Zone 1, with 27% in Flood Zone 2 and about 37% in Flood Zone 3 (Flood Map for Planning 2020). The BLP Inspector concluded, in her final report, that as industrial development is a less vulnerable use, the Triangle site passes the sequential test, and this is appropriate in Flood Zones 2 and 3a. Policy NR1 of the BLP also confirms that the sequential test is not required for sites allocated for development.

4.9 Ground Conditions

- 4.9.1 The land in the SWMPA has a range of topographies, but generally slopes up towards the centre. Most of the land is classed as Grade 4 agricultural land. The AL13 site lies within a mineral safeguarding area and there are expected to be sand and gravel deposits beneath the ground.
- 4.9.2 As the placemaking area is predominantly greenfield land, there is not expected to be any issues with contamination, although the Council's GIS records indicate that there may be potential contamination issues with some already developed parts of the wider area, including within AL15 and close to the Holiday Inn on Manor Lane.

4.10 Services and Amenities

- 4.10.1 There are several existing schools within or near the SWMSPA, including Oldfield Primary School, Braywick Court School, Larchfield Primary and Nursery School, and Desborough College. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) produced for the BLP identified a need for a new 4 form entry primary school and a new 7 form entry secondary school on the AL13 site and these are a requirement of the BLP site proforma.
- 4.10.2 There are several doctor's surgeries in the vicinity of the site, with the nearest being the Ross Road Medical Centre. There are other GP surgeries within the town centre. The IDP for the Borough Local Plan notes that the existing health infrastructure is under increasing pressure due to a rise in population, demographic factors, and the inadequacy of some of the surgery buildings which are outdated and are no longer fit for purpose. There may be an opportunity within the proposed Local Centre for a new medical facility to replace some of the existing GP surgeries close to the site.
- 4.10.3 Thames Valley Police (TVP) have an aspiration for a 'touchdown office' in the SWMSPA to reinforce the visibility of policing in the new community.

4.10.4 With regards to sports and community facilities, Braywick Park contains a range of sporting facilities. A new Leisure Centre has recently opened within Braywick Park, replacing the Magnet Centre. There are three libraries close to the site, Maidenhead Library, Boyn Grove Library and Cox Green Library. The Green Lane allotment site is on the north-eastern edge of the SWMSPA.

4.11 Utilities

4.11.1 Maidenhead Wastewater Treatment Works is located to the east of the SWMSPA and has a catchment that covers all of the town. The Council and Thames Water signed a Statement of Common Ground in 2020 in relation to the Borough Local Plan. It was agreed that whilst there are no proposed upgrades to Maidenhead Sewage Treatment Works (STW) in the 2020-25 period, the proposed levels of growth can be accommodated. It added that the capacity of the STW will be continually monitored as growth comes forward and that should upgrades be necessary, they will be put in place in time to support the scale of development planned in the BLP, including in Maidenhead.

4.11.2 The Licensed Electricity Distribution Network Operator (DNO) for the Borough is Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution (SSEPD). Cadent, formally National Grid Gas Distribution Limited is the gas network strategic infrastructure provider for the Borough. Electric and gas network operators have a legal duty to respond to requests for new supplies, and it is not anticipated that there would be any constraints in terms of the provision of such utilities for the South West Maidenhead development.

4.12 Noise and Air Quality

4.12.1 The northern edge of the SWMSPA adjoins the Maidenhead Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Whilst not within the AQMA, development in such proximity to the AQMA may exacerbate emissions in the area. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) found that whilst there might be a minor negative impact on air and noise pollution, the promotion of non-car travel would help to reduce transport related emissions.

4.12.2 However, the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) was updated in March 2020, and this assessed the impact of the development within the Proposed Changes version of the BLP. As part of the air quality appropriate assessment, Ricardo Energy & Environment undertook further analysis and this work concluded that there would be no adverse impact on the site integrity of any European site due to changes in air quality. The Ricardo report, appended to the HRA document, also concluded that whilst there would be some increase in concentrations of pollutants at receptor points, no relevant locations (including areas assigned as AQMAs) were at risk of exceeding the national Air Quality Objectives in 2033 for scenarios containing the Proposed Changes Plan development.

4.12.3 The SEA/HRA Screening Document produced for this SPD states that “There is likely to be scope within the site to ensure new residents are situated away from major


sources of air pollution, such as roads, through careful design and layout and the use of GI [Green Infrastructure] buffers...”.

4.12.4 Approximately 400m east of Braywick Park is a licensed waste site which includes the Braywick Recycling and Refuse Centre. There is also an inert waste recycling site to the western end of Kimber’s Lane, adjacent to the A404(M).

4.12.5 The southern areas of the SWMSPA are also adjacent to the A404(M) and A308(M). It may be the case that those parts of the site closest to these roads may be adversely affected by noise and air quality issues. This will need to be looked at in more detail, and appropriate noise mitigation measures provided should they be needed at the planning application stage.

4.13 Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT)

4.13.1 Figure 3 below shows some of the key constraints present in the SWMSPA.



4.13.2 Building on the initial work undertaken by HYAS for the SWM Placemaking Study (2019), the section below sets out a summary of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats for the SWMSPA.

- 4.13.3 The main **strength** of the area is that it has very good accessibility, located immediately south of the town centre and railway station, with access to the Elizabeth Line and bus routes, and to strategic roads, including the M4, the A308(M) and A404(M). It has good proximity to existing assets and facilities, including those in the town centre and open spaces/leisure.
- 4.13.4 With regards to **weaknesses**, the roads within and surrounding the area act as barriers to connectivity, as well as limiting access e.g., to open space at Ockwells Park and Braywick Park. It currently has poor connectivity, particularly for pedestrians.
- 4.13.5 Turning to **opportunities**, the South West Maidenhead area provides the opportunity to deliver significant levels of housing (including affordable housing), social and community infrastructure, and employment space to help meet the needs of the Borough. The scale of development requires a new approach to the design and delivery of the area in order to create a new character in this area and attract new investment and new residents to support local services and enable the provision of new businesses. Furthermore, a coordinated approach to development will support delivery of renewables and low carbon living at scale. There are also opportunities for the delivery of innovation in green buildings, walkable neighbourhoods, pedestrian and cycle priority, shared facilities to make efficient use of land and public transport provision, biodiversity net gain and the building of mixed and balanced communities.
- 4.13.6 Finally, turning to **threats**, the size and capacity of the area will likely require higher densities, with pressure on green space, trees and environmental impacts that will need to be mitigated. The development could result in some pressure on existing facilities and infrastructure in the town, including on the highway network, and again this will require mitigation.
- 4.13.7 The policies in the Borough Local Plan, supported by the guidance in this SPD, help to ensure that both the issues and the opportunities associated with development in the SWMSPA can be fully addressed through the planning application process.

5 Vision

5.1 The Vision

5.1.1 The adopted Borough Local Plan (2022) sets out a spatial vision for the Borough (BLP, page 18), and a series of related objectives (BLP, pages 19-22). Important themes include:

- Protecting and enhancing the special qualities of the Borough's built and natural environments;
- Promoting sustainable development and high-quality design;
- Making effective and efficient use of land;
- Ensuring necessary new infrastructure is delivered alongside development; and
- Providing jobs and homes for residents, in a safe, healthy and sustainable environment.

5.1.2 Within this broad context, Policy QP1b – South West Maidenhead Strategic Placemaking Area (SWMPA (referred to as SWMSPA elsewhere within this SPD)), presents a Vision specifically for South West Maidenhead. This Vision states the following:

“SWMPA will be an area that fulfils a variety of roles for both the local area and Maidenhead as a whole. The provision of infrastructure and other functions will contribute in a number of ways to a more sustainable, more distinctive and more desirable part of town.

A sense of place and distinctiveness will emerge in different ways across the SWMPA. Maidenhead is renowned for being a green town with leafy approaches benefitting from the rich landscape backdrop of the Thames Valley to the east and north, the Chilterns margins to the north-west and wider open countryside to the west and south. Retaining the existing trees and landscape buffers along the strategic road corridors at the southern end of the SWMPA will maintain the sense of leafy enclosure and new residents will benefit from improved access to and integration with the significant green spaces of Ockwells Park and Braywick Park as well as new and improved blue infrastructure. New and existing communities alike will live a greener existence among a flourishing network of green streets and spaces which will accommodate biodiversity and people harmoniously.

In 2019 the Council committed the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead to become carbon neutral by 2050. This challenging commitment will require a proactive approach by many parties, including the residents of Maidenhead. As new communities become established, more sustainable patterns of living will become enshrined to enable new residents to instinctively choose to reduce their environmental impact. The choice to live in South West Maidenhead will be a choice

*South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)*

to live more sustainably and with this will come the opportunity to live better, more sociable, more connected and healthier lives.”

- 5.1.3 The vision for SWMSPA has been translated into a series of policy principles and requirements (Policy QP1b (5)), with further site-specific requirements included in the site proformas for AL13, AL14 and AL15. The table at Appendix 1 shows the relationship between the Vision for the SWMSPA, the policy principles and requirements set out in Policy QP1b (5), and the site-specific requirements set out in the three relevant site proformas. The site proforma requirements are attached in full at Appendix 3.

6 Design and Delivery Principles and Requirements

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 Drawing on the context and analysis in earlier sections, this section sets out:

- An Illustrative Framework Masterplan for the area
- Design Principles for development in the South West Maidenhead area
- Other Delivery Principles and Requirements

6.1.2 The SWMSPA incorporates a variety of sites, uses, and characters. The DFSPD coordinates the holistic design of the place in a comprehensive way to avoid piecemeal or isolated parts of development and coordinate strategic green infrastructure. Overall, development proposals across South West Maidenhead must adhere to the following key overarching design principles:

Overarching Design Principles

- Ensure a holistic approach to the design of the place in a comprehensive way to avoid piecemeal or isolated parts of development and coordinate strategic green infrastructure.
- Create distinct neighbourhoods, which are walkable in size and organised around centres of activity which include a mix of uses.
- Include a varied residential character and a mix of housing types that can contribute to creating legibility and a sense of place.
- Provide a vibrant local centre that is legible, distinct and easily accessible from surrounding development promoting the use of local facilities and facilitating more sustainable lifestyles.
- Set new development within a variety of high-quality public realm and open spaces, including suitable provision for landscape, ecology and biodiversity.
- Ensure that development is designed to incorporate measures to adapt to and mitigate climate change.

BLP Links: QP1b, AL13, AL14, AL15, QP1

Other Links: Corporate Plan

6.1.3 The key principles within this section of the DFSPD are set out in boxes, with further supporting detail provided below. References are made to relevant policies in the Local Plan, including the policy requirements in the proformas for sites AL13, AL14 and AL15 that are set out in Appendix C of the Local Plan. It is important to note that the principles set out below are to be read alongside the requirements of the proformas – they do not replace the proforma requirements but may add detail and potential approaches to delivery.


6.2 Illustrative Framework Plan

6.2.1 The preparation of an Illustrative Framework Plan draws together the various influences on the study area to set out an approach that can guide future delivery.


6.2.2 The Illustrative Framework Plan (Figure 4) provides an illustration of how key design principles may come together across the Placemaking Area. It is not intended to represent a masterplan for the area. The illustrative block form and other supporting design information is intended to provide the context for communicating the key principles. Further masterplan design work will be necessary to determine the layout of development in each area and through this subsequent process, greater understanding of constraints may result in a variety of block arrangements and relationships between open space, streets and development.

South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)


Figure 4 - Illustrative Framework Plan



*South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)*

	<p>The northern neighbourhood comprises a low traffic, high density development near to the station and the town centre. Development block form is arranged as a regular grid to provide direct access to the green spine as the location of open space in the neighbourhood and the main way of moving around by bike or by foot. Vehicular access is provided away from the green spine where possible.</p>
	<p>The Harvest Hill neighbourhood (previously referred to as the 'southern neighbourhood' within the Borough Local Plan) includes residential areas to the north and south of Harvest Hill Road and is focused around the school and the local centre located to the south of the golf course site. The green spine passing through the neighbourhood centre provides the opportunity for central public realm and green space.</p>
	<p>The Triangle site lies to the south of the A308(M). It comprises solely employment use but is arranged to encourage access by bike and by foot, and as an attractive means of travel for those working in this location and wanting to access other parts of the south west of Maidenhead outside of work time and by sustainable means. The developable area will be defined by flood and other constraints for which more investigation needs to be carried out (determined at planning application stage). Development layout should be able to accommodate a range of employment units including smaller business units to support the local economy and a diversity of operators. Larger units (for example B8 distribution units) should only be permitted where they are required to secure the delivery of a mix of units as part of a comprehensive scheme. Internal arrangements and servicing arrangements of employment units should be considered with regards to the street scene and creating a high quality and safe public realm suitable for use by pedestrians and cyclists. Offices, ancillary uses, and smaller business units can contribute to an active elevation along key routes into and around the site, and HGV circulation and docking would be more appropriately accommodated away from the main public realm areas.</p>
	<p>The green spine forms a legible continuous route connecting north to south at all times, prioritising pedestrian, and cycle movement through the provision of a segregated pedestrian and cycle route of no less than, or equivalent to, 4m wide where combined (or minimum 2.5m bi-directional cycle route and 1.5m pedestrian route if separate). Different parts of the green spine will include different modes of transport and may incorporate these minimum specifications in different ways.</p>
	<p>The green spine in the northern neighbourhood is the primary sustainable movement corridor with direct sight lines towards the town centre, landmarked along its length by building frontage and public realm features. The green spine includes a variety of formal open spaces along its length.</p>
	<p>To the north of the Harvest Hill neighbourhood the green spine is multi-functional providing a means of sustainable movement as well as ecological connectivity. Vehicular access is routed alongside the spine in this development area, but additional open space is located within residential areas, accessible from the green spine.</p>

*South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)*

	<p>To the south of Harvest Hill Road, the green spine performs an ecological and movement function. It should be designed to encourage people to access the local centre by sustainable means as an easy choice for walking and cycling.</p>
	<p>Pedestrian and cycle improvements and coordination of built frontage (fronting onto Kimbers Lane from both sides) and planting help improve safety and the attractiveness of the link along Kimbers Lane to Ockwells Park.</p>
	<p>Throughout the Harvest Hill neighbourhood green space for recreation and for wildlife is integrated throughout the development and includes pocket parks, small greens, retained woodland and hedgerows. These spaces create a network of green infrastructure and should be well connected in a legible and permeable way to the green spine.</p>
	<p>The southern green margin contributes to biodiversity gain across the south west Maidenhead area and as an ecological facility should be connected to the wider network of wildlife corridors and habitats. Some public routes linking east to west can be provided through this area and development fronting it from the north should create a positive relationship with the edge of the green margin which slopes away to the south. Where possible the area could also be used for informal recreation.</p>
	<p>The junction on Braywick Road at the Braywick Leisure Centre entrance and the footbridge over the A404(M) providing a route to Ockwells Park should both be improved to provide more legible and easy to access routes to these significant areas of green space and leisure facility. Opportunities to create ecological continuity at the crossings should also be explored bearing in mind both ground and airborne wildlife.</p>
	<p>Braywick and Ockwells parks provide important strategic green spaces and leisure facilities for the whole of Maidenhead and improvements to the access points from the south west Maidenhead area, not only serve the residents of the new development but help in connecting existing communities to these regional facilities including to future schools. They may also provide the opportunity for enhancements to biodiversity, but careful consideration should be given to the compatibility between this and the important recreational role these parks have.</p>
	<p>Retained existing planting and new planting along the rear of neighbouring properties to the site can contribute to connectivity for wildlife benefit.</p>
	<p>Planting can be used to screen large employment buildings where these do not provide a significant value in forming a gateway on the approach by road from the south. Building location and form (to be determined at planning application stage) may determine where, and to what extent, planting is required.</p>

*South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)*

	<p>A series of key junctions exist across the development area where key routes cross or link with other destinations. In these locations public realm improvements help integrate the whole of the south west of Maidenhead making it a sustainable place, connected with the wider town and safe for pedestrians and cyclists. Built form, public realm and highways design all play an important role in improving these gateways.</p>
	<p>Individual areas of ecological value across the south west Maidenhead area such as Rushington Copse to the north of the site area are very valuable in ensuring the biodiversity of the area. These individual landscape components should be linked together to bring greater ecological value through connected habitats.</p>
	<p>The Harvest Hill Road corridor should have a variety of character along its length. The opportunity for safe pedestrian and cycle provision should be explored.</p>
	<p>Vehicular access to areas to the north and the south should be designed to contribute to the legibility along the corridor and the changing character. Each individual access should be considered in the context of the whole corridor and other nearby accesses in order that one access does not prohibit another being delivered and being designed well. All vehicular access from Harvest Hill Road to the north or the south should be designed in a way that does not prohibit a suitable quantity and location of pedestrian and cycle crossings and does not hinder pedestrian and cycle connectivity in a north-south or east-west direction.</p>
	<p>To the very north of the site the opportunity to connect directly with the town centre and create access to the railway station should be explored. Development form should safeguard the long-term potential to realise this possibility where the short-term opportunity does not exist.</p>
	<p>Existing vehicular access to and from the site.</p>
	<p>Potential additional access to be explored.</p>


*South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)*

	<p>Green streets, connecting to the green spine and other key routes and providing a legible choice of pedestrian and cycle movement around and between neighbourhoods. Street design should include the consideration of access to open space, ecological continuity and amenity value, accommodating various user groups, relationship with buildings on either side of the street primarily designed to overlook the street and with entrances from the street, and providing an easy to navigate network which connects areas within and beyond the site itself.</p>
	<p>Built form overlooks key routes providing access to homes and other uses from the street and avoiding rears of properties onto important routes which need to be safe and attractive.</p>
	<p>Flood risk area.</p>
	<p>Area of transition between north and south (Harvest Hill) neighbourhood areas is characterised by integration of generous green space for recreation and ecological purposes as part of the requirement for a central green area. The area marks a distinctive transitioning through green space from one neighbourhood area to another. Consideration should be given to the northern and southern edges to built development, how they address green space, the integration and networking of ecological assets within this central transitional area and the legibility between north and south (Harvest Hill) neighbourhoods achieved as a result.</p>

6.3 Design Principles

6.3.1 The South West Maidenhead area, while made up of a series of distinct sites in different land ownership, also represents an important part of the town, contributing in a variety of ways to the function and identity of the town as a whole. Together, the various allocations making up the SWMSPA serve to contribute to social, environmental, and economic improvements locally and for the good of the town more widely. Land use and development patterns around the south of the town have to date dictated particular patterns of movement and community definition, and in particular movement and relationships in an east-west direction have been limited. The design and planning of new development in this area offers the opportunity to address this and the following series of overarching design principles outline how this should be done in an effective way.

Figure 5 - South West Maidenhead Strategic Placemaking Area



Approach to Placemaking & Creating Distinct Neighbourhoods

- 6.3.2 The SWMSPA should comprise distinct neighbourhoods which are walkable in size organised around a legible centre. The northern most neighbourhood should be oriented towards the town centre, given its proximity, and in doing so establish a new town centre neighbourhood. At Harvest Hill (to the south) the location and accessibility of the local centre should reflect that development will extend to the south of Harvest Hill Road. The Triangle site, whilst not a neighbourhood in its own right, should consider how people will move between their workplace and any nearby facilities in a sustainable way. The transition between the north and south neighbourhoods is marked by the integration of green space for recreation and ecological purposes with each of the neighbourhoods addressing this area in a positive way to create a legible change between north and south through the green space.
- 6.3.3 Varied residential character and a mix of housing types can help create balanced communities and also allows a variety of building form and appearance to help with the legibility of the place. Variations in character and mix between the different


neighbourhoods will help ensure they are distinct from one another. Building and public realm typologies should reflect the different lifestyles which will emerge in each of the neighbourhoods.

- 6.3.4 The local centre at Harvest Hill is most suitably located within reach of the most amount of people (including existing residents) and co-located with the school to support the resilience of local centre facilities and to help with a behavioural shift towards more sustainable mobility patterns. The mix of uses at the centre would contribute to a vibrant local centre and include retail, residential and community facilities. This variety and associated building and public realm design will mean the centre is legible, distinct and easily accessible from surrounding development, promoting the use of local facilities and facilitating more sustainable lifestyles.


- 6.3.5 Employment provision at the Triangle site can make an important contribution to the economy locally and should be designed in a way that encourages sustainable travel to and from work. Routes to, and gateways into the site should be designed to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists, as well as service vehicles to promote local trips by bike or on foot.

South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)

Figure 6 - Neighbourhoods and Centres of Activity





Creating Legible Neighbourhoods






Mixed Uses and Centres of Activity

6.3.6 Design of the urban block structure throughout the area follows a sequence of structure first and detail later. Applicants are encouraged to use the following methodology:

NB: Rectangular blocks are shown for ease of illustration.





<p>1. Block size and shape</p>	<p>This determines the permeability and legibility of the development. Varying block dimensions in relation to surrounding streets and green infrastructure is at the foundation of the variation in character throughout the development. Block dimension and shape should respond to the variety of local constraints and opportunities and facilitate the changing function and identity of green infrastructure as a framework for biodiversity and ecological performance, recreation and sustainable movement.</p> <p>The BLP (Policy SP2(1)(a)) seeks to maximise opportunities for both natural heat (solar gains) and ventilation through the optimal orientation of buildings, increasing the sustainability of any development. This should not compromise the integrity of a walkable and legible neighbourhood which in themselves are essential for the long-term sustainability of the town. Once the structure of the urban form is established there are also opportunities in the detailed design (see item 5. Architecture & Detail) to maximise natural heating and ventilation.</p>	 <p>A diagram showing a grey diamond-shaped block. Two double-headed arrows labeled 'x' and 'y' indicate the dimensions of the block along its sides.</p>
<p>2. Divide the Block</p>	<p>Arrange the buildings around the perimeter according to character areas. Non-site-specific example block plans for each character area can be used to inform the site-specific response in each character area.</p>	 <p>A 3D perspective diagram of a block. The block is a square with buildings represented by orange rectangular blocks along its perimeter. The interior of the block is a light grey color.</p>

<p>3. Street Hierarchy</p>	<p>Combine blocks in a layout to create a legible street hierarchy. It is important to consider which edges of the blocks form which streets.</p>	
<p>4. Public and Private Space</p>	<p>Different approaches to private and public space, at the front and rear of buildings, boundaries, parking and the public realm are suitable in different character areas. Varying these elements builds on the foundation of the block structure to affect the changing character throughout the development.</p>	
<p>5. Architecture & Detail</p>	<p>Not until the structure is right should the detail be considered but it can help to reinforce the structure and distinctiveness of character area if considered carefully. The energy performance of buildings is a key consideration in the detailed design of buildings within all urban typologies and regardless of building orientation, size or use. Steps should be taken through detail design to maximise natural heating and ventilation</p>	



6.3.7 The following diagrams and descriptions identify the key design principles to be considered across the SWMSPA. These are not intended to represent a masterplan for any given site or location. Illustrative block form and other supporting design information is intended to provide the context for communicating the key principles.

6.3.8 The purpose of the following sections of the SPD is to add further guidance on the interpretation of the Illustrative Framework Plan acknowledging that this does not represent a masterplan for any given site. The following design principles can assist as further work is undertaken by highlighting which aspects are of most importance in the overall placemaking approach.


Approach to Northern Neighbourhood

<p>To the north of the SWMSPA, nearest to the town centre, development is at its densest. Development organised as a series of regular blocks in a grid form helps ensure everyone has easy access to nearby facilities and public open space. There is the opportunity for higher density in this area due to its connectivity and walkable distance to the town centre. Direct access to the central green spine from all streets ensures people benefit from these convenient connections and proximity to the town centre. Consideration should also be given, in the design, height and location of new development, to the relationship with existing residential development.</p>	 <p>Building heights step down to the site boundary</p>
<p>Building orientation helps reinforce the central green spine as the main focus of movement, activity and recreation. Building elevations may be setback to create larger open spaces but these should avoid obstructing the main route of the green spine and open spaces should function as events along its route rather than alternatives to the green spine. The legibility along the green spine and block to block is helped by these contrasts between enclosure and open space.</p>	
<p>Building heights and features can help the legibility of the green spine and the distinction between different buildings on similar dimension blocks. Taller corners, or contrasting form, materials or ground floor use, and floor to ceiling heights can help wayfinding between blocks and mark the corners of open spaces or mark the gateway between contrasting sections of the green spine.</p>	
<p>Accommodating vehicular access within the northern development area should avoid compromising the quality and function of the green spine as a high-quality public realm environment primarily for use by pedestrians and cyclists. Where necessary to run parallel to the green spine, the vehicular route should not obstruct or dominate the green spine through the development. Alternatively, routes should be found for vehicular access which avoid conflicting with the green spine and access blocks from the rear or side streets. This may result in more circuitous routes for vehicles which in turn results in walking and cycling becoming recognised as more convenient, quicker choices.</p>	

Approach to Harvest Hill Neighbourhood (previously referred to as the 'southern neighbourhood' within the Borough Local Plan)

<p>The new neighbourhood at Harvest Hill extends to the north and the south of Harvest Hill Road. It is important for the sustainability of the place and for the desirability as liveable place that the Harvest Hill Road does not form a barrier between parts of the new community. The legibility of the green spine through the development blocks is paramount. Block form should be organised to give priority access along the green spine with side streets creating direct routes to the green spine. The hierarchy of building form should draw attention to the green spine as the primary route through the development so that it is obviously the first choice for movement by pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. Consideration should also be given, in the design, height and location of new development, to the relationship with existing residential development.</p>	 <p>Building heights step down to the site boundary</p> <p>The diagram shows a plan view of the Harvest Hill Neighbourhood. A central green spine runs north-south, with arrows at both ends indicating movement. A red dashed line represents Harvest Hill Road, crossing the spine. Building footprints are shown in grey, with a bar chart below indicating that building heights decrease as they approach the site boundary.</p>
<p>In addition to the primary block form, good legibility and way finding around the neighbourhood is created using a variety of elevations and building frontages. As well as a clear focus upon the green spine, other important routes and areas of public space can be marked by changes in the building frontage and elevations. This may include taller and more continuous terraces, or a language of materials and elevational treatments and roof lines which frame spaces and mark the corners and gateways between different streets and spaces.</p>	 <p>The diagram shows a plan view of the Harvest Hill Neighbourhood, similar to the one above. It highlights building frontages and elevations with orange outlines and arrows, showing how they frame spaces and mark corners and gateways between different streets and spaces.</p>

Views along the green spine and between important locations and destinations, such as the school entrance, the local centre, and bus stops should be marked by landmark features. This may include the use of taller or more contrasting building forms, changes in materials but can also be helped by the design of the public realm and choice of street trees and furniture in these locations. Reduction of clutter, over provision of signage, highways posts and rails etc., generally throughout the development will help to ensure this is a people friendly place and easy to navigate.



Housing and Density

- 6.3.9 There is an opportunity at south west Maidenhead to create a place which combines high quality housing, a vibrant community and safe and sociable public spaces. In creating this place there must be a balance between the benefits of a critical mass of people to support local facilities and create a sociable and active public realm, and the accessibility and inclusiveness of the public realm and privacy people enjoy within their homes and the environment they live within. Building at density must be coupled with adequate provision and accessibility to high quality public realm and a mix of open space from private to public, active and passive. The environment must be one which makes higher density living attractive.
- 6.3.10 South west Maidenhead offers a sustainable location for housing and the provision of a mix of building typologies, heights, and living accommodation arranged over multi-storeys contributes to this sustainability. Creating an environment which is welcoming to a variety of people and different family make ups involves the design of streets and spaces as well as the buildings themselves. Family housing could comprise different types and tenure of properties but must be coupled with good access to a variety of open space, and an attractive and safe environment.

Accommodating family housing (see Figure 7)


- 6.3.11 Family housing can include apartments and duplex units above ground floor and groups of different types of properties configured together in a building or a block (as well as individual houses). Units which do not have ground floor accommodation should where possible have routes to access some private or communal (for residents) outside space. For family housing overlooking of the outside space from the property is important for the safety of children. Un-supervised space is impractical for young families. Providing living accommodation above ground floor will also have consequences for street width, block depth (enabling the provision of private space) and the green spine design.

- 6.3.12 Generally, streets and spaces should be wider where buildings and living accommodation is within taller buildings. But quality of the street space and its function is also important. With less dedicated private gardens the streets and spaces around buildings will need to function as amenity and play space and so easy access to street level is important for family living above ground floor. This can be a very positive way of improving sociability and community cohesion as people get to know their neighbours through more communal activity, but if there is poor provision (quantity or quality) the potential benefits are undermined.
- 6.3.13 For above ground floor accommodation, the greenness of streets and spaces is important. Street trees improve the outlook from above ground floor units and can help with privacy in denser environments. Street trees and tree planting in private and communal spaces should be included in all neighbourhoods whether higher density or not. The choice of species and size of trees and other planting can vary to help with street hierarchy and legibility as well as their scale suitable to building height and street width and should be suitable for the environment in which they are located.


The following illustrative sections are not intended as a specification of building heights (see also the Building Height and Tall Buildings SPD for other important guidance on building heights). The variety of building heights should be considered in combination with the quality of environment, legibility and accessibility considerations and the provision of services and facilities which facilitate a sustainable and acceptable quality of life. The following sections indicate how varying building heights, and the quality of the environment can be considered together.

South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)

Figure 7 - Illustrative cross sections - Accommodating Family Housing




a	2 or 3 storey house in single ownership
b	Includes private rear garden
c	Privacy strip/front garden
d	Pedestrian walkway (some widened public realm allowing street play and/or bike parking)
e	Verge with Tree include SUDS or other planting where possible
f	Regular trees between parking
g	Narrower carriageway reduces speeds




a	2 storey house
b	Apartment Above
c	Access to split rear garden reflects multiple ownership
d	Privacy strip/front garden
e	Pedestrian walkway (some widened public realm allowing street play and/or bike parking)
f	Occasional groups of end on parking and increased bike dock/parking
g	Regular trees between parking
h	Narrower carriageway reduces speeds
i	Balcony for above ground floor units (front or rear depending on street aspect)
j	With the increase in units along a street care should be taken that car parking does not dominate


South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)



a	2 storey house
b	Duplex above
c	Includes private rear garden for ground floor unit only
d	Privacy strip/front garden
e	Configuration of larger above ground floor units reflects limited access to outside private space
f	Taller buildings either side of the street should be accompanied by wider streets and more flexible and multi-purpose public realm
g	Larger trees and generous public realm increases amenity value and use of the street as a communal and sociable space



a	Non-residential use
b	Duplex unit above
c	Access to rear garden from unit above ground floor (consider implications on access to ground floor unit)
d	Non-residential ground floor adds activity to the street which should be reflected in space provided in the public realm
e	Balcony for above ground floor units (front or rear depending on street aspect)



School Provision



- 6.3.14 The school site offers a number of opportunities including its location close to the centre of Maidenhead, location at the heart of the Illustrative Framework close to the local centre with all the associated new facilities this will offer, and the good transport connections particularly for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport.
- 6.3.15 As per the Borough Local Plan, the school should provide 7 forms of entry for secondary school and a 4 forms of entry primary school, as well as necessary nursery and early years provision. The schools should be co-located and at a location within or in close proximity to the local centre. The school facilities should be capable of dual use as community facilities, for example for use of buildings for local groups and sports facilities for sports use by the community.
- 6.3.16 Ideally, all the school sports facilities would be located on the main school site. Should this not be possible, an element of off-site provision could be provided in Braywick Park to cater for peak usage (e.g., for major sporting events). Access to the off-site sports provision would need to be improved to allow safe access for the school.
- 6.3.17 To be fit for purpose for use by the school, areas used for school purposes including open grassland would need to be secured to prevent any casual use by the public. This could be done sensitively and in combination with the provision of a wider network of green infrastructure across the Placemaking Area, including part of the


route of the green spine to promote an open setting and enable wildlife links between different sites.

Approach to the Triangle Site Employment Area

- 6.3.18 The Triangle site is located at a key gateway to the town of Maidenhead and is an important highly visible part of the Placemaking Area. Development on the site will therefore need to be of a high-quality design reflecting its positioning at this prominent southern edge to the town and a place where many people will experience in their day to day lives. It will also need to reflect its edge location to strengthen the boundary to the remaining Green Belt, ensuring it is defensible and permanent.
- 6.3.19 In line with employment policies in the Borough Local Plan⁴, priority should be given to accommodating units that can meet the needs of the Borough's firms. This is likely to take the form of smaller 'flexible' units for small and medium sized businesses. Larger units should only be permitted where they are required to secure the delivery of an overall mix of units as part of a comprehensive scheme and ensure that the allocation is delivered to a high standard reflecting the 'gateway' nature of the site.

⁴ Policy ED1 and Site AL14

<p>1. At junctions within the site there is the opportunity to create events in the street scene and building landmarks. Building form, public realm and road design can respond to these features.</p> <p>2. Public Realm & Tree Planting: along Ascot Road and within the site care should be given to the continuity of the public realm and the safety and experience of pedestrians (particularly at crossings). Consideration should be given to the location of a bus stop adjacent to the site along Ascot Road. The main routes within the site should be tree lined and include convenient bike parking close to building entrances. There may be the opportunity to establish a bike share scheme (in coordination with other neighbouring and town centre development) with bike docking located centrally within the site. Some short term on-street car parking could also be included along key routes for visitors.</p>	 <p>The diagram shows a site layout with buildings represented by grey shapes. A green dotted line indicates a path through the site, starting from a junction marked with a black circle containing the number '1'. The path continues through a junction marked with a black circle containing the number '2'. Below the path, the text 'Public realm focus' is written. To the right of the site, a vertical green double-headed arrow is labeled 'Bus stop', indicating its location adjacent to the site.</p>
<p>3. Building Elevation: Variation along building elevations owing to internal arrangements and mix of unit sizes enhances the street scene and improves the visual appearance of buildings from a pedestrian and cyclist's perspective.</p>	 <p>The diagram shows a site layout with buildings represented by grey shapes. A black dotted line indicates a path through the site. A black circle containing the number '3' is placed on the path, highlighting a specific area of building elevation variation.</p>

<p>4. Corners: Where buildings include ancillary, office operation and comprise a mix of smaller units, these, as well as pedestrian entrances should be concentrated at corners, helping to focus activity at junctions and overlooking the public realm.</p> <p>5. Rear service courtyards: turning areas for HGVs, access for other service vehicles and longer-term car parking where possible should be located to the rear of buildings to minimise the prominence of vehicle noise and activity along the key route into the site.</p> <p>6. Planting: varied planting screen buildings in particularly sensitive locations.</p>	 <p>The diagram shows a site plan with several buildings represented by grey shapes. A green line represents a key route. Callout 4 is placed at four different corners of buildings along this route. Callout 5 is placed in three rear service courtyards behind buildings. Callout 6 is placed at the end of a green dotted line representing a planting screen.</p>
---	---

Incorporating Green Infrastructure & Open Space

- 6.3.20 Overall the study area can become united through the delivery of strategic green links. The opportunity presented by an area stretching from the settlement and countryside edge to the edge of the town centre is that new sustainable green links can be established for the benefit of both people and nature. Creating continuity across the area through the use of this strategic green infrastructure can ensure that the identity of this new development, and the study area as a whole is rooted in the perception of Maidenhead as a green town.
- 6.3.21 Landscape and open space will be fundamental to how people will live within and use the area, with new green and open spaces being provided that will contribute to a variety of aspects of community life – such as creating connections and movement along green corridors, providing education in the landscape, day-to-day interaction with wildlife and the promotion of biodiversity and creating legible transitions between neighbourhoods, moving from the built environment, through green space to arrive at other distinctly different areas of the built environment.
- 6.3.22 A hierarchy of green spaces can also determine and support patterns of living among communities in the new development, ensuring this is a place where it is possible to live sustainably. A high-quality framework of green space and landscape can become the centrepiece of the place.

- 6.3.23 A multifunctional green spine extends north-south through the area, located within easy reach of all residential areas. The spine compliments Braywick Road and Shoppenhangers Road as north-south routes. The inclusion of public transport and high-quality pedestrian and cycle routes addresses the risk of increased traffic by providing a convenient alternative to the car. Creating a series of legible green infrastructure junctions with other routes around and into the area allows the green spine to become a preferred route for pedestrian and cycle access to the local centre from other existing residential areas -reducing car traffic along Braywick and Shoppenhangers roads.
- 6.3.24 Braywick Park and Ockwells Park in addition to being regional destinations currently become more accessible local resources for new and existing local residents, ensuring access to a wide range of recreational and nature experiences are within easy reach of people’s homes by foot and by cycle.
- 6.3.25 Around the south of the developed area, land alongside the A404(M) and A308(M) are less attractive for development and can be used to enable ecological continuity establishing a southern green margin around the south of the town which can also serve an informal recreational purpose.

Approach to the Green Spine


- 6.3.26 The green spine performs a structural and functional role in the placemaking of the area to the south west of Maidenhead. The following key principles (and illustrative diagrams) summarise how the green spine performs this role and how it will become an influential part of a shift to a more sustainable and liveable place:

Green Spine


- The spine maintains a strong north south continuity through all neighbourhoods.
- The design of the green spine varies within each neighbourhood reflecting the different demands of the spine relative to different residential and mix of uses.
- The green spine serves an important opportunity to ensure ecological capital and connectivity becomes an everyday part of people’s lives and integrating this into a multi-functional corridor is important.
- Pedestrian and cycle movement are a priority along the length of the spine, but it may also accommodate other modes of travel.
- Built form and other routes and open spaces should respond to the green spine as the primary route so that all areas are well connected to the spine and the spine itself is a safe a legible route.

BLP Links: QP1b(5e,5g), AL13(2,3)


The green spine plays a strategic role linking the town centre through the entire site, connecting in the south with the southern green margin. This connection serves several strategic purposes: to prioritise sustainable movement and to promote behaviour change by providing easy access between locations for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport leading to greater walking and cycling locally as well as throughout the town as a whole; to establish important ecological continuity throughout the south of Maidenhead and ensure new provision of habitats and green infrastructure is integrated with existing surround corridors and ecological capital; a recreational and sociable location extending throughout new development to support community cohesion and wellbeing by making high quality connected spaces available within easy reach of every home.




The design of the green spine varies along its length (see also various cross section diagrams illustrating variation) responding to the development form and layout along its length and how this reflects the varied identity and function of the spine in these different locations:




To the north the spine serves as a primary route through higher density development organised around a grid layout. Here the spine provides the majority of the public open space and is overlooked by a mix of uses resulting in it needing to respond to multiple user groups. See also Green Spine Cross Section A for further illustration.



Within the Harvest Hill neighbourhood, north of Harvest Hill Road the spine connects people to the core facilities of the Harvest Hill neighbourhood at the local centre and the school, as well as access to public transport. It must be highly legible, prioritise pedestrian and cycle movement and facilitate people making easy choices in favour of sustainable movement options. Public open space within this neighbourhood takes the form of more community scale spaces within the residential areas and while connections and signposting to these spaces can occur along the green spine it does not itself need to accommodate spaces for recreational purposes. See also Green Spine Cross Section B for further illustration.




<p>To the south of Harvest Hill Road, the green spine has a purpose in facilitating people’s connections north by foot or by bike by making the green spine a legible continuous route from the south extending north. Surrounding development here will be entirely residential however so the scale and function of the green spine takes the form of an oversized residential street, distinguishable from other surrounding green streets which feed into it, creating a recognisable hierarchy between the spine and surrounding streets. Along its whole length, to the north and the south of Harvest Hill Road, the green spine will accommodate tree planting, address ecological continuity, and provide an attractive setting for overlooking residential properties. South of Harvest Hill Road the green spine may also provide a solution for parking and local play space (see Green Spine Cross Section C for further illustration).</p>	
<p>The Green Spine contributes to creating a network of high-quality footpaths and cycleways linking the site into its wider area. Along its length are several significant junctions to other connections with surrounding neighbourhoods and destinations. At these locations the buildings and public space in and around the green spine create legible way marking to these surrounding areas and destinations enabling people to easily find their way and encourage them to consider walking or cycling before driving. These links also the opportunity for existing residents in the area to find their way to the green spine as means of longer journeys which avoids using Braywick or Shoppenhangers roads.</p>	 <p>The diagram shows a central vertical green spine with several horizontal and diagonal branches. At the top, a dashed oval represents a residential area. At the bottom, a large green oval represents Ockwells Park. A horizontal dashed oval on the right represents Braywick Park. Green arrows indicate the direction of movement along the spine and its branches, showing connections to these parks and surrounding areas.</p>

6.3.27 The illustrations below in Figure 8 show how the nature of the green spine could vary in different locations along the spine.


South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)

Figure 8 - Illustrative Cross Sections of the Green Spine




Green Spine Cross Section A	
a	Increased ground floor to ceiling height for non-residential uses helps legibility and overlooking of public realm
b	Occasional widening to create public open spaces
c	Generous north side public realm
d	Verge with Tree include SUDS or other planting where possible
e	Central designated cycle route
f	Where necessary vehicular route located along south side of spine
g	Pedestrian walkway
h	Privacy strip to buildings if required
i	Landmark building on corners or at transitions between contrasting sections of the spine
j	Green spine enclosed between buildings, width of spine not less than height of buildings either side

South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)



Green Spine Cross Section B	
a	Local Centre or School entranced integrated to built form and prominent
b	Occasional trees along route
c	Privacy strip to buildings if required
d	Verge with Tree include SUDS or other planting where possible
e	Shared cycle route and public realm wide enough to accommodate two way cycling and pedestrians stopping
f	Where necessary vehicular route located along south side of spine

South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)




Green Spine Cross Section C

a	Occasional trees in spaces
b	Front gardens
c	Pedestrian walkway
d	Narrow carriageway with occasional passing places
e	Mixed central green area with space to cycle/walk
f	Occasional parking areas integrated within spine area accessed from adjacent streets

Access, Movement & Wayfinding

Figure 9 - Access and Movement Diagram



*South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)*

Access and Movement Key:

	a	The Green Spine provides a continually connected and legible route for pedestrians and cyclists throughout the South West Maidenhead areas
		Key junctions and gateways within the green infrastructure network
		Additional routes attractive to pedestrians and cyclists
	b	E-W links across the area to the south of Harvest Hill Road provide alternative choices to Harvest Hill Road for pedestrians & cyclists
	c	In the northern neighbourhood all routes lead to the green spine as the primary movement corridor and recreation space
		Urban form and street design assist the legibility and gateways at key vehicle access points
	d	Improvements at key points along the Braywick and Shoppenhangers Road corridors help with the overall legibility
	e	The existing public right of way is improved to provide an important E-W link to and from the area and linking other communities and contributes to the distinct transition between north and south neighbourhoods.
		Create legible access from the green spine into residential areas
	f	Create clear entrances in multiple places to the school site and potential shared facilities
	g	The Harvest Hill road corridor is improved to provide an attractive and legible route through the heart of the neighbourhood National Cycle route 4, (traffic free)
		Vehicular access
	h	Vehicular accesses off of Harvest Hill Road should contribute to the overall corridor legibility and safety

	i	Links to and from Ockwells Park can be improved to be more legible and safe, including frontage to Kimbers Lane.
	j	Create a legible entrance to the Triangle site using building scale, entrances and orientation
	k	Various improvements to walkways, cycleways, bus stops, and planting help improve sustainable access to the Triangle site.
	l	Primary northern vehicular access is prominent and easy to navigate using built form and public realm to create a legible entrance
	m	Longer term, a clear route through to the station may be established. Development in the short term should not prohibit this.
		The southern green margin provides an opportunity for an additional pedestrian and cycle link from E-W
		Green Lane: National Cycle route 4 -traffic free
		The Cut: attractive pedestrian route connecting N-S

6.3.28 Existing routes and layout of development has predicated movement into and out of the town centre in a north-south direction with the area occupied by the golf course creating a separation between Desborough to the west and Braywick to the east.

6.3.29 As the new neighbourhoods emerge there is the opportunity to improve connections in an east west direction around the south of the town as well as new development creating north-south movement to and from the town centre providing better choices of sustainable movement for existing residents as well as offer new residents more convenient options than the car for local journeys.

6.3.30 Overall, the area will become a well-connected area using sustainable means of transport and prioritising public transport, pedestrian and cycle movement. The development of the specific allocated sites at the centre of the study area provides the opportunity to create links which have not previously existed and, by so doing, overcome the dominance of vehicular movement outside of the area. Establishing two new neighbourhoods in the area provides the opportunity to consolidate residential development within easy reach of existing public transport and the town centre facilities. Embedding sustainable transport and movement into the structure of the place allows for the greatest potential for reduction of car use locally.

6.3.31 Establishing this new network of green links and pedestrian and cycle routes helps in relieving many of the existing challenges at roads and junctions throughout the study area. Rather than solely relying on piece meal 'improvements' to existing highways and junctions aimed at increasing capacity for vehicles and measured by the extent to which the car journey is eased, the approach to transport and movement should be a strategic and pro-active one, ensuring sustainable choices are possible and favoured above other traffic generating options. The overall approach therefore seeks to establish a place where car use is not an inevitability, and that quality of life and alternative choices are desirable alternatives.

Approach to Harvest Hill Road

Harvest Hill Road Corridor

- To integrate the corridor within a new neighbourhood giving it purpose as an East-West route as well as an environment which brings together development to the north and south
- To maintain all of the existing movements whilst creating a more pleasant, connected network.
- To create an attractive, diverse, safe and inviting corridor that shifts mode of travel from vehicular to a more people focused approach.
- To retain the green characteristics of the corridor through the retention of and provision of new green assets, landscaping and open spaces
- To contribute to creating a network of convenient walking and cycling links by providing high levels of segregation and prioritization, with multiple crossing points located at locations which provide the best access to local and wider networks and activities.

BLP Links: QP1b(5e, f), AL13 (1ii, 15e)

South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)

Figure 10 - Diagrams Illustrating the Approach to Harvest Hill Road





Figure 11 - The varying identity and function of the Harvest Hill Road corridor



a: The junctions of Harvest Hill Road with Shoppenhangers and Braywick Road, as well as managing changing movements into and out of Harvest Hill Road should also consider how their design can better serve east-west connections and the integration of pedestrian and cycle movements along Harvest Hill Road as well as along Shoppenhangers and Braywick roads.

The priority and legibility of these road users should inform the design of the public realm at these junctions to promote these as the preferred choice for local journeys.

b: Existing development towards the Shoppenhangers and Braywick Road corridors exists for up to approximately 200m on both sides of the Harvest Hill Road corridor. Although limited to the existing carriageway, better provision for cyclists and pedestrians and design which reduces speeds will improve the environment for existing residents and help integrate them with the new communities within the development by ensuring good access to the local centre and safe movement along the Harvest Hill corridor to open space and for local journeys.

c: New development on one side of Harvest Hill Road offers the opportunity for more comprehensive design of the corridor but needs to allow for the integration of existing properties which are accessed from Harvest Hill Road. While they can benefit from the improved environment, lower speeds and better cycling and pedestrian provision, they also present constraints to the design of built form and public realm of new development on the opposite side of the road.

d: Where new development is proposed on both sides of Harvest Hill Road there is the greatest opportunity for a comprehensive design of the corridor including the option of

generous pedestrian public realm on both sides of the carriageway and a segregated cycle way. These areas are likely to be the most preferable locations for additional crossings where built form and public realm can be designed in a coordinated way on both sides of the road to promote a safe and legible location to cross the road. These areas remain peripheral to the local centre with residential uses on both sides of the road. The design of the built form, and accompanying public realm can assist in the understanding and ease of access to the local centre with careful consideration in crossing location and design of routes to school and daily trips, particularly by residents to the south of Harvest Hill road, to shops, open space and other facilities.

e: The central area of the Harvest Hill corridor coincides with the location of the school and the local centre on the north side of the road (within the golf course site). The local centre in this location is within easy reach of the most amount of residents and the design of the corridor along this stretch should reflect the need for easy access across the corridor in a N-S direction. Changing priorities reflected in the carriageway width, design of cycle and pedestrian facilities and the use of materials will distinguish this area as being the centre of the neighbourhood.

The design of built form and public realm on both sides of the road should be coordinated and facilitate a safe and sociable environment for all users. Access into residential areas, and the school and local centre, as well as connections with the green spine are all likely to coincide along this length of the corridor requiring careful design to avoid conflicts and an undesirable environment.


Creating a sense of arrival:

6.3.32 Even though the mix of uses at the local centre may be co-located with the school (within the Golf Course site) and there is benefit in this in creating a vibrant and active public realm, the built form at Harvest Hill Road also plays a role in the legibility of the local centre. For this reason, creating a sense of arrival at the mid-point along the Harvest Hill Road corridor and where the green spine crosses Harvest Hill Road is important in announcing the local centre, promoting pedestrian and cycle movement in a north-south direction and encouraging a reduced reliance or preference for car use locally.

6.3.33 Harvest Hill Road serves an existing purpose as a vehicular route around the south of Maidenhead. Currently there are few accesses from Harvest Hill Road to areas to the north and the south other than to existing residential areas at the east and west ends of the corridor. With new development to the north and the south new accesses and connections mean the Harvest Hill Road corridor will fulfil a new role as a route through the heart of the new neighbourhood. The design of the road, surrounding public realm and buildings plays a part in the creation of this new neighbourhood but Harvest Hill Road will still serve a purpose in connecting east to west. Figure 10 shows the indicative location of potential access points into the new development areas but the precise location of these may vary. It is essential that developers coordinate with each other and with the Council to ensure that the

various new access points, both individually and collectively, are appropriate in highways and design terms.

Figure 12 - Harvest Hill Road - Creating a Sense of Arrival (illustrative)



6.3.34 As a result, the journey along the corridor for those travelling through the area should recognise the arrival at and departure from the new neighbourhood. Changing public realm design and proximity and height of buildings can help the sense of place and contrast along the corridor. Likewise for pedestrians and cyclists moving around the new neighbourhood the legibility of the area begins with creating a sense of centre around the school and the local facilities.

6.3.35 The topography along Harvest Hill Road helps create this sense of arrival where the local centre and the green spine crossing coincide with the high point along the road corridor. Moving towards the centre is moving up hill adding to the sense of growing scale and density and vice versa moving away from the centre.

The Green Spine crossing the Harvest Hill Road corridor

- 6.3.36 The continuity of the green spine from the north at the town centre to the southern green margin to the town is an important principle of the overall framework plan for south west Maidenhead.
- 6.3.37 There are various junctions with the green spine along its length where maintaining this continuity needs careful consideration. At the crossing of the green spine with Harvest Hill Road there are a number of considerations for maintaining this continuity whilst also meeting other objectives for the design of Harvest Hill Road itself, and the design and performance of the development parcels to the north and the south of Harvest Hill Road:

Green Spine continuity:

- 6.3.38 From the north and the south the green spine should meet the Harvest Hill Road corridor in the same location in order to maintain visual continuity of the green spine across Harvest Hill Road. The crossing of Harvest Hill Road is a direct link between north and south parts of the green spine. Careful design of the crossing point and associated highways solutions are necessary to ensure the continuity of the green spine and pedestrian and cycle safety and legibility are maintained.
- 6.3.39 The design of the built form should consider the legibility of the green spine to the north and south of Harvest Hill Road and be promoted as the preferred choice for movement for residents on both sides of Harvest Hill Road. The continuity of the green spine helps overcome the barrier of the road corridor and ensure the cohesion of the whole community across the Harvest Hill corridor.

Green Spine and an integrated local centre

- 6.3.40 The Local Centre and the School are indicated as being located on land towards the southern end of the golf course site, but they serve a residential area which extends to the south of Harvest Hill Road and to the very southern limits of the development along the A404(M) and the A308(M). It is important therefore that visual links and physical connections are created between areas to the south with the School and Local Centre to the north. The green spine offers the facility to do this.
- 6.3.41 The design of the public realm straddling the Harvest Hill corridor and extending northwards towards the School and the Local Centre can help to ensure the legibility of the local centre to residents north and south of Harvest Hill Road with the location of the school and facilities of the local centre fronting on to and landmarking this space. Vehicular movement along Harvest Hill Road is retained and so it is important that the design of the built form and public realm facilitate easy access and legibility between north and south ensuring all residents feel a part of one neighbourhood.

Next Steps with masterplanning & design control


- 6.3.42 The Illustrative Framework set out in this document provides a visual representation of the broad and indicative disposition of land uses and key strategic matters that site specific proposals are anticipated to accord with. It has evolved the conceptual work set out in the Borough Local Plan and provides further information relating to a number of key design themes and related principles that are particularly important in terms of securing a high-quality development across the Placemaking Area. It is illustrative and does not define in detail how separate areas will definitively be developed.
- 6.3.43 Further placemaking and design related work will therefore need to be undertaken by individual landowners & developers as they bring forward more detailed proposals for their specific sites. Masterplans and Design Codes are particularly relevant to large and long term multi-phased developments such as that coming forward in this area, acting as a mechanism to assist in the delivery of comprehensive and coordinated development and high-quality design outcomes. They provide a mechanism through which individual applicants will be able to demonstrate how they have addressed design requirements set through national and local policy, enabling more effective and efficient determination of separate applications.
- 6.3.44 Masterplanning is about place making. A good Masterplan should tell a 'story' about the place as it is now and how it will be in the future as it is developed. Incorporating Masterplanning into the planning process enables issues to be addressed collaboratively and in a coordinated and comprehensive way before the detailed elements of a development are established. This helps to enable the overarching development objectives for the site to be realised and reduces the potential for design quality compromises and delays at the detailed planning application stage.
- 6.3.45 Across SWM it is recognised that landowners and developers will bring forward proposals at different speeds and covering different geographic areas. How each separate proposal meets national and local policy will need to be demonstrated. All proposals will need to have evolved with community and stakeholder engagement and demonstrate how this has informed the overall approach.
- For larger sites with multi-phase proposals, likely to be submitted (at least in part) as outline planning applications, these should be supported by the preparation of a 'Site Wide Masterplan' and 'Site Wide Design Code' prepared by the landowner/developer. Relevant information and an overview of the approach should be included and explained as part of the accompanying Design & Access Statement. The Site Wide Masterplan and Design Code material should show how the land use and design matters have been considered, and how delivery of development will accord to the design principles and criteria as set out in the BLP, this SPD and other relevant documents and policies. The information will also need to set out how the site interfaces with adjoining development sites,

including how appropriate connectivity with any adjoining sites is to be achieved and explain how a comprehensive approach has been taken.

- For smaller sites where single-phase proposals are likely to be submitted in detail, these will also need to contain sufficient information to set out a 'Site Wide Masterplan' (reflecting the actual detailed proposal) and 'Site Wide Design Code' (again to reflect the detailed proposal but enabling consistent consideration by Officers) prepared by the landowner/developer. Where proposals are in detail, such information could be included and explained as part of the accompanying Design & Access Statement. These will also need to set out how the site interfaces with adjoining development sites including how appropriate connectivity with any adjoining sites is to be achieved and explain how a comprehensive approach has been taken.

6.3.46 Site Wide Masterplans and Design Codes should be submitted alongside and as part of supporting material related to the relevant planning application/s. The scope and level of detail may vary depending upon the nature of different proposals. For larger sites with subsequent future phases, it may be appropriate for the preparation of Design Codes for any future sub-area or phase to be required by condition to be submitted and approved by the Council prior to approval of reserved matter applications and commencement of development on that sub-area/phase. A summary of how the overall process is provided in Figure 13 below.

Figure 13 - Sequence of design control, masterplans and design coding



Site Wide Masterplans

- 6.3.47 Each Site Wide Masterplan should set how proposals for individual development plots will come forward in a planned and comprehensive way, whilst still allowing for design flexibility and innovation at the detailed design stage.
- 6.3.48 Each Site Wide Masterplan will establish a spatial strategy for the key components within the site and at the interface with adjoining development sites. As a minimum, they should contain information on matters such as:
- Placemaking: to set out the approach to residential and other built development plots, character, scale and density. This should also include other specific supporting infrastructure such as education and health facilities.
 - Green infrastructure: approach to open spaces, landscape, biodiversity and ecology.
 - Access, wayfinding, & movement: Access points and key movement routes and corridors.
- 6.3.49 Each Site Wide Masterplan will also need to show how the specific proposal aligns and integrates with adjoining development areas in the placemaking area. In the absence of other approved adjoining Site Wide Masterplans and Codes, the material will need to demonstrate how proposals accord with the policies and principles set out nationally, within the Borough Local Plan, this SPD, other relevant policy documents. Such material will be needed to illustrate conformity and give confidence that a comprehensive approach to the SWM allocation site has been appropriately considered and incorporated in the design thinking.

Site Wide Design Codes

- 6.3.50 A Design Code will be needed to provide additional design information for each separate site and proposal. This should establish elements that are considered to contribute to the creation high quality place making, starting from the most strategic elements working through to more focused detailed elements.
- 6.3.51 For larger, multi-phase proposals likely to be submitted as outline planning applications, Design Codes will need to be approved prior to commencement of any specific phase. These should be submitted alongside the outline application. They should correspond to an appropriate area which may be the entire area of the application, any sub-area of the site and/or alternative approach for example related to differences in character and/or phasing. Where there are future sub-areas or phases, additional design codes may be required by condition prior to the preparation and submission of related reserved matters applications for such sub areas/phase.

- 6.3.52 For smaller, single-phase proposals likely to be submitted in detail, a Design Code should also be provided as part of the application material, potentially presented within and as part of the Design & Access Statement. The provision of Design Codes as part of outline and full applications will enable applicants to demonstrate they have considered and comply with policy and guidance set nationally and locally, thereby enabling consistent and efficient consideration by Officers.
- 6.3.53 To ensure that Design Codes are effectively implemented, a 'Compliance Checklist' should also be produced as part of each detailed proposal. This will set out how the elements of Design Code have been considered and addressed, set out in a simple, template table. For larger scale multi-phase proposals, applicants submitting detailed/Reserved Matters applications for each phase will be expected to complete the Checklist as part of each phase/submission to confirm their proposals accord with the approved Design Code. For smaller scale, single phase schemes submitted in detail, a 'Compliance Checklist' may not be appropriate, but the Design & Access Statement should contain sufficient information to demonstrate how the scheme's design addresses matters that would otherwise be contained within a Design Code.
- 6.3.54 It is likely given the duration of the South West Maidenhead Area development that the circumstances within which the code will operate will change over time. The Compliance Checklist should also make provision for applicants to acknowledge where a code may no longer be fit for purpose and provide design justification for any proposed deviations. This may necessitate amendments to Design Code details approved via variation of condition applications (or where amendments were minor as non-material amendments)

Design Review

- 6.3.55 The adopted Borough Wide Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document requires large projects to be the subject of review by Design South East (D:SE). This would be expected to be undertaken at pre-application stage and be funded by the developer.
- 6.3.56 As the South West Placemaking area is subject to specific design and placemaking policies in the Borough Local Plan and this site related Supplementary Planning Document, it will be at the discretion of RBWM as to whether specific proposals for development across the area ought to be considered through a Design Review process. Where it is considered necessary, the Council will ensure that any Design Review is focused on testing the compliance of proposals against the established design policies and principles.
- 6.3.57 Whilst it is recognised that individual schemes may come forward at different times, wherever possible design reviews will consider adjoining proposals to enable a comprehensive consideration to be given.

6.4 Other Delivery Principles and Requirements

6.4.1 This section outlines the range of other principles and requirements relevant to development in the South West Maidenhead placemaking area. They are grouped under three categories:

- Community Needs
- Connectivity
- Sustainability and the Environment

However, they often cover inter-connected issues, so it is important to consider them in the round and in particular the relationship they have with the design principles set out above.

6.4.2 A number of the principles derive directly from the proformas that set out site specific policy requirements for the allocated sites or from other policy requirements in the Borough Local Plan. As such they are direct policy requirements in the Plan. To ensure simplicity the boxes below do not distinguish between principles and policy requirements.

6.5 Community Needs

Housing

Housing Mix

Having regard to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) mix, the very significant supply of smaller units/flats coming forward, particularly in nearby Maidenhead town centre, and the policy for the site (particularly for the northern neighbourhood and area around the local centre), this evidence points towards the need to apply the following to provide an appropriate mix:

- Across the whole AL13 area, as a minimum, the development should deliver the SHMA mix for larger homes of 55% 3 and 4 bed units
- To balance out higher delivery of flats elsewhere in the town and the Borough, a higher proportion of family homes should be delivered, whilst recognising that some of the family homes might be delivered through new typologies of housing
- The proportion of 3 and 4 bed units, and other family homes, should increase significantly in the Harvest Hill Neighbourhood, away from the local centre

BLP Links: AL13 (1i) 1(ii), QP1(b)(5d), HO2

- 6.5.1 In relation to the dwelling mix of housing, Table 12 of the Borough Local Plan sets out information on housing size mix from the 2016 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and Policy HO2 of the Plan indicates that development should provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes, reflecting the most up to date evidence in the SHMA, but where evidence demonstrates an alternative housing mix would be more appropriate, this will be taken into account. Across all tenure types, the SHMA indicates a broad mix of 45% 1 and 2 bed homes, and 55% 3 and 4 bed homes. Para 7.5.4 notes that the policy for the mix of homes should be able to react to changing circumstances and ensure that it contributes towards the mix of both the wider area as well as the development site itself, and continues that developers will be expected to have regard to the Borough-wide housing mix target set out in the 2016 SHMA (and subsequent successors) as a starting point when bringing forward proposals for individual sites. The Council will be looking for developers to demonstrate how they are addressing the needs of the wider area.
- 6.5.2 Having regard to the policy basis, given that a significant proportion of housing supply in the Borough, and particularly in Maidenhead, will come forward from developments of flats in the town centre, it is important that developments on greenfield sites provide a higher proportion of family housing. Appendix 3 sets out further information and evidence relating to housing mix.

- 6.5.3 The AL13 proforma in the Local Plan, supported by the design principles set out earlier, also highlight that the northern neighbourhood will be orientated to the town centre, making the most of proximity to the railway station and town centre facilities. It notes that building heights, densities and typologies will reflect those in the town centre. Conversely, in the southern (Harvest Hill) neighbourhood the Local Plan proforma recognises that residential areas will reduce in density away from the Local Centre, allowing for the provision of family homes with gardens.

As such, given the SHMA mix, the evidence on wider housing delivery, and the BLP policy for the two neighbourhoods, the proportion of 3 and 4 bed units and other family housing, will be expected to increase significantly in the Harvest Hill Neighbourhood and the proportion of flats and 1 and 2 bed units is expected to be much lower in the Harvest Hill Neighbourhood, especially south of Harvest Hill Road and away from the local centre.

Affordable Housing

To deliver 30% affordable housing across the AL13 site with a tenure mix in accordance with the Policy HO3 of the Local Plan and a dwelling size mix that takes account of the latest evidence of need and supply to ensure priority needs are addressed.

BLP links: AL13 (13), QP1b (5d), HO2, HO3

Other Links: Housing Strategy, Corporate Plan

- 6.5.4 The affordable housing requirements for the AL13 housing site are set out in Policy HO3. In summary they are:
- 30% of units to be affordable housing
 - A tenure mix of 45% social rent, 35% affordable rent and 20% intermediate tenures
 - The priority is for onsite provision
 - The required affordable housing size and tenure mix should be in accordance with the SHMA or subsequent affordable housing needs evidence
- 6.5.5 Appendix 3 sets out the SHMA mix for affordable housing.
- 6.5.6 However, Appendix 3 also sets out more up to date evidence on affordable housing need, both in relation to relets and to priority needs on the housing register. There is a high proportion of 1 bed (especially) and 2-bed flats available as relets of existing properties and many households in temporary accommodation need rented family housing. Similarly, the housing register shows a high need for 2 and 3 bed properties for those in priority need. Consequently, the evidence points towards there needing to be more emphasis on houses and the dwelling mix being sought for new build affordable housing in South West Maidenhead should be based on the mix set out in

*South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)*

Table 1 below (rather than the SHMA figures shown at the end for comparison). Given that the AL13 site will be developed over a number of years and in different phases, if the affordable housing needs change over that time such that it would be more appropriate to secure a different dwelling size mix for affordable housing, the Council will issue updated guidance to reflect this.

Table 1 - Affordable Dwelling Types Sought in South West Maidenhead

	1BF	2BF	2BH	3BH	4BH	
Rent • Social Rent 45% • Affordable Rent 35%	10%	10%	20%	30%	10%	80% (45%) (35%)
Shared ownership	5%	10%	5%	-	-	20%
	15%	20%	25%	30%	10%	100%
SHMA (for comparison only)	35-40%	25-30%		25-30%	5-10%	

6.5.7 The affordable housing should be provided in a way that avoids large clusters of affordable housing, ensuring it is well integrated with the market housing and that the design and appearance of the development is “tenure blind”. The Council will be preparing a Supplementary Planning Document on Affordable Housing and regard should be had to this document when it is available.

Other Housing Requirements in the Local Plan

6.5.8 The Local Plan sets out a range of other requirements in relation to provision of new housing in Policy HO2 that are relevant to the AL13 site. This includes:

- Ensuring homes are adaptable to changing life circumstances
- Providing 30% of homes on the site as accessible and adaptable dwellings in accordance with Building Regulations M4(2)
- Providing 5% of the dwellings to meet the wheelchair accessible standard in Building Regulations M4(3)⁵
- Providing 5% of the market housing as fully serviced plots for custom and self-build housing

6.5.9 Concerning the requirement for 5% of dwellings to meet the wheelchair accessible standard, it is recognised that in practice this is often provided as part of the affordable housing requirement (normally social rent or affordable rent). However,

⁵ The M4(2) and M4(3) requirements should be applied unless evidence can be provided to demonstrate that such provision would be impracticable or render the scheme unviable

developers are also encouraged to consider providing wheelchair accessible housing as part of market housing provision.

6.5.10 In relation to the self and custom build requirement, which applies to sites of 100 or more net dwellings and is therefore required on the AL13 site, the fact that individual applications for parts of the AL13 site may come forward for less than 100 dwellings does not mean those proposals should not provide for 5% self and custom build. In the absence of a single application for the site, each application will be required to deliver 5% custom and self-build housing.

6.5.11 Policy HO2 indicates that every self-build/custom build plot will need a plot passport. This is to be prepared by the developer. The Council will prepare further guidance on self-build/custom build provision, including in relation to the content of plot passports and how they fit in the planning application process. The Council will also seek further information regarding the specific requirements of those on the self-build and custom build register to ensure that developers are able to ensure that the self/custom build plots that they provide can best meet the requirements of those on the register. Policy HO2 also indicates that community-led housing approaches (such as co-housing, community land trusts and cooperatives) will be encouraged on allocated sites.

Community Infrastructure

6.5.12 The design principles highlight the key requirements for the two schools and the importance of their relationship to the local centre, sustainable modes of travel and the green spine. The timing of the delivery of the two schools is likely to be different with the primary school being needed earlier in the development period but potentially being developed in more than one phase. Further information on the schools and their potential cost is set out in Appendix 4.

6.5.13 The secondary school, however, is not likely to be required until towards the end of the local plan period which covers 2013 - 2033. As such there is likely to be a period of time when the land for the secondary school is vacant and development occurs around it. As such a temporary use for the site should be considered, but one which does not prevent the secondary school from being provided when needed.

Local Centre and Community Building

To deliver in a timely manner a Local Centre that lies at the heart of the Harvest Hill neighbourhood incorporating a mix of uses including retail, leisure, community facilities including space for police, health and recycling facilities. To deliver the policy requirements, a location on the north side of Harvest Hill Road, but near to and visible from Harvest Hill Road and close to the schools, as well as being highly accessible by sustainable modes of transport would be appropriate

BLP links: AL13(5), QP1(b)(5c), IF6

Other Links: Corporate Plan

- 6.5.14 The scale of development means that it is appropriate and necessary to provide a range of community facilities on site and this is set out in the Local Plan, enabling residents to access local facilities to meet every day needs without the need to travel further afield. Further consideration of design factors and discussions means that it is most appropriate to locate the local centre north of the Harvest Hill Road, whilst still needing to be near to and visible from the road.
- 6.5.15 At the heart of the Harvest Hill neighbourhood, a multi-purpose community building should be provided, creating a focus for the new community. The specification for such a facility should be worked up closely with community representatives, groups and stakeholders.

Health Provision

To explore with the relevant health providers the scope to provide a health hub within the local centre, including the possibility of the relocation of health provision from the surrounding area

BLP links: AL13(5), QP1(b)(5c), IF6

Other links: Corporate Plan

- 6.5.16 The scale of residential development in South West Maidenhead will generate significant additional demand for primary health care facilities. Existing surgeries in the area have little additional capacity. Consideration is being given to the primary health care provision in the wider area, including the scope for the relocation of some existing primary healthcare provision onto the AL13 housing site to form a health hub. This should form part of the local centre. As such provision would be a mix of new health provision for the AL13 site and re-provision, a mix of funding would be needed (see section 7).
- 6.5.17 The scope exists to combine a health hub with the provision of a multi-purpose community building, and this option should be explored further.
- 6.5.18 As the health hub would be meeting a combination of new and existing needs, development should contribute proportionately to the costs of the new provision, having regard to the balance between new patients arising from the development and existing patients from the surrounding area.

Open Space

- 6.5.19 The design principles highlight the importance of establishing a strong green infrastructure framework and the approach to the provision of open space in the two neighbourhoods on the AL13 site. The open space standards in the Borough Local Plan provide important guidelines in relation to types of open space, quantity, accessibility (walking distance) and quality.

- 6.5.20 It will be important for development proposals to provide a range of different open spaces to meet different needs, including high quality new amenity open spaces and play facilities for older and younger children (including Local Areas of Play (LAPs), Locally Equipped Areas for Play (LEAPs) and Neighbourhood Areas for Play (NEAPs).
- 6.5.21 A further key consideration is ensuring that clear mechanisms are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of open space.

Playing Pitches

The proforma for the AL13 site indicates that the site is allocated for a range of uses to accompany the residential development. This includes playing pitch provision. It is anticipated that there will be some playing pitch provision associated with the schools. However, the residential development also creates additional demand for the use of existing playing pitches in the area, including at Braywick Park.

The Council is currently preparing a playing pitch strategy, which will assess the adequacy of playing pitch provision and how and where it may need improving, both across the Borough but also more specifically in Maidenhead. The outcome from that work will not be known until 2023 but it is likely that the addition pressure on playing pitch provision arising from development on the AL13 site will need to be mitigated. This is likely to be through financial contributions to new pitches or enhancements to existing provision, secured through section 106 agreements.

- 6.5.22 The Policy context section of this SPD summarises the Policy requirements in relation to the nature of the industrial and warehousing space to be provided on the site. The focus of the employment development on this site is one of delivering smaller industrial units for small and medium sized firms. The supporting text to the policy explains the reasons for this, including meeting growth needs and historic under-provision, and a negative industrial pipeline.

Employment

To provide new industrial and warehousing space on AL14 the Triangle Site in accordance with Policy ED1 of the Borough Local Plan

BLP links: ED1, AL14(3)

Other Links: Corporate Plan

6.6 Connectivity

Connectivity

To deliver development that is highly connected both within the development areas and to the surrounding areas, with a focus on enhancing connectivity for walking, cycling and public transport. This infrastructure should be delivered in a timely manner to ensure that the use of sustainable modes of travel is available to new residents and occupants early on in the development.

*BLP links: QP1b(5e,5f), AL13(3, 15, 16, 17), AL14(5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11), AL15(1, 2), IF2
Other Links: Corporate Plan, Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan*

- 6.6.1 The development areas in South West Maidenhead, and especially the AL13 housing site, are well located to major destinations in the town, particularly the town centre and the railway station but also other destinations such as the Braywick Leisure Centre and major parks and open spaces. The provision and enhancement of high-quality sustainable connections to those destinations, both within and beyond the development area, will be key in delivering sustainable development. Similarly providing the right connections, particularly those relating to sustainable modes of travel to key local facilities on the site, including to the employment opportunities on the Triangle site, will further contribute to the sustainability of development.
- 6.6.2 Policy QP1b (5c) states that provision of the necessary infrastructure should be ahead of or in tandem with the development it supports. The early delivery of key elements of the walking and cycling and public transport infrastructure will help embed sustainable travel “habits” for those in living or working in the development areas.
- 6.6.2 The Illustrative Framework and related design principles set out key principles for access, movement and wayfinding. This section outlines in more detail some of the specific measures needed to deliver those principles

Walking and Cycling within Surrounding Areas

To provide high quality walking and cycling connections between development areas and the wider area, in particular connecting with the walking and cycling network identified within the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), including:

- New cycling and pedestrian crossing across Braywick Road to the leisure centre for the current footpath across the golf course
- New means of crossing Braywick Road at the east end of Harvest Hill Road to link with the new segregated walking/cycling route along the north side of Harvest Hill Road, potentially as part of a wider junction improvement
- Improvements along Braywick Road to the town centre
- Improvements to the bridge over the A404(M) and to the quality of the environment either side to improve the quality of access to Ockwells Park
- A series of walking and cycling measures to/from the Triangle site and improved connections to the town centre and the AL13 site
- Creation of attractive and legible direct links to the railway station and beyond to the town centre

BLP links: QP1b(5e), AL13(3)(15)(16), AL14(5)(8)(10), AL15(2), IF2

Other links: Corporate Plan, Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan

- 6.6.3 It essential that high quality, including wherever feasible segregated, walking and cycling routes, are provided to connect to key destinations outside of the main development sites. These routes will also need to connect to the wider walking and cycling network, as defined in the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, to ensure that those living or working in the new development can sustainably reach other parts of the town and further afield on foot or by bike. Figure 14 illustrates the cycle network in the area and proposed improvements to it.

South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)

Figure 14 Existing and Proposed Cycle Network in the South West Maidenhead area⁶

- Existing cycle facility
- Existing cycle facility (upgrades proposed)
- Proposed new cycle facility
- Quiet road suitable for cycling



All proposals are subject to funding and feasibility

⁶ Proposed route through golf course land is illustrative

- 6.6.4 This new provision to ensure a fully connected development will involve a combination of provision of new walking/cycling paths and improvements to means of crossing key routes/barriers such as Braywick Road and the A404(M) to improve the accessibility of key facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. In the case of the existing footbridge over the A404(M) which provides a key link to Ockwells Park, this should include both a refurbishment of the bridge and an improvement to the environment either side of the bridge. New walking/cycle paths will need to meet the Department for Transport standards for new provision wherever possible.
- 6.6.5 One of the requirements for the AL13 and AL14 sites in the Borough Local Plan is to discuss further, including with National Highways (formerly Highways England), the feasibility of a pedestrian and cyclist bridge over the A308(M) connecting the employment development on the Triangle site with the new housing development immediately to the north, and if deliverable any such bridge should create a distinctive landmark on the approach to Maidenhead. However, if not feasible, the Local Plan indicates that alternative sustainable access solutions would need to be explored and implemented that provide comparable benefits for the movement of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users in the area.
- 6.6.6 As a result, further work has been undertaken to consider the options. In summary that work has concluded that the alternative to the bridge involving pedestrian and cyclist crossings on the northern and eastern side of the Braywick Road roundabout, and improved walking and cycling connections along Braywick Road to the town centre and also to the AL13 Housing area could provide comparable benefits to the bridge and is the preferred approach. It was noted as part of this work that the bridge option was more expensive having regard to the potential level of use of the bridge.

Walking and Cycling within Development Areas

To deliver high quality segregated walking and cycling infrastructure that ensures high quality north/south and east/west connectivity, including:

- Along the north/south green spine
- East/west along the north side of Harvest Hill Road, extending beyond the site in either direction
- The existing footpath across golf course land
- East/west connectivity across the parcels of land to the south of Harvest Hill Road
- Within the Triangle site
- Provision of secure, high quality and accessible cycle parking facilities – at key destinations within the development (e.g. schools, local centre, employment development) and for all dwellings, including charging points for electric bikes

To recognise the fundamental relationship of the walking/cycling network with the green infrastructure network across the development area

BLP links: QP1b(5e), AL13(3, 15, 16), AL14(5, 8, 10), IF2

- 6.6.7 The development provides the opportunity to create a high quality, segregated walking/cycling network, connecting up with the wider walking and cycling network beyond the development sites. This will need to be carefully planned alongside the green infrastructure network. Making the right connections to key destinations within the development areas, notably to open spaces, the schools and the local centre will be essential to ensure these are truly accessible and attractive to reach on foot or by bike.

Public Transport

To ensure that development is well-served by public bus routes/demand responsive transport/other innovative public transport solutions, with appropriate provision of new bus stop infrastructure, such that the bus is an attractive alternative to the private car for local journeys. To ensure bus routing integrates closely with the location of the local centre, school and commercial development.

BLP links: QP1b(5e), AL13(3, 16,17), AL14(5,6,10), AL15(5), IF2

Other Links: Corporate Plan, Bus Service Improvement Plan

- 6.6.8 The approach to public transport provision is also one where it is important that public transport provision to serve the new housing and employment development is well integrated with the existing network and consistent and supports the

implementation of the recent Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) (November 2021)⁷. Survey information in the BSIP of non-bus users identified the following measures as the top three actions that would make people use buses:

1. Cheaper fares
2. More frequent services
3. More bus routes

6.6.9 The new development needs to be well served by public transport, connecting the development with key destinations in the surrounding area is critical, but it is also important to ensure key facilities such as the local centre and the schools are well connected by public transport too.

6.6.10 The measures that should be considered to deliver the public transport provision needed in South West Maidenhead, informed by the BSIP include:

- Diversion of an existing bus route or 'new sub-route', initially along Harvest Hill Road to serve early housing development to the south of Harvest Hill Road, and then through the residential development to the north of Harvest Hill Road (including the local centre and the school)
- Improved frequency of buses
- Trialing cheaper fares for the route through the site over an extended period of time to encourage greater patronage
- Provision of additional bus stops with real time passenger information
- Incorporation of bus priority measures
- Consideration should be given to conversion of buses to electric buses at the earliest opportunity

6.6.11 The Borough Local Plan and the Bus Service Improvement Plan also highlight the potential of demand responsive transport, and this too could be explored further to enhance the public transport accessibility of the area.

Vehicular Access and Off-Site Junction Improvements

6.6.12 The access, movement and wayfinding section of the Design Principles illustrate the location of the main vehicular access points to the development areas, including the importance of the Harvest Hill Road corridor.

⁷ See https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2021-11/rbwm_bus_service_improvement_strategy_november_2021.pdf

The Wider Road Network

As part of mitigating the impact on the wider road network, to provide/fund improvements to the following junctions:


- Braywick Road roundabout
- Shoppenhangers Road/Norreys Drive
- Holyport Road/Windsor Road
- A4/A404(M) Thicket Roundabout and Cannon Lane/Henley Road/Bath Road (A4) roundabout
- M4 J8/9 (a contribution)
- Improvements to Harvest Hill Road/Braywick Road – to be explored further and linked to improved pedestrian/cycle crossing

BLP links: QP1b(5f), AL13(15), AL14(9)

Other Links: Corporate Plan

- 6.6.13 Traffic modelling work for the Borough Local Plan identified the need to improve a number of road junctions across the town to address the impact of development proposed in the Plan. Further modelling work has been undertaken to test the need for junction improvements focusing in on junctions around the South West Maidenhead area, and necessary improvement measures have been identified and costed. The junctions needing improvement are identified above, shown on the plan (Figure 14) below and are also included in the Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix 2. The traffic modelling has been focused on the immediate area and is consistent with taking a simple but comprehensive approach to infrastructure delivery, which is the Council's preferred approach set out in Section 7 of this SPD. If, however, developers do not follow this approach, then Section 7 sets out an alternative. It would not then be possible to rely on the traffic modelling undertaken for this SPD.
- 6.6.14 The junction of Harvest Hill Road with Braywick Road is a location where it is essential to provide a high-quality walking/cycling crossing. However, following early consultation, further consideration is required of traffic movements at that junction, and in particular those vehicles that would want to turn right at that junction but cannot at present due its current configuration. The output from that consideration may result in further improvements being identified.

Figure 15 – Location of required junction improvements



6.6.15 Although the development in South West Maidenhead is likely to have wider impacts than the junctions identified above, some improvements have been or will need to be provided through other means. It is important, therefore, that the specific junction improvements identified above are provided for by funding from development on the AL13 and AL14 sites.

6.7 Sustainability and Environment

Sustainable Building - Net Zero Carbon

A key objective of the Council is to see development coming forward as net zero carbon development (operational) in developments across the area, and that moves towards approaches that take account of the 'whole life carbon' emissions of development. Accordingly, the Council will give significant positive weight to applications that deliver this.

BLP links: QP1b(5i), SP2

Other Links: Corporate Plan, Environment and Climate Strategy, Position Statement on Sustainability and Energy Efficient Design

*South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)*

6.7.1 In 2019 the Council declared a climate emergency and then adopted an Environment and Climate Strategy the following year. This sets out the approach and actions locally to address climate change, based around 4 themes:

- Circular Economy
- Energy
- Natural Environment
- Transport

6.7.2 The implications of this strategy relate to a number of aspects of development at South West Maidenhead and the content of this SPD. In relation to energy, reducing our energy consumption, decarbonising our supply of energy and increasing local renewable energy generation is key to realising the Borough's zero carbon aspirations.

6.7.3 The Borough Local Plan (Policy SP2) sets out that all developments need to demonstrate how they have been designed to incorporate measures to adapt to and mitigate climate change. Policy QP1b for the South West Maidenhead area indicates that one of the key principles for the placemaking area is that development includes measures to reduce climate change and environmental impacts including suitable approaches to sustainable energy, recycling and construction.

6.7.4 Taking forward these aspirations at a practical level in relation to new development, the Council has adopted a Position Statement on Sustainability and Energy Efficient Design (March 2021). This sets out a series of measures which will be sought on new developments in order to deliver on the requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), national and local commitments towards climate change and the Council's Environment and Climate Strategy.

6.7.5 Key elements of this Position Statement are sought including following the energy hierarchy of:

- Be lean: use less energy
- Be clean: supply energy efficiently
- Be green: use renewable energy

and specifically, all development:

- To be net zero carbon (operational)
- To include detailed energy assessments
- Maximising on site renewable energy generation

6.7.6 The net zero outcome should be achieved on site where feasible, but where it is not feasible, to contribute towards a carbon offset fund. The Council's strong preference and expectation, particularly on greenfield sites such as those in South West Maidenhead, is that net carbon is achieved on site. Furthermore, to be genuinely sustainable, developers are encouraged to consider the 'whole life carbon' impact of

their development, taking account of the energy used in the construction, maintenance and demolition phases of a building, as well as the operational phase.

6.7.7 There is guidance and good practice available to assist in ensuring development achieves zero carbon. Developers should look to apply the LETI Design Guidance on Zero Carbon⁸. The Council will also be producing a Supplementary Planning Document on Sustainability and Climate Change – regard should be had to this document when it is available.

6.7.8 The Position Statement identifies a number of other measures that to be addressed in new developments to help meet the Council’s climate change and sustainability objectives including:

- Reduce potential overheating and reliance on air conditioning systems by applying a ‘cooling hierarchy’
- Recognising quality regimes such as Passivhaus or Home Quality Mark
- New homes to use three phase power supply
- Provision of electric vehicle (EV) charging facilities
- High speed internet to facilitate homeworking
- Minimise the use of water including application of a water usage target

6.7.9 In relation to EV charging facilities, it should be noted that from June 2022 changes to the Building Regulations are bringing in a requirement that all new residential buildings with a parking space must have an electric vehicle charging point.

6.7.10 The scale of development in the South West Maidenhead area provides the opportunity for the provision of centralised energy systems to be provided. Developers should work together to explore this option, exploring that latest technology for heat networks.

⁸ [Climate Emergency Design Guide | LETI](#)

Biodiversity Net Gain

Development across the area should deliver biodiversity net gain (with a national requirement for 10% being introduced shortly). In line with the principles and requirements in the Local Plan, the following approach should apply:

1. To maximise the level of biodiversity on the two main development allocations (AL13 and AL14) through protection and retention of existing habitats and species wherever possible, and through on-site mitigation within those allocated areas; then
2. To secure biodiversity gains elsewhere in the placemaking area covered by this SPD; then

If the required net gain is still not achieved, for the remaining gains to be delivered, preferably on land in proximity to the placemaking area where possible and appropriate, or, if not, elsewhere in the Borough, potentially through a biodiversity net gain credit scheme. Any necessary provision outside of the South West Maidenhead placemaking area should be guided by seeking to secure the best biodiversity outcome. In following this approach, careful regard should be had to the design principles set out in Section 6.3 above.

BLP links: QP1b(5h), AL13(8), AL14(25), NR2

Other links: Corporate Plan, Environment and Climate Strategy, Biodiversity Action Plan

6.7.11 Policy NR2 of the Borough Local Plan sets out a policy requirement that development proposals will demonstrate a net gain in biodiversity by quantifiable methods such as the use of a biodiversity metric. It also sets out a mitigation hierarchy to avoid, then mitigate and as a last resort to compensate for any adverse biodiversity impacts. The Environment Act (2021) introduces a requirement for development to deliver a 10%⁹ net gain in biodiversity. Policy QP1b requires delivery of net gain across the placemaking area that reflects its nature conservation interest. The proforma for the AL13 site requires provision of biodiversity net gain across the site and the adjoining open spaces in the placemaking area as a whole.

6.7.12 Considering the application of these principles and requirements to the South West Maidenhead area has resulted in the formulation of a local hierarchical approach whereby not just the mitigation hierarchy is applied but mitigation is focused as much as possible on protection and mitigation within the allocated site areas, AL13 and AL14. Particular opportunities exist to maximise biodiversity gain in the southern fringe to site AL13 shown in the Illustrative Framework Plan (Figure 4), and on parts of the Triangle site AL14 where a combination of green belt designation and flood risk limit the extent of the developable area. The opportunity for mitigation in the

⁹ The 10% net gain in the Environment Act is expected to come into force in November 2023 but the Council believes that developers should be applying this approach at the earliest opportunity.

wider placemaking area covered by the SPD, and potentially beyond, is likely to need to be explored further also.

- 6.7.13 In developing mitigation and enhancement measures it is important that the identified mitigation is species specific and has particular regard to mitigating for species that are under threat or have been lost. Net gain should relate to priority species identified in the Biodiversity Action Plan. Similarly, the use of native species in new habitat creation is another very important principle.
- 6.7.14 Development on the site allocations in the South West Maidenhead area provides the opportunity to design in from the start opportunities to maximise the on-site retention and mitigation of biodiversity, whilst recognising the need to accommodate the development identified in the Borough Local Plan. The design principles highlight the importance of the green infrastructure network required across the development areas and their significance in providing ecological connectivity.
- 6.7.15 The Government's metric 3.1 provides the basis for calculating net gain at present but the latest metric should be used. The Council may develop further guidance in relation to biodiversity net gain. It should be noted that there would be a 30-year protection for biodiversity improvements and funding agreements must cover maintenance for that period. Enforcement and monitoring will be essential, and funding will need to be secured to undertake this work. Communication and engagement will also be very important.

Trees

Development should look to maximise the retention of trees on the development sites whilst having regard to the scale of growth identified in the Borough Local Plan policies, and deliver significant additional new tree planting

BLP links: QP1b(5g), AL13(7, 9), AL14(14, 15), NR3
Other Links: Environment and Climate Strategy

- 6.7.16 It is recognised that to accommodate the level of growth planned for the areas, some loss of trees will be required. The proformas in the Borough Local Plan for sites AL13 and AL14 (included at Appendix A of this SPD) set out a number of requirements in relation to trees and landscape buffers on the two development areas that need to be reflected in development proposals. These can be summarised as, on the AL13 housing site:

- Retention of Rushington Copse
- Retention of other mature trees and hedgerows wherever possible
- Retention and enhancing of boundary trees and landscape buffers
- Protecting trees from the impact of development

and on the AL14 site:

- Retain all valuable trees and reinforce the tree landscape buffers to the A308(M) and the M4 and along all site boundaries

6.7.17 Tree surveys and related assessments and plans to the standards defined in the Local Plan Policy NR3 will be very important in applying these principles and requirements in practice.. Similarly, every opportunity should be taken to deliver significant new tree planting in the area.

Other Issues

6.7.18 There are a wide range of other environmental issues that will need to be considered as part of bringing forward development proposals for the area. The Borough Local Plan, including both the site-specific requirements in the Proformas in Appendix C of Plan (and Appendix 3 of this SPD), together with the wider suite of policies in the Plan provide set out what is expected in relation to those issues. Some of those key issues are highlighted below:

Food Production

6.7.19 Food production should be incorporated into the green infrastructure network to enable a significant proportion of new residents the opportunity to participate in or benefit from on-site food production in the residential development. This could take various forms including:

- Allotments
- Micro allotments – smaller scale plots for those wanting more limited growing space
- Community gardens and/or orchards
- The incorporation into gardens of pre-prepared growing space

Flood Risk

6.7.20 There are areas of flood risk on both the AL13 and AL14 sites and development proposals for both sites will need to be accompanied by a robust Flood Risk Assessment.

6.7.21 There is particularly significant flood risk on the AL14 site which will affect the extent of the developable area, and the Local Plan proforma for the site highlights issues of surface water flooding and risk to groundwater that will need to be addressed. The watercourse “The Cut” also runs along the northern part of the site and the site is also crossed by Chawbridge Bourne at its western end. If practicable and appropriate, an undeveloped 8 metre buffer should be provided on both sides of these watercourses to provide access for maintenance and maintain a wildlife corridor.

6.7.22 In relation to the AL14 site, although employment uses are classified as a “less vulnerable use” and the Government’s planning practice guidance indicates that less vulnerable uses are appropriate in zones 1, 2 and 3a (but not 3b), the Council’s Sequential and Exceptions Test report¹⁰ prepared as evidence to support the Borough Local Plan, sets out a range of key considerations for the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) including ensuring floodplain storage capacity and safe evacuation of the site. Only once the FRA has been concluded can the developable area of the site (from a flood risk perspective) be confirmed.

6.7.23 Policy NR1 of the Local Plan provides more detailed requirements in relation to managing flood risk and waterways.

Scheduled Ancient Monument

6.7.24 There is a scheduled ancient monument on the northern edge of the AL14 site. Development proposals will need to ensure that they conserve and enhance the scheduled ancient monument and its setting, having particular regard to the ‘wet’ nature of the site. To ensure this, a setting study will need to be undertaken.

Environmental Protection

6.7.25 There are a number of potential pollution concerns that will need to be addressed by development proposals. These include:

- Noise and air pollution from existing nearby sources of pollution such as the A404(M) and the A308(M) and its impact on new residents
- Potential pollution generated by the new development, including its implications for the nearby Town Centre Air Quality Management Area and potential light pollution
- Potential impact on environmental quality during the construction phase.

6.7.26 The Environmental Protection chapter of the Borough Local Plan (Policies EP1 - EP5) puts in place strong policy safeguards to ensure that development proposals address these and other environmental protection issues.

Water Infrastructure

6.7.27 The Borough Local Plan Policy IF7 sets out important policy requirements in relation to water supply and sewerage infrastructure. Developers should contact the water/wastewater company at the earliest opportunity to discuss their development proposals. As the South West Maidenhead area falls within an area of water stress, the opportunity should be taken to design development that is water efficient and reduces water consumption. The Council’s Position Statement on Sustainability and Energy Efficient Design provides further information on how this could be achieved.

¹⁰ [2019 ‘Sequential and Exception Test’ document](#)

7 Infrastructure Delivery

7.1 Infrastructure Delivery - Policy, Principles and Approach

Infrastructure Delivery Principle

That development in South West Maidenhead should fully mitigate its impacts in terms of necessary infrastructure provision.

BLP links: QP1b (3)(5a, c), AL13 (various), AL14 (various), IF1

Other Links: Corporate Plan, Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule

- 7.1.1 It is essential that the impact of new development at South West Maidenhead is fully mitigated in a comprehensive and coordinated way, in terms of the provision of the required new or improved supporting physical and community infrastructure. There is a range of infrastructure required to deliver a successful place and this is highlighted in the Local Plan and in this SPD. This section focuses on the “hard” physical infrastructure of a strategic nature, much of which is provided “off-site”, to consider how this can be delivered collectively, having regard to the fact that there are a number of different landowners/developers who will deliver development in the area.

Policy Basis for Infrastructure Provision

- 7.1.2 The Borough Local Plan provides the principal policy basis for infrastructure planning in the South West Maidenhead area. Policy IF1 Infrastructure and Developer Contributions provides the overarching approach to infrastructure in relation to development, and it:
- Requires development to deliver infrastructure to support the spatial strategy
 - Indicates that section 106 contributions (for on and off-site facilities) will be used as well as Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
 - Notes that development may be phased to ensure the timely delivery of infrastructure
- 7.1.3 Policy QP1(b) South West Maidenhead Placemaking sets the policy framework for the South West Maidenhead area covered by this SPD. It includes:
- Part 3 – to ensure that development in the placemaking area as a whole comes forward in a strategic and comprehensive manner, this SPD will be brought forward including “phasing of development and infrastructure delivery for the SWMSA as a whole”

- Part 5(a) requires a coordinated and comprehensive approach to development of the Area to avoid piecemeal or ad-hoc development proposals
- Part 5(c) requires provision of necessary social and physical infrastructure ahead of or in tandem with the development that it supports

The individual site proformas for sites AL13, AL14 and AL15 provide more detail on some of the main infrastructure requirements.

Community Infrastructure Levy

7.1.4 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is an important tool for local authorities to use to help them deliver the infrastructure needed to support development in their area. The legislation and Government guidance gives local authorities wide discretion on how CIL is spent, but in summary:

- Local authorities must spend the levy on infrastructure needed to support the development of their area, and they will decide what infrastructure is needed.
- The levy can be used to increase the capacity of existing infrastructure or to repair failing existing infrastructure, if that is necessary to support development.

As such, the spending of CIL is not ringfenced to the local area in which it is collected. Any CIL monies collected from within the Borough can be spend anywhere in the Borough.

7.1.5 The impacts of the major development identified for South West Maidenhead will be felt on existing and proposed infrastructure well beyond the SPD area. In addition, it should be noted that CIL is not collected in Maidenhead Town Centre where significant housing growth is taking place and is planned. As such CIL from development outside of the town centre will need to help fund infrastructure improvements in that area as well as elsewhere in the Borough. Further information on the Council's approach to spending CIL may be included in the Council's Infrastructure Funding Statement when published.

Section 106 Funding

7.1.6 Section 106 agreements (also known as planning obligations) help to mitigate the impact of unacceptable development to make it acceptable in planning terms. They must meet the following test: they must be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.¹¹ It is clear from the work

¹¹ These tests are set out in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010)(as amended). Further guidance is set out in the Government's Planning Practice Guidance on Planning Obligations: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/planning-obligations>

undertaken in support of the Local Plan and this SPD that Section 106 contributions will be required alongside CIL contributions, to deliver the identified, necessary, infrastructure to support development at South West Maidenhead.

Approach to Infrastructure Funding for South West Maidenhead

- 7.1.7 The key policy requirement for South West Maidenhead is to ensure the comprehensive and coordinated delivery of infrastructure in advance of or in tandem with development.
- 7.1.8 Implementing this policy requirement will be challenging for all concerned, not least because there are a number of different landowners and developers involved (who will be delivering their schemes at different times), and because given the scale of the planned development, there will be a very wide range of impacts within and beyond the SWMPMA to consider and mitigate.
- 7.1.9 The Council's preferred approach to infrastructure funding and delivery is set out below.

Simple Comprehensive Approach

- 7.1.10 The work on the SPD has sought to develop the evidence base on the main infrastructure requirements and costs associated with the South West Maidenhead development without an exhaustive assessment of its wider impacts beyond the Placemaking area. The resulting approach, which is a pragmatic approach that seeks to provide certainty for developers on their section 106 contributions, involves a simple but comprehensive approach to delivery whereby a combination of the CIL receipts payable in relation to the development within SW Maidenhead and section 106 contributions would fully fund those main infrastructure requirements.
- 7.1.11 This approach would disregard wider impacts of the SW Maidenhead development beyond those identified in this SPD but would also need developers within South West Maidenhead to fully fund infrastructure through CIL and s106 payments based on a proportionate indicative cost per square metre basis. Conversely, only in relation to specified strategic infrastructure (i.e., health provision, M4 motorway junction and secondary school) would SW Maidenhead development part fund the infrastructure. It is necessary that the identified infrastructure is provided in accordance with local plan policy as referred to above (i.e., necessary to make the development acceptable) and it is considered that this approach ensures that the contributions are directly related to the proposed development and the amount of contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the individual developments. The box below outlines the steps set out in this SPD to deliver this approach.

Infrastructure Delivery – Simple Comprehensive Approach

In taking forward this approach the following sequential steps are set out in this section of the SPD to deliver a comprehensive approach to the funding and delivery of infrastructure required as a result of the South West Maidenhead development:

1. To assess the main infrastructure needs and costs
2. To consider other funding sources in relation to health provision, M4 J8/9 motorway junction and secondary school provision
3. To consider potential CIL receipts from the AL13 site
4. Any remaining funding gap to be funded from section 106 contributions from the AL13 and AL14 sites, having regard to the more limited range of infrastructure impacts arising from the AL14 site

That the overall aim is to ensure an equitable distribution of infrastructure costs across the different development interests in the South West Maidenhead area

That this assessment is updated as and when required to inform negotiations on section 106 agreements.

BLP links: QP1b (3)(5a, c), AL13 (various), AL14 (various), IF1

Other Links: Corporate Plan, Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule

Step 1 - Infrastructure Needs and Costs

- 7.1.12 As part of the preparation of the Borough Local Plan, an Infrastructure Delivery Plan was prepared setting out the infrastructure required to support the growth set out in the Plan. This included a consideration of the infrastructure requirements for the South West Maidenhead area and in particular the specific site allocations in the Plan (sites AL13, AL14 and AL15), some of which were subsequently reflected in the site-specific requirements in the proformas at Appendix C of the Local Plan.
- 7.1.13 This assessment has formed the basis for considering the infrastructure requirements in this SPD. However, further work has also been undertaken to understand the infrastructure requirements for the development of the area and the potential timing of delivery. This work has included:
- Additional traffic modelling and work to determine the nature of required off-site junction improvements, and their costs
 - Consideration of the Harvest Hill Road corridor from a highways and urban design perspective, including costing work on the potential segregated walking/cycling route
 - Further consideration of walking, cycling and public transport provision in the context of emerging strategies

*South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)*

- Further consideration of potential locations for the school site, the broad timing of when the schools may be required, and developing cost estimates based on benchmark figures
- Discussions with health providers about the need for a health facility on site

7.1.14 Given the scale of the planned development, the number of different landowners and developers involved, and the length of the likely delivery period, the Council will be adopting a precautionary approach in securing developer contributions towards necessary supporting infrastructure. Whilst at this stage in the planning process the Council has undertaken some concept design work for junction improvements, looked at recent comparable costs for infrastructure delivery elsewhere, and used a range of other techniques to arrive at reasonable cost estimates for the required new infrastructure, it is inevitable that these costs will change, as further design work is completed, and delivery constraints are more fully understood. As part of preparing the costs for the final version of this SPD, the Council has updated costings prepared earlier in 2022 by indexing those costs by reference to the CIL Index, which uses the BCIS All In Tender Index as its base. Costs have been updated to December 2022 on this basis.

7.1.15 As a result of the original and further work an infrastructure delivery schedule has been prepared for the South West Maidenhead area (see Appendix 2). This includes an indication of the potential costs of the different elements of infrastructure. Over time, these costs will be refined as more information becomes available and costs will continue to be updated based on the latest CIL index. This table, and its implications for development contributions will be updated. Any updates will be published on the Council's website to inform any ongoing discussions with developers and for wider awareness.

7.1.16 In negotiating S.106 financial contributions, the Council will seek to minimise any risk that the overall receipt from S.106 contributions, CIL and other identified funding sources is insufficient to deliver the required supporting infrastructure in full. The Council will also seek to ensure that those landowners and developers that are last to bring forward planning applications on their land are not left with a disproportionately high CIL/ S.106 burden by reviewing the costs and delivery of infrastructure as development in South West Maidenhead is progressed.

7.1.17 In summary a range of infrastructure requirements that need to be funded by financial contributions have been identified arising from development in the South West Maidenhead area. These include:

- Strategic network highway junction improvements
- Local network highway junction improvements
- Improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure
- Improvements to public transport provision
- Provision of a new secondary school and primary school
- Community and health provision

- Contributions towards improvement to off-site playing pitch provision (not yet costed)

In addition, there will be a range of other primarily on-site infrastructure that will need to be provided by developers such as vehicular accesses, open space and green infrastructure, transport infrastructure provision internal to the site, etc.

7.1.18 In broad terms the wider infrastructure needs related to the site amount to around £120m (see below). This is broadly split as set out in Table 2.

Table 2 - Indicative Infrastructure Costs

Type of Infrastructure	Indicative cost indexed to Dec 2022
Highway Junctions	£29.4m
Walking and Cycling	£11.6m
Public Transport	£1.8m
Schools	£70.2m
Community and Health	£7.1m
Total	£120.1m

7.1.19 In identifying the infrastructure requirements of the area we have taken a proportionate approach in identifying how different infrastructure should be funded. We have also, however, aimed to keep the approach relatively simple to ensure that the key infrastructure requirements are fully addressed. This is in the interests of clarity and certainty. Smaller contributions could have been identified towards other infrastructure provision and detailed arguments could be made one way or another about proportions of impact, but such discussions would be complex and time consuming, could delay delivery and would not assist in delivering a comprehensive approach to development where the key impacts are addressed.

Community Facilities Land Cost

7.1.20 In addition, in considering the cost of providing community facilities including the schools, it is considered appropriate and equitable to include an appropriate cost for the land in the overall cost of the infrastructure. This SPD indicates that the main community uses, notably the schools and the local centre incorporating health and community facilities, should be located on the land north of Harvest Hill Road where there is a single ownership. This is meeting the needs for community facilities not just on land north of Harvest Hill Road but also the residential development south of Harvest Hill Road, and in the case of the secondary school and potentially the health

facilities a catchment area extending outside of the AL13 site. The cost of providing those community facilities is both the build cost and the cost of the land.

- 7.1.21 Without some allowance in the infrastructure costs for the cost of the land, the developer of land to the north of Harvest Hill Road would be funding the full land costs for the various community facilities, which would not be equitable. As such a value needs to be attached to the land, as a means of ensuring an equitable distribution of costs.
- 7.1.22 The Council has taken further advice as to the appropriate cost of the community land. This is based on an updated viability assessment for the whole AL13 area undertaken in October 2022. This results in a cost for the different elements of community land of £633,174 per hectare. In this approach, this is simply added to the construction costs for the different elements of community provision to derive a total cost for that infrastructure provision. As the SPD indicates that all of the land for community uses is located on the golf course land north of Harvest Hill Road it is right that appropriate relief is provided to the landowner for the proportion of community land costs that are not attributable to the impact of their part of the development.

Step 2 - Other Funding Sources

- 7.1.23 Most of the infrastructure identified above is required in its entirety to mitigate the impact of the development in the South West Maidenhead area. However, in relation to the provision of the secondary school, the health facility, and junction improvement on the strategic highway network (J8/9), for this strategically significant infrastructure it is considered that a substantial element of the provision of that infrastructure is related not just to South West Maidenhead growth but to the needs from a wider area. As such only a proportion of those costs should be funded by the South West Maidenhead development under this approach, with the remaining funding coming from other sources outside of South West Maidenhead development.
- 7.1.24 It is assumed that a proportion of the following schemes are funded by other sources as follows (see Appendix 2 for further details):
- Secondary school – 43% funded by other sources
 - Health Facility – 60% funded by other sources
 - M4 Junction 8/9 – there would be a maximum 30% contribution from South West Maidenhead development with the remainder funded by National Highways.

Broadly, those other funding sources would need to fund about £27.0m of the total £120.1m of infrastructure costs.

Step 3 - Potential Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts

- 7.1.25 The level of CIL that is chargeable and the types of development that can be charged are set out in the Council's CIL Charging Schedule¹². CIL is chargeable on the housing development on the AL13 site¹³ but is not chargeable on the industrial and warehousing development on the AL14 site. The updated Viability Assessment of the AL13 site, based on a policy compliant scheme for the allocation and taking account of the guidance in the draft SPD, calculated a CIL receipt for the whole site of £45.7m.
- 7.1.26 Under the CIL legislation, where an area has a town or parish council, a local allocation of CIL is passed to the town or parish for that area. This amounts to 15% of CIL receipts (or 25% in the event that there is a 'made' neighbourhood plan). The area of land south of Harvest Hill Road and east of Kimbers Lane is within Bray Parish and also within the AL13 housing allocation. Decisions on the spending of this element of CIL are made by the Parish Council, not the Borough Council. The Borough Council will keep under review whether it is appropriate to include the local allocation of CIL as part of its assessment of the overall funding available for the infrastructure set out in this SPD.

Step 4 - Addressing the Funding Gap

- 7.1.27 Taking account of the other funding sources and potential CIL receipts, as it stands the funding picture is as set out in Table 3:

Table 3 - Determining the Funding Gap

	Indicative cost
Total Infrastructure Cost	£120.1m
Less	
Other funding sources	£27.0m
Less	
Estimated CIL receipts	£45.7m
Equals	
Funding Gap	£ 47.4m

¹² <https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/home/planning/planning-policy/community-infrastructure-levy/cil-charging-schedule>

¹³ The current rate is £295.11 per square metre of residential development. This is index linked so changes each year.

7.1.28 There is therefore an approximate £47.4m funding gap at present. This will need to be made up through section 106 contributions from development.

The Triangle Site (AL14) contributions

7.1.29 Some of the impact of development in the South West Maidenhead area will be caused by the industrial and warehousing development on the Triangle Site (AL14). Section 106 contributions will be expected to address that impact. Section 6 explains the options considered in relation to sustainable walk/cycle links from the site to the wider area and the preferred option.

7.1.30 As such it is considered that contributions are required for the following:

- Sustainable off-site measures to enable pedestrians and cyclists to reach the site
- A contribution towards improvements for walking and cycling to the town centre/wider walking/cycling connectivity including to the AL13 site
- A contribution towards public transport provision in the area
- A contribution to some junction improvements

7.1.31 In relation to walking and cycling improvements a package of measures has been identified. As of today, contributions to the following would be expected to be the following amounts:

- Improvements in the vicinity of the site/Braywick Road roundabout - £2.7M
- Contribution to the cost of improvements to walking/cycling to the town centre/wider connectivity including to the AL13 site = £2.6m

7.1.32 In relation to the impact of the development on the highway network, development of the site will have the most impact on the Braywick Roundabout and Junction 8/9 of the M4. A proportionate approach between the impact of the Triangle site and the AL13 housing site should be taken to the contribution of the Triangle site to the cost of those improvements. Table 4 below sets out the peak hour traffic generation of the two sites on the Braywick Roundabout.

*South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)*

Table 4 - Braywick Roundabout traffic data¹⁴

Site	AM	PM	Total
AL13	405	768	1,173 (55.3%)
AL14	506	444	950 (45.7%)
Total of both developments	911	1,212	2,123

This indicates that around 45.7% of the additional traffic from the two main South West Maidenhead development sites is generated by the AL14 site. Based on this proportion and the indicative cost to the South West Maidenhead development of the improvements at Braywick Roundabout and M4 Junction 8/9, a formula has been developed to calculate the contribution towards these two junction improvements which will vary depending on the level and type of employment use provided on the site as follows:

- B2 Industrial development – £6,912 per 100 square metres
- B8 Warehousing – £1,715 per 100 square metres

Based on an indicative 80,000sq.m development, with 60,000sq.m as B2 industrial and 20,000sq.m B8 warehousing, this would result in a contribution to junction improvements of £4.5m. It should be noted that this assessment only assumes contributions to the improvement of two junctions, although the traffic impacts from development of the site may well be much wider.

7.1.33 It is important that the site is also well served by public transport and as such the site should also contribute towards public transport provision. The level set out below in Table 5 assumes 45% of the total public transport package for South West Maidenhead is funded by the AL14 site.

7.1.34 Based on current day information the total contribution from the Triangle site is summarised in Table 5 below.

¹⁴ Based on updated traffic modelling to inform the SPD

*South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)*

Table 5 - Section 106 contributions from the AL14 Triangle Site

Nature of Infrastructure mitigation	Indicative Cost
Walking, cycling provision	£5.3m
Public Transport improvements	£0.8m
Junction improvements	£4.5m
Total	£10.6m

The final level of contribution in relation to the junction improvements and public transport will depend on the land use mix of the proposed development on the Triangle site.

The Housing Site (AL13)

7.1.35 The contribution from the Triangle site reduces the total funding gap to about £36.8m – see Table 6 below.

Table 6 - Remaining Funding Gap

	Based on indicative costs only
Funding Gap	£47.4m
Less	
Contribution from Triangle Site	£10.6m
Equals	
Remaining Funding Gap	£36.8m

This should be funded by additional section 106 contributions from the housing site (AL13). As it stands, this is £36.8m. This amounts to around £14.1k per dwelling.

7.1.36 In terms of the approach to distributing this remaining funding gap across the different landowner/developer interests on the AL13 site

it is considered that a contribution based on the square metres of development would be the most equitable way of distributing the contributions across different developers/landowner interests across the site. Viability work undertaken to inform this SPD modelled a total floorspace figure of 220,258 sq m, having regard to the policy for the site and the guidance in the draft SPD. As a guide, based on the funding gap for the residential development, this amounts to around £167 per square metre S106 contribution. This would apply to all types of residential

development. Development proposals that provide this level of section 106 contribution would be considered to meet the policy requirements for ensuring they are providing a proportionate contribution towards the comprehensive delivery of necessary infrastructure. It is important to note that financial contributions towards infrastructure from development within the AL13 allocated area also apply to any smaller scale housing development that may be proposed within the allocated area.

- 7.1.37 The figures set out above provide an indication of the level of additional S106 contributions required. This will need to be kept under review in the light of changing costs and as schemes evolve, including indexing, and the level of contributions received and committed. Updates to the funding position and funding gap will be published on the Council's website as and when necessary.

More Complex Comprehensive Approach

- 7.1.38 A more complex but comprehensive alternative to the Council's preferred approach involves specific items of infrastructure provision that are identified in this SPD being delivered through section 106 agreements with individual developers negotiating with the Council their proportionate contributions to that provision. Developers will need to undertake their own assessments of the wider impact of their development on a range of different types of infrastructure and may need to contribute to a wider set of infrastructure improvements. CIL receipts would be used to fund some elements of the infrastructure identified in this SPD, but not all the CIL receipts arising from development in the SWMPMA would be retained for use in South West Maidenhead as they would be needed to help fund the wider impacts of growth. Developers will need to demonstrate how their infrastructure funding proposals form part of a comprehensive and coordinated approach to infrastructure delivery and ensures delivery of infrastructure ahead of or in tandem with the development it supports.
- 7.1.39 The Council's preferred "simple comprehensive approach" outlined earlier in this section provides a simpler, more streamlined approach that provides more certainty, is likely to result in faster delivery whilst ensuring that developers fund infrastructure on a proportionate basis. However, if developers decide to pursue the more complex approach, then table 7 sets out those elements of infrastructure that the Council expects to be funded by means of section 106 agreements that would be the subject of negotiation. It also highlights those elements of infrastructure it expects to be funded by CIL (and, where appropriate, section 106 contributions from the Triangle site).

*South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document
(Adopted December 2022)*

Table 7 - Split between section 106 funded infrastructure and CIL funded infrastructure under the "Complex Comprehensive Approach"

Infrastructure to be funded/delivered by s106 agreement	Infrastructure to be funded by CIL (and where appropriate s106 from the Triangle site)
Primary School	Secondary school
Harvest Hill Road walk/cycle route	Braywick Road Roundabout improvements (including s106 from Triangle site)
New/improved connections to Braywick Park and Ockwells Park	Thicket Roundabout – A404(M)/A4/Cannon Lane/Henley Road
The following junction improvements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norreys Drive/Shoppenhangers Road • Holyport Road • Braywick Road/Harvest Hill Road 	M4 J8/9 (including s106 from Triangle site)
Public transport to support the area	Wider impacts of growth
Sustainable travel connections to the Triangle site	
On site community facility/building	
Health provision (SW Maidenhead development related proportion)	
Off-site playing pitch provision	
Other assessed impacts as a result of developer assessment of infrastructure impacts	

7.1.40 This approach will require a full assessment of the infrastructure impact of each proposed development, and not rely purely on the infrastructure package identified in this SPD.

7.1.41 For example, in relation to scale and scope of any traffic assessment, it will need to be sufficiently robust to assess both the impacts of their development on the local area and the wider highway network including, but not limited to:

- Local modelling assessments (base year, opening year and forecast year with and without development)
- Microsimulation assessment of areas of the network with more complex and sensitive trip patterns

If the developer chooses this approach, it will need to be undertaken in isolation from the assessment undertaken to support this SPD.

- 7.1.42 These more detailed assessments of impact may mean that there are other assessed impacts that may need to be addressed through section 106 agreements.
- 7.1.43 As referred to earlier in that the relation to the simpler comprehensive approach, it is important to ensure land costs for the various community uses are factored into the funding mechanisms. The advice the Council received in relation to valuing the community land set out potential land costs for the community land based on a per dwelling basis. Broadly speaking these are about £1,637 per dwelling for any development parcels south of Harvest Hill Road or £19.32 per sq m. For the golf course land a deduction of about £2,383 per dwelling or £28.12 per sq m would apply due to the fact that all the land for community uses is within this area, and equalisation is therefore appropriate. These sums would be addressed in section 106 agreements.
- 7.1.44 It is important to note that if developers decide to adopt this more complex alternative, it is not appropriate to mix this approach with the Council's preferred simple comprehensive approach.

Planning Reform

- 7.1.45 The Levelling-Up and Regeneration Bill (2022) proposes the replacement of the current development contributions system based on the Community Infrastructure Levy and section 106 agreements with a new Infrastructure Levy, based on property values. However, the Bill is at the beginning of its progress through Parliament and there will be further secondary legislation to accompany the new system.
- 7.1.46 As such there is no clarity on when the new system will come into force and what transitional arrangements will apply. Given that it is anticipated that planning applications are likely to come forward for parts of the South West Maidenhead area before the new system comes into force, this guidance has been prepared on the basis of the current CIL and section 106 system. Clearly, there may need to be updates to the guidance in due course to reflect the changing system.

7.2 Timing and Phasing

Infrastructure Delivery Timing

That infrastructure should be delivered in a timely manner, in advance of or in tandem with development, to ensure that the impact of development is addressed at the right time.

In relation to the provision of infrastructure to support sustainable modes of travel, the focus should be the introduction of provision early in the development/relevant phase of development to ensure sustainable travel habits are embedded early on.

BLP links: QP1b (5a, c), IF1

Other Links: Corporate Plan

7.2.1 The precise timing of the delivery of infrastructure will be determined by the individual planning applications and the related overall delivery timetable for the housing and employment development. However, the following elements of infrastructure are priorities for early delivery:

- Harvest Hill Road walking/cycling route
- Braywick Road pedestrian/cycle crossing to the leisure centre
- Braywick Road roundabout
- Holyport Road A308 improvement
- Public transport measures
- Sustainable travel measures related to the AL14 site

7.2.2 It is anticipated that the secondary school will not be required until towards the end of the Local Plan period, but the primary school will be required earlier but may be built in more than one phase (see Appendix 4 for more details).

7.2.3 Further consideration will need to be given to the timing of the provision of the local centre and the associated community facilities, relative to the timing of residential development and key infrastructure. However, as a principle, the early delivery of the local centre will further assist with new residents using local facilities rather than travelling further afield and help to establish early on the heart of the new neighbourhood. There will also need to be coordination in relation to the timing of the health hub, having regard to the generation of new demand from the residential development.

7.3 Viability

Viability

The starting point for considering the viability of development in the area is the viability assessment work that informed the Borough Local Plan. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), it is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage.

BLP links: IF1

- 7.3.1 Viability assessments to inform the preparation and examination of the Local Plan were undertaken in 2017 with an update in 2019. The 2019 update in particular undertook an assessment of the AL13 housing site based on 2,600 dwellings. It included allowances for CIL and also £32m of section 106 contributions. This level of contributions is broadly in line with the contribution levels for the AL13 housing site identified in this SPD.
- 7.3.2 As part of “sense checking” the emerging SPD, a viability assessment was undertaken in October 2022 of the AL13 site as an update to the 2019 viability assessment of the site undertaken as part of the evidence base for the Borough Local Plan. This new assessment used the same base viability model as that used for the Local Plan, but updated to reflect changes to costs and values, national standards and guidance in the draft SPD. This continued to show that development of the AL13 site is viable.
- 7.3.3 In relation to employment, the 2017 Viability assessment included a generic assessment of large industrial development on a greenfield site and this showed good viability against benchmark land values.

Appendix 1 - Table Illustrating Link Between the Visions, “ High Level” Development Principles, BLP Proforma Requirements, and SPD Principles

SWMPA Vision	Policy QP1b Principles and Requirements	Site Proforma Requirements (See also Appendix 5)	SPD References
A sense of place and distinctiveness will emerge in different ways across the SWMPA.	a. A coordinated and comprehensive approach to development of the Area to avoid piecemeal or ad-hoc development proposals;	AL13 - 1, 12, 15, 18 AL14 - 2, 3, 29, 30 AL15 - 1	Sections 6.3 – 6.6 Sections 7.1 – 7.2
The provision of infrastructure and other functions will contribute in a number of ways to a more sustainable, more distinctive and more desirable part of town.	b. Creation of a distinctive, sustainable, high quality new development which provides a strong and identifiable gateway into Maidenhead from the south;	AL13 - 1, 11 AL14 - 1, 2, 4, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 27 AL15 - 3	Sections 6.2 – 6.3

	<p>c. Provision of the necessary social and physical infrastructure ahead of or in tandem with the development that it supports in order to address the impacts of the new development and to meet the needs of the new residents.</p>	<p>AL13 - 3, 5, 6, 15 AL14 - 9, 31, 32 AL15 - 3</p>	<p>Sections 6.3 – 6.6 Section 7.1 – 7.2</p>
<p>New and existing communities alike will live a greener existence among a flourishing network of green streets and spaces which will accommodate biodiversity and people harmoniously.</p>	<p>d. Development that provides for a balanced and inclusive community and delivers a range of sizes, types and tenures, including affordable housing, in accordance with other policies in the Plan.</p>	<p>AL13 - 1, 13, 14, AL14 - AL15 -</p>	<p>Section 6.5</p>

<p>The choice to live in South West Maidenhead will be a choice to live more sustainably and with this will come the opportunity to live better, more sociable, more connected, and healthier lives.</p>	<p>e. Provision of measures to minimise the need to travel and maximise non-car transport modes, including provision of a multi-functioning green link to create a continuous north-south corridor through the whole SWMSA.</p>	<p>AL13 – 1, 3, 15, 16, 17</p> <p>AL14 – 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 28</p> <p>AL15 – 1, 2, 4, 5</p>	<p>Sections 6.3 and 6.5</p>
	<p>f. Enhancement of existing and provision of new vehicular and non-vehicular connections to and across the SWMSA.</p>	<p>AL13 - 3, 15, 16, 17</p> <p>AL14 - 5, 8, 11</p> <p>AL15 - 1, 2, 4, 5</p>	<p>Sections 6.3 and 6.5</p>

<p>Retaining the existing trees and landscape buffers along the strategic road corridors at the southern end of the SWMPA will maintain the sense of leafy enclosure and new residents will benefit from improved access to and integration with the significant green spaces of Ockwells Park and Braywick Park as well as new and improved blue infrastructure.</p> <p>New and existing communities alike will live a greener existence among a flourishing network of green streets and spaces which will accommodate biodiversity and people harmoniously.</p>	<p>g. A strategic green infrastructure framework and network of green spaces to meet strategic and local requirements, including retention of existing green spaces and edges where possible and provision of new public open space in accordance with the Council's standards.</p>	<p>AL13 - 2, 4, 7, 9, 15 AL14 - 12, 13, 14, 15, 26 AL15 - 6, 8, 9, 10</p>	<p>Sections 6.3 and 6.7</p>
	<p>h. Delivery of a net gain in biodiversity across the area that reflects its existing nature conservation interest.</p>	<p>AL13 - 2, 4, 7, 8 AL14 - 13, 25 AL15 - 7, 8</p>	<p>Section 6.7</p>

<p>In 2019 the Council committed the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead to become carbon neutral by 2050. This challenging commitment will require a proactive approach by many parties, including the residents of Maidenhead. As new communities become established, more sustainable patterns of living will become enshrined to enable new residents to instinctively choose to reduce their environmental impact. The choice to live in South West Maidenhead will be a choice to live more sustainably and with this will come the opportunity to live better, more sociable, more connected, and healthier lives.</p>	<p>i. Measures to reduce climate change and environmental impacts including suitable approaches to sustainable energy, recycling and construction.</p>	<p>AL13 - 5, 10, 19, 20 AL14 - 18, 22, 23, 24 AL15 - 11</p>	<p>Sections 6.3, 6.6 and 6.7</p>
---	--	---	----------------------------------

Appendix 2 - Infrastructure Delivery Schedule

This table sets out the main strategic/off-site elements of the infrastructure requirements and estimates of costs. As explained in section 7.1 of this SPD, these are draft estimates and will be kept under review and are based on a range of different approaches to estimating costs. The costs include land costs. All build costs have been indexed to December 2022 using the CIL index which at October 2022 was 6.9% per year (0.58% per month). Funding sources are based on the split between CIL and section 106 set out under the “alternative complex approach” to infrastructure funding set out in section 7. All figures have been rounded to the nearest £0.1m.

Infrastructure requirement	Estimated cost	Funding Sources	Indicative proportion from other funding sources	Potential amount to be funded from other sources	Delivery by whom	Comments
Junction improvements						
M4 Junction 8/9	£9.3m	CIL S106 (Triangle site) Government funding	n/a	£6.5m	National Highways	Cost based on concept design of £8.9m @ May 2022. 7 months indexing at 0.58% per month. Inclusion in schedule subject to further information from National Highways. Local contribution to the scheme assumed to be a maximum of 30% of scheme cost
Braywick Road roundabout	£9.3m	CIL	0%	£0	RBWM	Based on costed concept scheme design @ May 2022, indexed for 7 months

Infrastructure requirement	Estimated cost	Funding Sources	Indicative proportion from other funding sources	Potential amount to be funded from other sources	Delivery by whom	Comments
		S106 (Triangle site)				
Norreys Drive/ Shoppenhangers Rd	£4.2m	S106	0%	£0	RBWM	Based on costed concept scheme design @ Apr 2022, indexed for 8 months.
Thicket Roundabout (A404M/A4)	£3.1m	CIL	0%	£0	RBWM (in consultation with National Highways)	Based on costed concept scheme design @April 2022, indexed for 8 months
Holyport Road	£0.5m	S106	0%	£0	RBWM	Based on costed concept scheme design @ Apr22, indexed for 8 months
Braywick Road/Harvest Hill Road junction	£3.0m	S106	0%	£0	RBWM	Preliminary estimate of £3.0m @May 2022, reduced by £140k to avoid double counting for Braywick

Infrastructure requirement	Estimated cost	Funding Sources	Indicative proportion from other funding sources	Potential amount to be funded from other sources	Delivery by whom	Comments
						Road crossings included in Triangle site walking/cycling measures. Indexed for 7 months
Sub Total	£29.4m			£6.5m		
Sustainable Travel – Walking/Cycling						
Harvest Hill Road walking/cycling route	£5.2m	S106	0%	£0	RBWM	Based on costed concept scheme design @ May 2022. Indexed for 7 months
New crossing of Braywick Road to Leisure Centre	£0.3m	S106	0%	£0	RBWM	Preliminary estimate @ May 2022. Indexed for 7 months
Improved connections to Ockwells Park	£0.8m	S106	0%	£0	RBWM	Preliminary estimate based on bridge refurbishment comparables and improvements to the approaches @ May 2022. Indexed for 7 months

Infrastructure requirement	Estimated cost	Funding Sources	Indicative proportion from other funding sources	Potential amount to be funded from other sources	Delivery by whom	Comments
Sustainable walk/cycle connections to Triangle site	£5.3m	S106	0%	£0	RBWM	Cost based on preliminary scheme design and benchmark costs @ May 2022. Indexed for 7 months
Sub Total	£11.6m			£0m		
Sustainable Travel – Public Transport						
Public transport measures	£1.8m	S106	0%	£0	RBWM/Bus operators	Based on cost estimates for the measures identified in this report @ May 2022. Indexed for 7 months
Sub Total	£1.8m			£0m		
Schools						
Secondary school	£42.3m	CIL Government funding	43%	£16.4m	RBWM	Based on the DfE Scorecard figure including regional adjustment and indexing from Mar 2022- see Appendix 4. Land cost included at £633,174/ha. Land area assumed to be 60% of 9.2ha = 5.52ha. Assume 43% of pupil generation from

Infrastructure requirement	Estimated cost	Funding Sources	Indicative proportion from other funding sources	Potential amount to be funded from other sources	Delivery by whom	Comments
						outside SW Maidenhead and hence funded from elsewhere
Primary School	£27.9m	S106	0%	£0	RBWM	Based on the National School Delivery Cost Benchmark figure including regional adjustment and indexing from Mar 2022- see Appendix 4. Land cost included at £633,174/ha. Land area assumed to be 40% of 9.2ha =3.68ha. All pupil generation due to SW Maidenhead development so should be fully developer funded
Sub Total	£70.2m			£18.2m		
Community facilities						
Community building/facility	£3.1m	S106	0	£0	RBWM/Developers	Based on 900 sq m building costed May 2022, indexed for 7 months.

Infrastructure requirement	Estimated cost	Funding Sources	Indicative proportion from other funding sources	Potential amount to be funded from other sources	Delivery by whom	Comments
						Land cost = 0.4ha @ £633,174 per hectare = £0.25
Health facility	£3.9m	S106 Government / NHS	60%	£2.3m	NHS/RBWM / Developers	Based on 1,000 sq m building costed May 2022, indexed for 7 months. Land cost = 0.4ha @ £633,174 per hectare = £0.25m. Assume 60% of patients from outside of SW Maidenhead and hence funded from elsewhere
Off site playing pitch provision/enhancement	To be confirmed	S106	0	£0	RBWM	Awaiting conclusions from playing pitch strategy
Sub Total	£7.1m			£2.3m		
Overall Total	£120.1m			£27.0m		

Appendix 3 – Affordable Housing and Housing Mix

Affordable Housing

Policy HO3 part (4) of the Borough Local Plan relating to the affordable housing mix states:

“The required affordable housing mix and tenure mix shall be provided in accordance with the Berkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2017, or subsequent affordable needs evidence. This currently suggests a split of 45% social rent, 35% affordable rent and 20% intermediate tenure overall.”

Table 12 of the Borough Local Plan (page 72) sets out the housing size mix by tenure that is set out in the 2016 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for the Eastern Berks and South Bucks HMA – as follows:

Table A3.1 SHMA Housing Mix

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+ bed
Market	5-10%	25-30%	40-45%	20-25%
Affordable	35-40%	25-30%	25-30%	5-10%
All Dwellings	15%	30%	35%	20%

There is more recent evidence on affordable housing needs since the SHMA and the adoption of the Local Plan, particularly in relation to the nature of relets of affordable properties which indicates that alternative mix of affordable dwellings should be provided in order to best meet affordable housing needs. Table A3.2 below sets out the relet data for the Royal Borough over the period October 2020 to September 2022.

Table A3.2 – Relets of Existing Affordable Housing October 2020 – September 2022

	1 bed flat	2 bed flat	2 bed house	3 bed house	4 bed house	
Relets	299	128	25	56	3	511
%	58%	25%	5%	11%	1%	100%

The table shows that over this two-year period, 58% of relets were 1 bed flats which is much higher than the SHMA projection of 35-40%. Only 12% of relets were 3&4 bed houses. As such, the supply of affordable homes coming forward as relets is exceeding the need identified in the SHMA when considered on a proportionate basis. A lower proportion of 1 bed flats is therefore sought in new build developments and a distinction has been made for 2 bed houses which are not highlighted in the SHMA. The proportions for 3 bed houses (30%) and 4 bed houses (10%) are consistent with the SHMA projections and should be a Social Rent or Affordable Rent tenure so that they are affordable to local households in housing need.

Furthermore, analysis of the priority needs of those on the Council’s Housing Register has been undertaken. Table A3.3 below sets out the dwelling type needs for the higher priority needs on the Register.

Table A3.3 Housing Register – Homeless Housing Needs (October 2022)

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed
Bands A and B	34	65	27	15	3
Total 144 (100%)	23%	45%	19%	11%	2%

Homeless housing needs in the above table are those households who have made a homeless application on the Housing Register in priority Bands A and B. Nearly half require permanent 2 bed accommodation but there is also priority demand for 3 bed, 4 bed and 5 bed accommodation.

Houses are a preference for families as they have access to a self-contained garden – this includes 2 bed properties as houses rather than 2 bed flats or 2 bed maisonettes. In addition, the size of bedrooms and number of bedspaces is important to maximise the number of double rooms and family occupancy rather than relying on single rooms. This means that:

- 2 bed properties should be 2x double rooms (4 person)
- 3 bed properties should be 3x double rooms (6 person)
- 4 bed properties should be 4x double rooms (8 person)

Additional factors which have influenced the proposed dwelling mix of affordable housing, are clarified below:

- (i) There are families in temporary accommodation who need permanent housing in the form of 3/4/5 bed houses. The average length of stay in temporary accommodation for a family is far longer than a 1 or 2 bed household due to the scarcity of suitable housing (only 12% of relets in the table above are 3&4 bed houses).
- (ii) There is scarce availability of 3/4/5 bed houses in the private rented sector at or below the Local Housing Allowance rent level.
- (iii) There is a significant cost to the council to place households in temporary accommodation.
- (iv) New build 3/4/5 bed houses enables a “chain of lettings” whereby smaller affordable dwellings can be released for smaller households in housing need without relying on new build.
- (v) The SHMA affordable housing projections do not breakdown “2 bed” into 2 bed flats and 2 bed houses, so an assessment has been made based on local evidence of housing need.
- (vi) 2 bed houses are preferable to 2 bed flats for families as they normally have more usable floorspace and a private garden. Even if the number of children does not

increase, children growing older are socially and practically more easily accommodated in a house rather than a flat.

As a result, as set out in Table 1 para 6.5.6 of the SPD, the following dwelling mix for affordable housing is sought. This continues to seek the same overall tenure mix set out in the Borough Local Plan Policy HO3(4) but seeks a lower proportion of 1 bed flats and a higher proportion of 2 bed houses compared to the SHMA mix, for reasons set out above.

	1 bed flat	2 bed flat	2 bed house	3 bed house	4 bed house	
Rent • Social Rent 45% • Affordable Rent 35%	10%	10%	20%	30%	10%	80% (45%) (35%)
Shared ownership	5%	10%	5%	-	-	20%
	15%	20%	25%	30%	10%	100%

General Housing Mix

Policy HO2 of the Borough Local Plan states:

1. *“The provision of new homes should contribute to meeting the needs of current and projected households by having regard to the following principles:*
 - (a) *provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes, reflecting the most up to date evidence as set out in the Berkshire SHMA 2016, or successor documents. Where evidence of local circumstances/market conditions demonstrates an alternative housing mix would be more appropriate, this will be taken into account*
 - (b) *.....”*

The SHMA housing mix is set out in Table A3.1 above and reproduced in Table 12 of the Borough Local Plan.

As part of the evidence submitted to the Borough Local Plan examination, analysis was undertaken of the likely dwelling mix of the Local Plan allocations against the SHMA overall housing mix¹⁵. This is summarised in Table 3.4 below:

¹⁵ See Document RBWM-078 Note re Housing Mix – available on the following webpage:
<https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/home/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/emerging-plans-and-policies/draft-borough-local-plan/examination-local-plan/councils-documents>

Table A3.4 SHMA Dwelling Mix Compared with RBWM Housing Allocation Estimates re Dwelling Mix

	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4+ Bedroom
A SHMA Target Percentage	15%	30%	35%	20%
B SHMA Target from Allocations	1,141	2,283	2,663	1,522
C RBWM Estimate from Allocations	1,743	2,961	1,908	997
D RBWM Estimate Percentage	22.91%	38.91%	25.08%	13.10%
E Over/Under SHMA Target	+602	+678	-755	-525

It indicates that the allocations in the Borough Local Plan were likely to deliver a higher proportion of 1 and 2 bed homes than the SHMA analysis suggests is needed, and a lower proportion of 3 and 4 bed homes.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the nature of the housing supply in Maidenhead in particular is for a high proportion of flats, due to the concentration of a significant number of allocations in the town centre growth location. A review of the housing allocations identified in Policy HO1 of the Borough Local Plan shows a total of 2,670 homes to be provided on town centre sites (which are likely to be almost exclusively for flats) out of a total 5,929 in total in Maidenhead. As such it is important that the opportunity should be taken to deliver a good proportion of houses on what is by far the largest greenfield site in Maidenhead, whilst taking advantage of its sustainable location to deliver higher density development where appropriate on the site.

Having regard to this evidence and local circumstances, as the single largest greenfield allocation in the Borough Local Plan, an appropriate housing mix on the AL13 site is one which takes every opportunity to deliver 3 and 4 bed homes, whilst recognising that the northern end of the site in particular and the area around the local centre provides an opportunity to deliver higher density development given their particularly sustainable location.

Appendix 4 - Education Provision

The Borough Local Plan proforma for the AL13 housing allocation in South West Maidenhead indicates that development of the site is required to provide a seven forms of entry secondary school and a four forms of entry primary school, as well as necessary nursery and early years provision. The schools should be co-located on a shared site totalling a minimum of 9.2 ha within or in close proximity to the local centre. These facilities should be capable of dual use as community facilities.

This appendix provides further information on the need for the school provision and the cost of that provision.

Need for new school places

As part of preparing the SPD, projections have been undertaken of the likely pupil yield for both primary and secondary school aged children, based on the planned housing growth in the area.

Plans for new school provision on AL13 South West Maidenhead are for:

- Up to four forms of entry (FE) of primary school provision. This is 120 places in each year group, and 840 places overall. The primary school will also have space for a 78 place nursery/early years provision.
- Seven FE of secondary school provision. This is 210 places in each year group, plus a sixth form of 258. This makes a total of 1,308 places overall.

New primary school

Pupil yields work indicates that the proposed new housing on the AL13 site would yield a maximum of around 121 pupils (4 forms of entry) at Reception and attending a borough school. This requires a four form entry school to accommodate those pupils.

Due to the development of the AL13 site over a long period, and the slow build up of pupil yields over time, the need for the number of forms of entry grows alongside the housing growth. Based on current trajectories, school provision would need to be in place to accommodate the following:

- 1 form of entry – in place by 2028
- 3 forms of entry – in place by 2031
- 4 forms of entry – in place by 2033

These timings will need to be kept under review in the light of progress with housing delivery (including any changing dwelling mix) and updated pupil projections.

As such it is likely that the school would be built in phases, with the site, core facilities and classrooms for one or two forms of entry built first. Additional accommodation would then be added to house the third and fourth forms of entry as the demand comes forward.

The scale of the development on the AL13 site means that the demand for primary school places can be considered independently of capacity in the surrounding areas, as most parents want to attend their local primary school. Although birth rates have been falling,

the demographic situation remains fluid due to changing patterns of internal and international migration. There are also significant numbers of new dwellings planned elsewhere in Maidenhead. It is not anticipated that the proposed AL13 primary school will be used to address demand from elsewhere in the Maidenhead area. Overall, the maximum yield at Reception from all the proposed completions in the period from 2022/23 to 2032/33 in the Maidenhead area is expected to be 7.3 forms of entry.

New secondary school

The proposed new housing on the AL13 site is not expected to generate sufficient demand for a secondary school by itself. Assuming a similar level of demand to primary, slightly over half of the 210 places per year group would be filled by pupils living in the new development.

The proposed new school is, however, intended to help meet the anticipated additional demand arising from new housing across the Maidenhead area, as set out in the borough's Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Secondary age pupils tend to travel further to their schools, and it is not unreasonable to assume that the new school would serve pupils from outside the AL13 boundary.

It is also very likely that the secondary school would not be needed until later in the Local Plan period, as pupil yield data suggests a significant delay before maximum secondary yields are achieved.

Costs of Schools

Table 1 sets out estimated costs of providing the two schools, based on (i) the National School Delivery Cost Benchmarking, with regional adjustment and indexed to December 2022. The DfE also provides estimated costs of new school provision in its annual Scorecards. Table 2 sets out the estimated costs per place. These figures do not include any allowance for the cost of land.

The regional adjustment, which is applied to the National School Delivery Cost Benchmarking, is 1.08 for the South East. This adjustment is already included in the DfE Scorecard figures.

The initial costs from both the benchmarking and scorecards have been indexed to March 2022. Tables 1 and 2 further index those costs to December 2022, based on the CIL index rate, which is the same as the BCIS All Tender Index. The annual index increase of 6.9% has been pro-rated to 5.18% for the nine months from March to December 2022.

The National School Delivery Cost Benchmarking figures are preferred in general. The DfE Scorecard figures are currently based on projects reported in 2015/16 and 2017/18, adjusted for inflation. However, the benchmarking data does not yet include secondary schools, as too few have been built nationally for inclusion in that dataset.

Table 3 provides the estimated cost of the secondary school provision, adjusted to the level of demand for secondary school places arising from the AL13 development. This is 754 places; 605 places in the main school and 149 in the sixth form. This is based on 121 places in year groups 7 to 11; equivalent to the primary yield at Reception (121 x 5 = 605). Sixth form numbers are calculated at 149, using the same staying on rates as used for the 1,308 places secondary school. 605 + 149 = 754.

Table 1: estimated total costs for new school provision

	National School Delivery Cost Benchmarking (2022)¹⁶	DfE Scorecards (2022)¹⁷
Cost of new school		
New primary school (840 + 78 nursery = 918 places)*:	£22.5m	£19.8m
with regional adjustment:	£24.3m	£21.4m
cost indexed to Dec. 2022	£25.6m	£22.5m
New secondary school (1,308 places):	n/a	£34.1m
with regional adjustment:	n/a	£36.9m
cost indexed to Dec. 2022	n/a	£38.8m
Total (including regional adjustments and indexed to December 2022) (2,148 places):	n/a	£61.3m

Table 2: estimated costs per place for new school provision

	National School Delivery Cost Benchmarking* (2022)	DfE Scorecards (2022)
Cost per new school place		
New primary school place:	£24,524	£21,559
with regional adjustment:	£26,486	£23,283
cost indexed to Dec. 2022	£27,858	£24,489
New secondary school place:	n/a	£26,105
with regional adjustment:	n/a	£28,194

¹⁶ Pages 11, 13 and 20, *National School Delivery Cost Benchmarking*, Hampshire County Council, May 2022.

¹⁷ DfE Scorecards - [LA School Places Scorecards \(shinyapps.io\)](https://shinyapps.io), DfE, 2022

cost indexed to Dec. 2022	n/a	£29,654
---------------------------	-----	---------

Table 3: estimated costs per place for new secondary school provision (South West Maidenhead proportion of costs)

Cost of new school (AL13 share)	National School Delivery Cost Benchmarking* (2022)	DfE Scorecards (2022)
New secondary school (754 places):	n/a	£19.7m
with regional adjustment:	n/a	£21.4m
cost indexed to Dec. 2022	n/a	£22.5m

Appendix 5 - Borough Local Plan Policy QP1b and Site Proformas for Sites AL13, AL14 and AL15

6

Quality of Place

6.7 Policy QP1b South West Maidenhead Strategic Placemaking Area

Policy QP 1b

QP1b South West Maidenhead strategic placemaking area

1. The South West Maidenhead Strategic Area (SWMSA), as defined on the Policies Map, is the focus for a significant proportion of the Borough's housing, employment and leisure growth during the Plan period and should be delivered as a high quality, well-connected, sustainable development in accordance with the key principles and requirements set out below and in accordance with other relevant policies in the Development Plan.
2. The SWMSA comprises the following allocated sites:

Ref	Site	Use
AL13	Desborough, Harvest Hill Road, South West Maidenhead	Approximately 2,600 homes plus new local centre
AL14	The Triangle site (land south of the A308(M), west of Ascot Road and north of the M4)	Strategic employment site for new general industrial and warehousing floorspace
AL15	Braywick Park, Maidenhead	Mixed use strategic green infrastructure space accommodating indoor and outdoor sports facilities, public park, special needs school and wildlife zone

Table 5 Allocated sites in South West Maidenhead strategic placemaking area

The above allocations are identified on the Policies Map. Detailed site specific requirements for each site are set out in Appendix C and form part of this policy.

3. To ensure that development in the SWMSA as a whole comes forward in a strategic and comprehensive manner, planning applications on individual land parcels should accord with the principles and requirements set out in the Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), incorporating a masterplan and approach to the approval of design codes; phasing of development and infrastructure delivery for the SWMSA as a whole.
4. The Development Framework SPD will be produced by the Council in partnership with the developers, landowners, key stakeholders and in consultation with the local community.

Quality of Place

6.7 Policy QP1b South West Maidenhead Strategic Placemaking Area

Policy QP 1b

QP1b South West Maidenhead strategic placemaking area

1. The South West Maidenhead Strategic Area (SWMSA), as defined on the Policies Map, is the focus for a significant proportion of the Borough's housing, employment and leisure growth during the Plan period and should be delivered as a high quality, well-connected, sustainable development in accordance with the key principles and requirements set out below and in accordance with other relevant policies in the Development Plan.
2. The SWMSA comprises the following allocated sites:

Ref	Site	Use
AL13	Desborough, Harvest Hill Road, South West Maidenhead	Approximately 2,600 homes plus new local centre
AL14	The Triangle site (land south of the A308(M), west of Ascot Road and north of the M4)	Strategic employment site for new general industrial and warehousing floorspace
AL15	Braywick Park, Maidenhead	Mixed use strategic green infrastructure space accommodating indoor and outdoor sports facilities, public park, special needs school and wildlife zone

Table 5 Allocated sites in South West Maidenhead strategic placemaking area

The above allocations are identified on the Policies Map. Detailed site specific requirements for each site are set out in Appendix C and form part of this policy.


3. To ensure that development in the SWMSA as a whole comes forward in a strategic and comprehensive manner, planning applications on individual land parcels should accord with the principles and requirements set out in the Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), incorporating a masterplan and approach to the approval of design codes; phasing of development and infrastructure delivery for the SWMSA as a whole.
4. The Development Framework SPD will be produced by the Council in partnership with the developers, landowners, key stakeholders and in consultation with the local community.

Quality of Place

5. The design and delivery of development within the SWMSA should adhere to the following key principles and requirements:
 - a. A coordinated and comprehensive approach to development of the Area to avoid piecemeal or ad-hoc development proposals;
 - b. Creation of a distinctive, sustainable, high quality new development which provides a strong and identifiable gateway into Maidenhead from the south;
 - c. Provision of the necessary social and physical infrastructure ahead of or in tandem with the development that it supports in order to address the impacts of the new development and to meet the needs of the new residents.
 - d. Development that provides for a balanced and inclusive community and delivers a range of sizes, types and tenures, including affordable housing, in accordance with other policies in the Plan.
 - e. Provision of measures to minimise the needs to travel and maximise non-car transport modes, including provision of a multi-functioning green link to create a continuous north-south corridor through the whole SWMSA.
 - f. Enhancement of existing and provision of new vehicular and non-vehicular connections to and across the SWMSA,
 - g. A strategic green infrastructure framework and network of green spaces to meet strategic and local requirements, including retention of existing green spaces and edges where possible and provision of new public open space in accordance with the Council's standards.
 - h. Delivery of a net gain in biodiversity across the area that reflects its existing nature conservation interest.
 - i. Measures to reduce climate change and environmental impacts including suitable approaches to sustainable energy, recycling and construction.

Site Allocation Proformas

AL13: Desborough, Harvest Hill Road, South West Maidenhead



Allocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 2600 residential units. Educational facilities including primary and secondary schools. Strategic public open space, formal play and playing pitch provision. Multi-functional community hub including retail as part of a Local Centre
Site Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 89.93 ha
<p>Site Specific Requirements</p> <p>Development of the site will be required to:</p> <p>In addition to the requirements set out in other policies in this plan, particularly those in Policy QP1b: Placemaking Principles for South West Maidenhead Strategic Area, the development of the site will be required to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Create two new distinct neighbourhoods, each forming a clear sense of place and sustainable function: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The northern neighbourhood will be orientated towards the town centre making the most of proximity to the railway station and town centre facilities. Here, building heights, densities and typologies will reflect those in the town centre and will promote patterns of living which reduce reliance on the car Residential development in the southern neighbourhood will be focused around a new local centre on or near to Harvest Hill Road, where services and facilities are concentrated and housing densities and building heights of 4 to 6 storeys reflect the area's accessibility and contribute to its vibrancy. Residential areas will reduce in density away from the Local Centre, allowing for the provision of family homes with gardens whilst retaining a high quality network of connections 	

Site Allocation Proformas

C

2. Create a dense and high quality green and blue infrastructure network across the site capable of supporting biodiversity, recreation, food production and leisure functions
3. Provide a highly connected green spine running from the northern edge near the railway station through the northern neighbourhood, the central green space, the southern neighbourhood, the Local Centre and south towards the employment site. The spine will carry the main sustainable public transport, biodiversity and green infrastructure networks and be intensively connected with the rest of the site. It will not carry cars or other private means of vehicular transport
4. Provide a central green area combining existing ecological assets and new publicly accessible spaces, retaining the existing public right of way across the golf course and including measures to enhance biodiversity, will create a distinction between the northern and southern neighbourhoods
5. Provide a range of services and facilities within the Local Centre including local convenience retail, leisure, community facilities, including space for police, health, and local recycling
6. Provide a seven forms of entry secondary school and a 4 forms of entry primary school, as well as necessary nursery and early years provision. The schools should be co-located on a shared site totalling a minimum of 9.2 ha within or in close proximity to the Local Centre. These facilities should be capable of dual use as community facilities
7. Retain Rushington Copse, together with other mature trees and hedgerows where possible, and include mitigation measures, including buffer zones where necessary, to protect trees from the impacts of development
8. Safeguard protected species and conserve and enhance the biodiversity of the area in addition to providing net biodiversity gain across the site and adjoining open spaces within the South West Maidenhead Strategic Area (SWMSA) as a whole
9. Retain and reinforce the tree landscape buffers to the A404(M) and A308(M) and along all of the site boundaries to maintain the sense of a leafy enclosure and setting to the development
10. Provide appropriate mitigation measures to address the impacts of noise and air quality in order to protect residential amenity
11. Retain long distance views to and within the site, with particular regard to the impact of tall buildings on existing long distance views and the amenity of existing properties surrounding the sites
12. Conserve and enhance the setting of the nearby Scheduled Ancient Monument to the south of the A308(M) at Moor Farm, Holyport
13. Provide 30% affordable housing in each planning application containing residential development
14. Provide 5% of market housing units as custom and self build plots (fully serviced)
15. Enhance access to and within the site in accordance with Policy QP1b: Placemaking Principles for South West Maidenhead Strategic Area, including
 - a. Strengthening east west connections across the site
 - b. An access to the north of the site from the existing Golf Course access on Shoppenhangers Road
 - c. The exploration of a new vehicular link between Shoppenhangers Road and Braywick Road that would provide an additional access into the site and deliver environmental and public realm improvements to the south of the railway station
 - d. The creation of attractive and legible direct links from the northern part of site to the railway station and beyond into the town centre
 - e. Making Harvest Hill Road the main vehicular access into and through the new residential development area. Improvements to its junctions with Shoppenhangers Road and Braywick Road will be required for vehicular traffic and such improvements should make better provision for safe pedestrian and cycle crossings
 - f. Where east-west connections cross existing road corridors, improvements to pedestrian and cycle crossings are required. The design of public realm, landscaping and tree planting around the public right of way which crosses the Golf Course should be used to increase the prominence of the right of way where it meets Shoppenhangers Road and Braywick Road
 - g. A safe, attractive green link between this site and the new leisure facilities and existing open space at Braywick Park should be established and improvements made to the non-vehicular crossing over the A404(M) to improve the attractiveness of the link from the Site to Ockwells open space
 - h. Further discussion is needed, including with Highways England, over the feasibility of a pedestrian and cyclist bridge over the A308(M), and if deliverable, this should create a distinctive landmark on the approach to Maidenhead and facilitate the safe movement of pedestrians and cyclists between the Triangle site and South West Maidenhead. Alternatively, if demonstrated not to be feasible, alternative sustainable access options would need to be explored and implemented that


Site Allocation Proformas

provide comparable benefits for the movement of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users in the area

- i. Opportunities to create a relationship and access between this site and existing residential areas to the south-east and south-west should be explored to provide access for existing residents to the new development and its facilities and green space
16. Promote sustainable travel and mitigation measures such as improved public transport provision and walking and cycling routes to mitigate the impact of development on the Maidenhead Town Centre Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)
 17. Ensure that the development is well-served by public bus routes/demand responsive transport/other innovative public transport solutions, with appropriate provision for new bus stop infrastructure, such that the bus is an attractive alternative to the private car for local journeys
 18. Undertake a minerals assessment to assess the viability and practicality of prior extraction of the minerals resource as the site falls within a Minerals Safeguarding Area
 19. Consider flood risk as part of a Flood Risk Assessment as the site is partially located within Flood Zone 2 and larger than one hectare
 20. Demonstrate the sustainable management of surface water runoff through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in line with policy and best practice; any proposed surface water discharge must be limited to greenfield runoff rates.

Site Allocation Proformas

C

AL14: The Triangle Site (land south of the A308(M) west of Ascot Road and north of the M4), Maidenhead


Allocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Industrial/Warehousing uses
Site Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25.70 ha (Note: not all of the site will be developed for employment purposes due to flood risk and other constraints)
Site Specific Requirements	
Development of the site will be required to:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be considered as a gateway site to the town of Maidenhead and an important highly visible part of a wider South West Maidenhead growth area Facilitate comprehensive development and effective placemaking in the South West Maidenhead Area In line with Policy ED1, provide a suitable and sustainable mix of B2 and B8 uses Explore how best to make efficient use of the site, which may include some E(g)(iii) space above industrial uses Promote sustainable travel and mitigation measures such as improved public transport provision and walking and cycling routes to mitigate the impact of development on the Maidenhead Town Centre Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) Ensure that the development is well-served by public bus routes/demand responsive transport/other innovative public transport solutions, with appropriate provision for new bus stop infrastructure, such that the bus is an attractive alternative to the private car for local journeys, including to railway stations Provide adequate vehicle and cycle parking provision proportionate to and in line with the implemented sustainable transport measures Provide pedestrian and cycle links to Desborough (AL13) with connectivity to the surrounding area and Maidenhead Town Centre Address impacts of vehicle movements on Ascot Road and Braywick Road roundabout 	

Site Allocation Proformas

10. Further discussion is needed, including with Highways England, over the feasibility of a pedestrian and cyclist bridge over the A308(M), and if deliverable, this should create a distinctive landmark on the approach to Maidenhead and facilitate the safe movement of pedestrians and cyclists between the Triangle site and South West Maidenhead. Alternatively, if demonstrated not to be feasible, alternative sustainable access options would need to be explored and implemented that provide comparable benefits for the movement of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users in the area
11. Enhance vehicular and non-vehicular access to and within the site in accordance with Policy QP1b: Placemaking Principles for South West Maidenhead Strategic Area
12. Provide high quality green and blue infrastructure across the site at both ground and upper levels. This should include green walls and roofs, sitting out areas for employees and robust and generous provision of landscaping in vehicle parking areas
13. Treat the existing water course on the site in a sensitive way to enhance biodiversity and ecosystem health
14. Retain all valuable trees and reinforce the tree landscape buffers to the A308(M) and M4 and along all of the site boundaries to maintain the sense of a leafy enclosure and setting to the development
15. Strengthen the boundary to the remaining Green Belt to ensure it is defensible and permanent, for example through landscape planting or a tree belt
16. Be of a high quality design that supports the character and function of the surrounding area
17. Be designed sensitively to consider the privacy and amenity of neighbouring residential properties
18. Provide appropriate mitigation measures to address any impacts of the site in terms of noise, pollution and air quality on adjoining residential areas
19. Ensure that building heights and densities reflect those of the surrounding area
20. Consider and retain long distance views to and from the site, particularly the impact of tall buildings on historic views and the amenity of existing properties surrounding the sites
21. Address topographical issues across the site
22. Address fluvial flooding issues, including by avoiding any built development within Flood Zone 3b areas which are located to the north and west of the site. Any development should be supported by a robust Flood Risk Assessment, demonstrating that the development would manage flood risk on site without increasing flood risk elsewhere and taking account of the impacts of climate change
23. Address surface water flooding and potential risks to groundwater
24. Demonstrate the sustainable management of surface water runoff through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in line with policy and best practice; any proposed surface water discharge must be limited to greenfield runoff rates
25. Conserve and enhance local biodiversity and local Priority Habitat areas
26. Provide high quality green landscaping surrounding the site
27. Provide a high quality public realm
28. Be supported by an appropriate Travel Plan
29. Retain, conserve and enhance the setting of the nearby the Scheduled Ancient Monument to the south of the A308(M) at Moor Farm, Holyport
30. Provide appropriate Archaeological Assessment
31. Provide strategic waste water drainage infrastructure
32. Connect to/provide all required utilities.

Site Allocation Proformas

AL15: Braywick Park, Maidenhead



Allocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A mixed use Strategic Green Infrastructure site to serve Maidenhead, providing a sports hub, a public park, a special needs school and multi-use games area, a 'wildlife zone' comprising the Braywick Local Nature Reserve and a Site of Special Scientific Interest. The site will remain in the Green Belt. (Note: planning permission has already been granted for the leisure centre and the special needs school/multi use games centre and these have been either completed/occupied or are under construction.)
Site Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.1 ha
<p>Site Specific Requirements</p> <p>Development of the site will be required to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be a highly connected place that provides links to surrounding residential areas, both existing and proposed (including AL13, Desborough), the town centre and improved links between the sports hub to the west and the publicly accessible parts of the nature reserve/Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) to the east Provide cycle and pedestrian links to be north-south (for example to the town centre) and east-west (for example to AL13, Desborough and the nature reserve) Provide a range of sporting facilities (indoor and outdoor) to create a high quality strategic sporting hub for Maidenhead. This will include a leisure centre to replace the Magnet Leisure Centre which is to be decommissioned Encourage links between the new proposed school and sporting facilities at Braywick Park, including the new leisure centre Encourage improved public transport access for users of the site Be a major focus of Borough's green and blue infrastructure network, delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits 	

Site Allocation Proformas

7. Preserve and enhance biodiversity by avoiding built development next to existing areas of biodiversity value, including the Nature Reserve/SSSI and the cemetery which will prevent noise/light pollution from affecting wildlife in accordance with the objectives of the Bray to Eton Pits and Meadow Biodiversity Opportunity Area
8. Take opportunities for setting pitches in woodland or landscaping, improving planting around buildings and car parks and providing trees and hedgerows along newly created footpaths wherever possible
9. Maintain rural open character of site that is part of the green wedge extending in from the south towards the heart of the town centre
10. Extend, maintain and reinforce the existing soft boundary character along Braywick Road which is comprised of trees and landscaping with intermittent views into the Park
11. Avoid built development in areas subject to flooding and address surface water flooding issues.

www.rbwm.gov.uk



Royal Borough
of Windsor &
Maidenhead

South West Maidenhead Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Statement

December 2022

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2 SPD preparation and early stakeholder and community engagement	4
3 Summary of the main issues raised by stakeholders during the preparation of the draft SPD, and how those issues were addressed in the draft SPD	6
4 Consultation on the draft SPD – Summer 2022	9
5. Main Issues Raised in Consultation on the Draft SPD and Main Changes to the SPD.....	11
Appendix 1 - South West Maidenhead SPD Early Public Engagement Report	14
1. Purpose of Engagement.....	15
2. What Engagement was undertaken and when?	15
3. How were people made aware of the engagement?	15
4. Response to the engagement	16
5. Summary of the Issues Raised (meeting and online form)	16
Green Belt.....	17
Housing.....	17
Community	18
Transport	19
Utilities.....	21
Biodiversity	21
Climate Change/Sustainable Development	22
Trees	24
Green Infrastructure.....	24
Other Environmental Issues	25
Other	25
Appendix 2 - Summary of Representations on the Draft South West Maidenhead Development Framework SPD and the Council’s response.....	28

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This statement sets out the work involved in preparing the South West Maidenhead Development Framework SPD including the early engagement to inform the preparation of the draft SPD and consultation on the draft SPD and the Council's response to those issues.
- 1.2 In line with Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) 2012 regulations and with the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Revised Statement of Community Involvement (June 2020), this statement provides details of:
 - (i) who the local planning authority consulted when preparing the supplementary planning document
 - (ii) a summary of the main issues raised by those persons
 - (iii) how those issues have been addressed in preparing the draft and final versions of supplementary planning document (SPD)
- 1.3 The remainder of this statement sets out in the following sections:
 - Section 2 – explains the engagement undertaken to help inform the preparation of the draft SPD
 - Section 3 – summarises the main issues raised in that early engagement and how those issues were addressed in the draft SPD. This is accompanied by Appendix 1 that provides a more detailed summary of the issues raised
 - Section 4 – sets out the engagement undertaken on the draft SPD
 - Section 5 – summarises the main issues raised in the consultation on the draft SPD and the outlines the main changes made to the final SPD as a result. This is accompanied by a lengthy Appendix 2 that summarises all the main issues in the comments received on the draft SPD and sets out the Council's response to those issues.

2 SPD preparation and early stakeholder and community engagement

2.1 As part of preparing the draft SPD, early stakeholder and public engagement took place, including:

- three online public engagement events together with the opportunity for people to submit written comments afterwards
- ongoing engagement with developers/promoters with an interest in sites allocated for development within the area
- a briefing for key agencies and infrastructure providers on the emerging SPD and an opportunity to highlight key issues

2.2 In relation to the online public engagement, there was extensive publicity about the events in advance including writing to nearly 1,000 homes in the vicinity of the main development sites, consulting an extensive list of people on the planning policy consultee database, holding a press briefing (with subsequent articles and publicity about the events on the local media), and regular use of social media to publicise the events.

2.3 The events held on 30th March, 6th April and 13th April 2022 were online briefings sharing the background to the SPD and some emerging issues and early thinking on three topics:

- Community Needs
- Connectivity
- Sustainability and Environment

2.4 There was the opportunity for people to ask questions in the chat bar. A number of these were answered by officers on the night and some were answered in written form and published on the Council's website afterwards. All the comments and questions from the chat bar were captured and reviewed by officers and 27 written responses were submitted via an online form on the RBWM Together website.

2.5 Although the numbers of people attending the online events was limited (ranging from 21–45), a wide range of questions and comments were made during the live events highlighting a wide range of issues. In addition, there were over 300 views of the three events via the RBWM YouTube channel (as at 9/5/22). Further details of the engagement undertaken, and the response received is set out in Appendix 1.

2.6 Early engagement has also taken place through a series of meetings with landowner/developer interests, ensuring that they can take account of emerging thinking on the draft SPD as they start to consider preparing planning applications. This was an opportunity to test emerging thinking on a range of issues, such as certain design principles and aspects of infrastructure provision.

- 2.7 The briefing with key agencies and infrastructure providers was held on 17th May 2022 and was attended by four organisations (Sport England, Historic England, National Highways and Environment Agency), helping them understand the impact of development on infrastructure and to consider appropriate mitigation/enhancements.

3 Summary of the main issues raised by stakeholders during the preparation of the draft SPD, and how those issues were addressed in the draft SPD

3.1 Appendix 1 summarises the main issues raised during the early engagement exercises. Some of the most prevalent views/strongest areas of concern raised at the online events and from the online feedback forms include:

- Concern about loss of Green Belt in Maidenhead
- Concern about the impact on wildlife
- Questions about the ability to deliver biodiversity net gain
- Concern about the potential scale of loss of trees
- The development conflicts with the Council’s Climate & Environment Strategy
- A desire to see net zero carbon development
- Concerns about the potential height of the apartment blocks on the site and impact on nearby properties/general concern about density, ensuring flatted development is “done well” and the need for more green space where there are lots of flats
- Concern to ensure housing affordability and a good housing mix
- Lack of infrastructure to support the development
- Increased traffic volumes and related comments about the impact on various road junctions
- Improvements to public transport service needed and various comments about improving walking and cycling infrastructure
- Concern about the road access points and parking
- Concerns about the control of air pollution and odours during construction and more generally
- Concerns from residents that this consultation is purely a box-ticking exercise.
- Concern that the SPD predetermines the planning application as approved

3.2 Some of the concerns raised relate to the principle of development which has been established through the preparation of the Borough Local Plan. For instance, the fact that the development of sites AL13 and AL14 involve the loss of Green Belt land was a decision made through the Local Plan process and endorsed by the independent planning inspector who examined the Local Plan. Similarly, decisions about the need for the development in relation to housing need, was a decision made at the Local Plan stage. As such these matters cannot be addressed through the SPD.

3.3 However, there are a wide of issues raised that are addressed in the draft SPD. Often these matters are also addressed at a higher level in the site proformas for the individual sites in the Local Plan with the SPD providing further detail and guidance on how they could happen. The way in which the

key issues highlighted in the early engagement are addressed in the SPD is summarised below:

Wildlife and Biodiversity Net Gain – the SPD sets out a hierarchical approach to securing biodiversity net gain, emphasising the importance of maximising biodiversity retention and mitigation on site. The design principles also emphasise the importance of integrating wildlife connectivity into the design of the development. Detailed ecological assessments will follow at the planning application stage.

Trees – the SPD reiterates the requirements of the Local Plan in relation to trees, seeking to maximise retention of trees within the context of the scale of development proposed and strongly encouraging new tree planting. The importance of detailed assessment at the planning application stage is emphasised.

Climate Change and Net Zero Carbon – the SPD sets out a strong expectation that development in the area is net zero carbon (operational) and encourages developers to consider the ‘whole life carbon’ impact of their development. It highlights the relevant supporting policies and strategies.

Height and Density – the design principles in the SPD address the issue of density and the importance of higher density development needing to be accompanied by access to high quality open space. The design principles highlight the relationship between high density development and the north/south green spine through the site, particularly in the northern neighbourhood.

Affordable Housing and Housing Mix – the SPD re-emphasises the affordable housing policy requirements in the Local Plan and provides further guidance in relation to the mix of affordable housing in terms of dwelling size to ensure that the priority needs for affordable housing are best met. The SPD also provides guidance on achieving a good housing mix overall and recognises that to achieve good levels of family housing, different housing typologies may need to be considered – the design section illustrates how this could be achieved.

Infrastructure – various parts of the SPD set out infrastructure requirements for development of the area including community infrastructure and transport infrastructure. An infrastructure schedule is included in an appendix to the SPD and a section of the SPD is set aside to explain how the infrastructure should be delivered and funded.

Traffic – further assessment has been undertaken of the traffic impact of development in the area and a range of resulting off-site highway junction improvements are set out in the SPD. These requirements are included in the infrastructure schedule.

Walking, Cycling and Public Transport – the SPD sets out a number of requirements to ensure that the development is well connected for walking

and cycling, and also for public transport. This is both within the development sites and connections to the wider network walking/cycling and bus networks. The design principles in the SPD provide more detail about how this can be achieved, particularly on key corridors with the development sites.

Road access points – the SPD illustrative framework plan illustrates broadly where these are likely to be and there has been more detailed consideration of the Harvest Hill Road corridor as a key point of access into the AL13 housing development, which is illustrated in more detail in the design principles of the SPD.

Air Pollution – the SPD highlights the issues around pollution and environmental protection and draws attention to key local plan policies that will be to be adhered to at the planning application stage to mitigate impacts relating to construction. More broadly, the focus on achieving modal shift to more sustainable modes of transport and the provision for electric vehicle charging facilities will help to mitigate pollution from the development once it is in place.

- 3.4 In relation to questions and queries about the process, this early engagement has helped to crystallise the issues that we need to address in the SPD, reinforcing and adding detail to the issues raised during the earlier placemaking work and Local Plan engagement. As set out above, the SPD is seeking to address a wide range of issues, providing further guidance on how development should come forward within the context of the policies in the Local Plan, including the proformas for the sites.
- 3.5 The SPD does not predetermine the planning application process, but it is quite deliberately seeking to provide a framework for planning applications to ensure a comprehensive and coordinated approach to development in the area and ensure delivery of infrastructure. There are a range of issues highlighted that are at a more detailed level and would more appropriately be addressed at the planning application stage when more detailed technical assessments have been undertaken to inform the preparation of a detailed scheme.

4 Consultation on the draft SPD – Summer 2022

- 3.1 Consultation on the draft SPD took place between 6 July 2022 and 17 August 2022. This was two weeks longer than required by the Regulations to reflect the fact that the consultation was partly held over the summer holiday period. The approach taken to consultation was consistent with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.
- 3.2 The following steps were taken to publicise the consultation and associated events:
- Letters were sent to nearly 1,000 households in the vicinity of the main development sites
 - Everyone on the planning policy consultation database was notified, mainly by e mail, some by hard copy letter
 - Information was included in the Borough Residents' Newsletter
 - Social media was used to message about the consultation
 - A public notice was placed in the Maidenhead Advertiser (7th July)
 - A press release was issued and there was press coverage of the consultation
- 3.3 All consultation material was made available on the Council website and hard copies were placed in Maidenhead Library.
- 3.4 A number of consultation events were held during the consultation period to help explain the draft SPD and encourage people to write in with their comments. These were:
- Three drop in/exhibition events:
 - Maidenhead Library – 14th July 2.00pm – 6.30pm
 - Maidenhead Library – 20th July 12.30pm – 5.00pm
 - Braywick Leisure Centre – 26th July 2.00pm – 7.00pm
 - An online briefing event – 27th July 7.00pm – 9.00pm
- 3.5 Following the various events, the Council updated its FAQs relating to the SPD and published them on the Council website. Copies of the presentation and recording from the online event were also made available on the website together with the exhibition boards.
- 3.6 During the consultation period people were able to send in their comments in a number of different ways:
- Via the Council's planning consultation portal

- By filling in a form available on-line and returning it by e mailing or post, or by e mailing comments
- By filling in a hard copy form available at Maidenhead library

5. Main Issues Raised in Consultation on the Draft SPD and Main Changes to the SPD

- 5.1 A total of 87 different organisations and individuals submitted written comments on the draft SPD. Many of these submissions were very extensive in nature, covering a wide range of issues in the draft SPD. Appendix 2 sets out a detailed summary of the key issues raised in these comments and includes a list of all the individuals and organisations who commented. It also sets out the Council's response to those issues and, where appropriate, highlights (in bold) where changes have been made to the SPD in response to those comments.
- 5.2 The issues raised were both of a general and detailed or technical nature. Key issues and concerns raised, primarily from the general public, included:
- A general opposition to the development
 - Loss of greenspace and lack of greenspace in the proposed new development
 - Impact on biodiversity and concern that it will not be possible to mitigate the loss
 - Loss of trees to development and associated impacts on climate change and pollution
 - Concern around various traffic impacts of the development of the area, including Harvest Hill Road and the impact on various junctions
 - Concern over increased air pollution and ability to mitigate it
 - Concern about local impacts during the construction period
 - General concern that the scale of development would result in overdevelopment of the area
 - Concern around building heights and density, particularly at the northern end of the golf course site, and its impact on surrounding residential areas
- 5.3 There was a desire from the general public comments to see more detail than the draft SPD set out to provide more certainty and clarity. Some also sought the use of stronger, firmer language in the way some issues are addressed in the SPD. Conversely, there were challenges, particularly (but not entirely) from the development industry, suggesting that the draft SPD was going "too far" and may be seeking to set policy in an SPD which was regarded as inappropriate.
- 5.4 There were a wide range of detailed and technical comments on various aspects of the draft SPD, but focusing on three main elements:
- Design principles
 - Other delivery principles and requirements
 - Infrastructure

A particular focus of the development industry comments was on the infrastructure delivery and funding section of the SPD, highlighting concerns

about the need for certain elements of infrastructure, the costings in the SPD, and the funding mechanisms including whether they were compliant with the relevant regulations.

5.5 Other areas of focus for more detailed comments included:

- Water infrastructure
- Pressure on playing pitch provision in the area
- Housing mix
- Carbon neutral development
- The proposed green spine
- Biodiversity net gain

5.6 In response to the comments received a wide range of changes have been made to the SPD. These are outlined in more detail in bold text in the “response” column of Appendix 2. In summary some of the main changes made to the SPD following consultation are:

- Wording reviewed to ensure consistency with the role of SPDs and to ensure appropriate policy references are clear
- Greater clarity on the requirement for a central green space (as part of the Illustrative Framework Plan in the SPD) and its importance in the transition zone between the two neighbourhoods
- Ensuring guidance refers to the importance of building heights “stepping down” towards the edge of the development and clearer cross referencing to the Building Height and Tall Buildings SPD
- A number of other detailed updates and clarifications in the design section, including in relation to maximising opportunities of natural heating (solar gains) and ventilation through design
- Greater clarity on housing mix guidance and provision of further information to support the approach (see new Appendix 3)
- Further evidence to support the affordable housing size mix guidance in the SPD (see new Appendix 3)
- Further information on the need for the schools, the timing of when they are needed and updated cost estimates (see new Appendix 4)
- New sub-section on playing pitches within the section on open space, highlighting the likely need for contributions to off-site playing pitch provision
- Greater clarity on biodiversity net gain and emphasising the importance of securing best biodiversity outcomes

- Further detail and clarification on the potential approaches to infrastructure delivery, the policy basis, and the respective roles of the community infrastructure levy and section 106 agreements
- An update on expected infrastructure costs, including indexing of costs to the present day, and inclusion of land costs for land for community uses (mainly schools)

5.7 Whilst it has not been possible to make changes to address all comments, not least because the SPD has to be consistent with the policies in the Local Plan, significant changes have been made in finalising the SPD. The SPD will be very important in shaping planning applications for the South West Maidenhead area, and there will be further consultation and engagement on those planning applications as they are prepared and submitted.

Appendix 1 - South West Maidenhead SPD Early Public Engagement Report

www.rbwm.gov.uk



Royal Borough
of Windsor &
Maidenhead

South West Maidenhead SPD Early Public Engagement Report

1. Purpose of Engagement

The Council invited the community to help inform plans for a major development area, known as South West Maidenhead, which will bring forward new homes, community facilities, infrastructure, employment space and improved public access to green space.

2. What Engagement was undertaken and when?

As part of preparing the draft SPD early public engagement took place in the form of three themed online events together with the opportunity for people to submit written comments afterwards. Each event held a presentation and was recorded. The web links to the presentations and event recordings are shown below:

Date	Event	Maximum Live Attendance	You Tube views
30 th March 2022	Community Needs <u>Presentation</u> <u>Event Recording</u>	45	162
6 th April 2022	Connectivity <u>Presentation</u> <u>Event Recording</u>	21	101
13 April 2022	Sustainability and the Environment <u>Presentation</u> <u>Event Recording</u>	27	57

A feedback form was made available on the [RBWM Together website](#) between Wednesday 30 March 2022 and Wednesday 27 April 2022.

A hard copy feedback form was also made available in the Maidenhead library.

3. How were people made aware of the engagement?

There was extensive publicity about the events in advance including the Council writing to nearly 1,000 homes in the vicinity of the main development sites, consulting an extensive list of people on the planning policy consultee database, holding a press briefing (with subsequent articles and publicity about the events on the local media), and regular use of social media to publicise the events.

4. Response to the engagement

Although the numbers of people attending the Live Events was limited (ranging from 21–45), a wide range of questions and comments were made during the live events. In addition, there were over 300 views of the three events via the RBWM You Tube channel (as at 12/5/22).

There were 27 online responses made through the [RBWM Together website](#) mostly from local residents (89%). The remainder made from community groups (7%) and others (4%).

5. Summary of the Issues Raised (meeting and online form)

The following most prevalent views/strongest areas of concern were raised at the online events and from the online feedback forms:

- Concern about loss of Green Belt in Maidenhead
- Concern about the impact on wildlife
- Questions about the ability to deliver biodiversity net gain
- Concern about the potential scale of loss of trees
- The development conflicts with the Council’s Climate & Environment Strategy
- A desire to see net zero carbon development
- Concerns about the potential height of the apartment blocks on the site and impact on nearby properties/general concern about density, ensuring flatted development is “done well” and the need for more green space where there are lots of flats
- Concern to ensure housing affordability and a good housing mix
- Lack of infrastructure to support the development
- Increased traffic volumes and related comments about the impact on various road junctions
- Improvements to public transport service needed and various comments about improving walking and cycling infrastructure
- Concern about the road access points and parking
- Concerns about the control of air pollution and odours during construction and more generally
- Concerns from residents that this consultation is purely a box-ticking exercise.
- Concern that the SPD predetermines the planning application as approved

The following more detailed comments were made from the respondents and analysed by the main topics dealing with Green Belt, Housing, Community, Transport, Utilities, Biodiversity, Climate Change/Sustainable Development, Trees, Green Infrastructure, other Environmental Issues, and other issues.

Green Belt

- Concerns over building on green belt when the BLP policy protects green areas.
- The measurement of the Green Belt area in RBWM and whether the Crown Estate land is included.
- Concern that Maidenhead is losing a large proportion of Green Belt.
- Concern that brownfield sites have been overlooked in favour of releasing Green Belt land for development.
- Suggestion that SPD help guide what might be considered Very Special Circumstances for inappropriate development on Braywick Park, which remains green belt land and proposals to build a football stadium on the land, which is not explicitly mentioned in the AL15 pro forma.
- Concern for amount of green space left after the development of housing, a secondary school and community centre.
- Concerns that the plan isn't protecting green areas - Maidenhead is losing close to half its green belt, including 132 acres at the golf course.
- Concerned that BLP is going to take away 50% of Maidenhead's greenbelt creating impacts of pollution and biodiversity loss unless compensated outside of the development area.

Housing

- Minimum number social housing units required on the site.
- Concerns for the maximum height of the apartment blocks and whose responsibility for managing the amenity land around the development.
- Concern that developers will be able to submit applications with lower than the required 30% affordable homes or with a tenure mix that doesn't meet the expected proportion of social or affordable rent homes, and if they are successful argue it would not be viable to provide these.
- Concern for affordability when currently houses are around 15x average salary. Offering properties at 80% of market rate does not solve this issue. This MUST be addressed in any plan for the future of Maidenhead.
- New homes in Maidenhead will allow local people to stay in the area, and this seems a sensible location given residents can walk to town. Shared ownership homes are a good idea so our children can afford to stay in the area and not have to move away from Maidenhead.
- Concern for mix of houses and flats, and price of apartments.
- People want cheaper terrace style houses rather than flats.
- Example of housing development to provide affordable net-zero housing: <https://passivehouseplus.co.uk/magazine/new-build/stirling-work-the-passive-social-housing-scheme-that-won-british-architecture-s-top-award>
- Concern for location of flats along Shoppenhangers Road or the side of Crescent Dale creating more noise for the retirement home of Crescent Dale.
- The mix of housing should be for a minimum size of two bed properties and more three/four bed properties should be included in the mix of housing to allow space for people working from home.
- Concern about housing delivery if any on AL13 part of the 1,400 will be complete by March 2024 as shown BLP 7.2.13 table 9.

- Question about delivery of policy HO2 stating 5% housing to be fully serviced plots. How many and size of housing?
- The sheer extent and dominant nature of multiple flat developments, both completed, under construction and currently proposed, the construction of more of the same upon Site AL 13 is as plainly excessive as it is inappropriate.
- To then even consider extending such development south of the railway lines in the midst of established residential areas surrounding Site AL13 would be totally destructive and would appear to serve only higher density of development and thus greater profit to RBWM whilst dismissing the interests of those existing residents living in the immediate area of Site AL 13.
- When referring to such as "high quality development" and aspiring to plan for quality of life and a place in which people would wish to live please carefully consider the nature and appearance of approved (by RBWM planning) developments (mainly more and more flat developments) within the town centre plus some beyond the town centre such that might give rise to cause for hope in what is finally to be proposed for Site AL 13.
- The community needs a large amount of social housing as well as affordable and market housing, and this is demonstrated in RBWMs own figures which show affordable needs to be over 60% of new units.
- As many of the new homes as possible as well as the communal facilities should be put into a Community Land Trust, for true affordability and for social and environmental sustainability, for future generations and permanent community benefit. Community ownership of land, homes, facilities, and open space will empower community on a long term basis and enable affordability to be passed down to future generations.
- Suggestion that flats be built similar to those that were built c20 years ago on Shoppenhangers Road are at least a pleasant design and of a suitable scale.

Community

- The site is close to the town centre so has less need for shops and community centre. The space could accommodate more trees and green space.
- Town centre shops are closing so why add them to the site?
- Concerns for insufficient healthcare provision and not included in list of requirements.
- Concern for insufficient police officers in Maidenhead.
- A secondary school is being considered on the site as there is demand for one. There will be a separate consultation for this.
- Residents asked whether Newlands School will move to the Golf course site.
- Secondary school is not required on the site as there is sufficient provision elsewhere and will leave extra green space for locals.
- Concern about sufficient space given to playing fields to support two schools on the golf club site in addition to 2000 homes.
- The new flats in the town centre need more green space built adjacent to them.
- With all the new houses and other facilities going up, there will no doubt be a rise in crime. Resident asked how this will be mitigated.
- The SPD should require access to good quality, preferably outdoor, affordable facilities which should be a priority in the design.
- Parks should be included on the site

- Question on provision allotments and community growing space as can be beneficial in many ways - providing homes for nature, helping people access more sustainable food and helping the country feed itself, outdoor activity and the benefits that provides, and community interaction. Article https://www.bhaf.org.uk/content/about/issues/the-financial-value-benefits-of-allotments?fbclid=IwAR0sd1NJuNnIBMpzJs6C6uR_nXMXQVQUx6QENcAO2bkra_cTg5hb-XBT3fl
- Separate areas for dog walkers, play and ornamental open space. Mini supermarket, drop off and collection for parcels.
- 1. The Alconbury development is really worth looking at. 2. appropriate scale/library/leisure/chemist/GP/places of worship 3. Sport England's local leisure offer is excellent for leisure provision local centres 4. You need a robust up to date Playing pitch strategy and built facilities strategies - the ones you have are now out of date.
- The community needs have been well considered.
- Teenagers have
- Not everyone is sporty - not everyone swims, not everyone does yoga, not everyone that wants to do stuff is over 60! What about the artists, the music lovers, where's the innovation or anything for teens to do in the town. Create youth bars, places where teens can actually go and get involved in the community, in a positive and cool, and relevant way, that is inclusive.
- SW Development Area needs neighbourhood centre to help cater for everyday shopping and other needs of the development and adjacent areas located roughly at mid point of AL13 with pedestrian and vehicular access (including scope for public transport) to /from Shoppenhangers Rd providing connections and better access to the wider area including Larchfield and Desborough Park leading to this part of Maidenhead becoming a more socially cohesive community with enhanced access to nearby greenspace.

Transport

- Concern about the road access points and safe access to Shoppenhangers Road, Rushington Avenue and Braywick Road from the Golf Course site and
- Concern about connectivity between Braywick Road to support East/West of the Golf Course site.
- Lack of infrastructure to support the development in south west Maidenhead. No regard given to the current traffic volumes upon the existing highways network. In particular Harvest Hill Road, Shoppenhangers Road and the Braywick Road. No consideration for increased traffic volumes following the development of the land. RBWM passing the responsibility for highway design and construction to the developers.
- Concern for increased and commercial traffic for the AL14 site and the already busy Ascot Road.
- Quantity of parking per household to be shown in plans.
- Concern that as there is limited parking allocated to each home, cars will be parked all over the place with numbers of at least 2,600 cars if not 4000!
- Concern about safe cycle and pedestrian access along Harvest Hill Road, Ockwells Park, the new Leisure centre etc. It's currently quite dangerous to walk along this road.

- Residents asked whether there was a plan to pedestrianise the lower end of Shoppenhangers Road and instead form a vehicular connection from Shoppenhangers, through the golf course entrance, and down Rushington Avenue.
- Residents request that the promotion of active travel be fully embedded in the design.
- Questions asked about the pedestrianised of the station end of Shoppenhangers Road, and route traffic across the current golf course entrance and into Rushington Avenue.
- Concerns about the high volume of traffic through Holyport on the A330 which is a Conservation Area and the Jealotts Hill development, and protection from heavy goods commercial vehicles. Also, Junction 8/9 of the M4 extra traffic even with the Smart Motorway and the coming of Bray Studios and the housing at Bray Lake, concerns for mitigation of congestion on the A308. How can any of these developments go ahead without the results of the A308 road study being made public and when will it be published?
- Concerns about car sharing scheme and whether residents will be private-car free.
- Concerns about provision of adequate cycle storage, for standard and non-standard (eg. cargo bikes) which can enable households to be car free.
- Concerns that bus use in RBWM is one of the lowest in the country. How will connectivity by public transport be improved especially from the surrounding villages to get cars off the roads which will then alleviate traffic congestion and be more sustainable for the environment?
- Suggestion for free bus travel so people can hop on and off, helps to get them around easily, without waiting for hours and all the bureaucracy that goes into actually getting a bus pass.
- Suggestions for a right turn out of Shoppenhangers Road.
- Right of Way - A full network of inter-connecting footpaths and cycleways must be included in the design. All routes must be accessible for people of determination.
- Vehicle and Bus Routes - The design should not be designed around cars but public transport and rights of way. This will encourage sustainable transport and minimise the impact of vehicles in the area.
- More cycle lanes, more routes, bikes, opportunities for people to walk, without pollution or risk of being squashed by trucks and cars.
- Suggestion for a roundabout or traffic lights between Harvest Hill Rd and Braywick Road avoiding a bottleneck around the entrance of Bray Wick Sports centre.
- Harvest Hill Road is a narrow highway with no footpaths and street lighting. The road is subject to a 40mph speed limit the greater part of its length and 30mph from approximately the Kimbers Lane junction to that with Shoppenhangers Road
- The proposed development of Site AL13 will involve access to and from Harvest Hill Road in terms of both from the north and south sides of same and will add to the volume of traffic utilising this already woefully inadequate highway. Walking and cycling routes would have to be sited adjacent to the far side of these trees and hedgerows to either side of the highway.
- Ensuring adequate charging points for cars, bikes, scooters, segways etc. also better cycling provision both parking and storage. Better wifi infrastructure.
- There should be another pedestrian crossing over the A308 into Braywick Park near the running track entrance to improve pedestrian/cycle access to this area. The A308 is dangerous for pedestrians to try to cross.
- Replace the concrete barrier down the middle of the A308 with wildflower verges/trees to absorb pollution generated by increased traffic.

- People cycling want continuous riding, and to minimise requirements to stop, dismount, or give way to vehicular traffic. Walkers want uninterrupted walking, and to minimise the requirement to cross roads or walk by busy roads. These are some of the things that make walking and cycling pleasant and attractive, and a genuine alternative to car travel. If they are not provided, people are likely to drive instead.
- AL13 bullet 15 mentions the access and connectivity but is vague in terms of solution. Some criteria for crossings are given such as “safe pedestrian and cycle crossings”, but there is no mention of crossing efficiency, uninterrupted walking and cycling, or effect on traffic flow.
- In Planning terms, the most sustainable forms of transport should have the greatest freedom of access and permeability. For example, the traffic light crossing such as that recently installed on the A308 opposite the new Leisure Centre. At peak times, when the crossing is busy with pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, there is a lot of waiting for all users. The solution does not score highly – it’s inefficient, interrupts walking and cycling, and adversely affects traffic flow. Major roads should be permeable by bridges or underpasses, rather than press-button-and-wait traffic light crossings which discourage cyclists and pedestrians and hold up traffic.
- Suggest that cycle tracks are incorporated into the design of the roads for the new development.
- Provision for multiple green corridors for people and wildlife, not just a 'green spine'. An extensive web of tree lined cycleways and footpaths will encourage people to walk and cycle around the site and connect to Braywick, the town centre and Ockwells. Trees and wildlife habitats are just as important for encouraging people to use these paths, as an all weather wide path allowing shared use.
- RBWM has a particularly high number of vehicle journeys for school runs due to the high (highest?) proportion of children attending private schools and therefore travelling longer distances. Concern for the SW site and for the whole of RBWM.

Utilities

- Concern about the capacity of the existing sewage/wastewater infrastructure in south west Maidenhead. An extra 10,000 residents will necessitate a new sewage or water works.

Biodiversity

- Concern for loss of biodiversity particularly, slow worms, deer and other animals being made homeless.
- The requirement for site assessment for any protected species such as slow worms.
- Area that floods in the Triangle south of the A308 (AL14) was proposed to the Council through TVERC that it should be a Local Wildlife Site. Will this area be a LWS in the future?
- Concern that wildlife will move towards the M4 and the town centre through the green spine.
- Concern that developers will not adhere to the biodiversity policy requirements and trees being removed before the biodiversity baseline is measured.
- Concern for Biodiversity net gain when building on Green Belt.
- The Council should be assessing the biodiversity rather than leaving this to developers.

- In May 2018, the area that floods in the Triangle, south of A308M (AL14), was proposed to the Council through the TVERC, as a new Local Wildlife Site. Will this flood area be a LWS in the future or has that now been quashed completely?
- Suggestion for a wildlife corridor left around the perimeter of the site to allow for movement of the protected species on site.
- Reference to the 2016 BLP Edge of Settlement Assessment section M23 has been disregarded.
- Concern that in order to meet biodiversity net gain, calculation and mitigation proposal showing compliance with BLP policies NR2 and NR3.
- Question whether RBWM as landowner and client can demand net zero homes.
- Question asked if ecology survey carried out and if so need to be made available to the public.
- Suggestion for baseline date for the calculation of biodiversity Feb 2022 - adoption of the BLP and Dec 2025 when the golf club will vacate the site to guarantee net gain.
- Delighted that wildlife and sustainable design is playing a part in the design especially on wildlife corridors. However, include permeable boundaries to private residential space for movement of hedgehogs.
- Please stipulate that a full detailed survey of wildlife, including all protected species, will be undertaken and evidence provided on how net Biodiversity Gain will be achieved the site This must be done before and not as an afterthought to ensure all sensitive wildlife areas are protected and enhanced with new wildlife corridors created.
- The proposals directly contradict the council's own Biodiversity Action Plan which aims to provide 30% of land in the Borough as a space for nature by 2030. The development proposals immediately reduce the current space for nature provided by the golf course, land south of Harvest Hill Road.
- Be inspired by the rise in popularity of canal towpaths, particularly in urban areas. People want to use them because they are traffic free and they are green, supporting biodiversity. Here's a link to the Canal & River Trust's annual report <https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/news-and-views/news/weve-published-our-2020-21-annual-report>
- The proforma for this allocation in the BLP, and other information in the consultation documentation does not show how the current biodiversity in local nature reserves and priority habitats will be protected from the impact of this development.

Climate Change/Sustainable Development

- Concerns that the south west Maidenhead area development does not fit with the targets as set out in the environment and climate strategy which states that the borough should halve its carbon footprint by 2025.
- The loss of trees conflicts with the RBWM's self-declared climate emergency.
- Concern that SWM does not meet the aims of the definition of sustainable development.
- Question regarding the AL13 and AL14 buildings being net zero carbon and shown in the RBWM Interim sustainability position statement.
- Question on the relationship between the SWM SPD and the proposed Sustainable Development SPD.

- The Ellen Macarthur foundation has some really good guidance on circular building requirements.
- Question regarding the development of 225 acres even and how this fits in with the declared climate emergency and how meaningful mitigations be made regarding biodiversity when the remaining green space will have public access.
- Concerns about the SWM and the delivery of the Council's 'Climate & Environment Strategy' (published June 2020) states that you will 'reduce the need for carbon intensive travel by encouraging walking and cycling as well as investing in digital infrastructure' and you will 'create conditions for sustainable travel through the provision of infrastructure such as cycle routes and electric vehicle charging points and minimise air pollution impacts of road traffic by encouraging cleaner vehicles'.
- Concern for climate and environment SPD being in place before the first planning permissions for AL13 comes in.
- Suggestion to require the developers to make houses sustainable in energy production ie solar panels and ground heat pumps.
- Concern that sustainable development as defined by the Sustainable Development Commission be objectively measured within the development.
- Concern that 'green infrastructure' or sustainability measures imposed on any development may be removed in the future.
- The design must use 100% green energy on the whole scheme, include, ground arveststandard of insulation and use environmentally friendly building materials. The scheme should minimise the demands on water and include grey water recycling and rainwater harvest tanks.
- All bedrooms and living rooms need ceiling fans; check anticipated peak temperatures in 2040 (clue, it is over 40 degrees on a regular basis). Retrofitted air conditioning is not the answer as grid will not cope and cost of electricity prohibitive.
- Ensure adequate shading provided. Use of solar film on south facing windows. Car ports with reflective roofs. Insulation needs to be far better than currently mandated.
- SuDS for golf club area will require one or more balancing ponds, located at a low point on site.
- There does not appear to have been any credible quantification of the environmental role and impact. Without a quantified and defined mitigation plan, it is not clear that the site can be delivered as sustainable development as defined in the NPPF. The SPD should fill this gap by providing a quantified mitigation scheme, to be considered alongside the housing numbers when assessing planning applications.
- Read the latest IPCC report. We have very little time to turn things around. Decisive action needs to happen. We should not be enabling any new construction in the town. We should be looking at how we 'reuse' what we already have. We should not be foregoing our carbon sinks (ala Maidenhead Great Park) - we should be rewilding, focusing on biodiversity.
- Take inspiration from others: <https://europepmc.org/article/PMC/PMC8959022> converting offices (that no one is using... into homes) <https://bleckarchitects.com/converting-commercial-properties-homes/>. Refacing rather than demolishing <https://www.azobuild.com/article.aspx?ArticleID=8426>
- The sustainability assessment demonstrates that the proforma for this allocation in the BLP, and other information in the consultation documentation, does not show how this development will mitigate the major negative impacts to climate change, water and flooding, or air and noise pollution.

- The scale of this development is incongruous with the declaration of a climate emergency and with the targets set out in the environment and climate strategy. The overage of housing need in the must be used to stop this development in its entirety or to massively reduce this development.

Trees

- Concerns that Rushington Copse (small) piece of ancient woodland is supposed to be protected and excluded from development. Needs a buffer zone around it.
- Rushington Copse not shown on the map.
- Concerns about retained trees not having Tree Preservation Orders be applied before planning application submitted.
- Concerns that a lot of trees all over the golf course (all of which are helping us combat air pollution) could be destroyed during development.
- The widening of Harvest Hill Road would result in the loss of even more trees and mature hedgerows.
- Suggestion for a tree survey/ estimate required of trees to be lost from planned development. Concerns for 10% biodiversity gain when so much habitat will be destroyed.
- New tree planting goes nowhere near replacing mature trees, it will be many, many years before any saplings contribute to our environment in the way the current trees on the golf course do.
- Ensure the SPD states that a full arboricultural survey will be undertaken and all the existing trees are protected to the full width of the root protection zone. The design should seek to protect and increase the trees in line with the governments requirements to demonstrate net biodiversity gain.

Green Infrastructure

- More details required regarding food production and community growing space.
- Concerns that that as Maidenhead Golf Course open space was rescinded, the 'green infrastructure' or sustainability measures imposed on any development could be similarly removed in the future.
- Concerns as to where the proposed flats will be located along Shoppenhangers Road as this would create more noise for the retirement home of Crescent Dale.
- Concerned that the specific Green and Blue Infrastructure SPD is not yet being prepared and applications may come forward before this is adopted.
- Concern about the inclusion of green corridors.
- Please ensure the SPD requires a full landscape assessment of the site and surrounding areas and designs should be in keeping with the surrounding areas. They must ensure the proposed building do not become a dominant eyesore visible for miles around ruining the existing green skyline. Large swathes of landscaping should be included to enhance the biodiversity but also the wellbeing of residents.

Other Environmental Issues

- Concerns about the control of air pollution and odours during construction.
- Concern about the loss of Maidenhead's green field land.
- Concerns that air pollution is not measured properly, including PM10 and PM2.5 particulates.
- Concerns about flooding on the AL14 Triangle site. Ensure that any mitigation measures that will obviously need to be put in place to alleviate flooding will not have a detrimental impact on water levels upstream in The Cut and The Bourne rivers. These rivers flow across AL14 and through Holyport village and are already vulnerable to flooding and increasingly so as a result of climate change.
- As the site extends down towards the M4 motorway (or also on the South side of the motorway) then large parts are subject to flooding, currently form part of the "blue" infrastructure of the area and also provide a wildlife corridor between the Ockwells/Thriftwood complex and the Cut and Thames-side Priority Wetland Habitats. Development in this area is inadvisable.
- Concern on the impact on air quality from petrol and diesel cars not being phased out in time. At the end of last year only 2 per cent of cars in the UK were electric or hybrid models. Mature trees also being removed.
- Air Pollution - The design should be restricted to electric cars and electric commercial vehicles only and include ways of reducing air pollution through for example additional tree planting.
- Impact of Neighbouring Developments - A full assessment of neighbouring developments should be undertaken. The design proposal should minimise visual impact, overlook, noise, pollution and avoid any detrimental impact on neighbouring developments.

Other

- Suggestion that Windsor should take 600 homes from the SWM area
- The questions asked on the online events should be answered formally.
- Concern that the SPD predetermines the planning application as approved.
- Concern for the timing of the public consultation and whether the comments and suggestions will be taken seriously.
- Ensure everyone in Maidenhead is involved in the consultations.
- Concerns from residents that this consultation is purely a box-ticking exercise. RBWM to demonstrate that concerns will be listened to and appropriately actioned rather than dismissed as people feel has happened to their input into previous placemaking exercises in relation to this area of Maidenhead.
- Concern that there is no budget for additional consultations.
- Concern that the SWM growth area includes existing streets that mean a presumption in favour of development of sites in those streets.
- Concern that that the planning application will not be dealt fairly as RBWM is the applicant and deciding body.
- More details required on Supplementary Planning Documents being produced and timing of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).
- The graphics on the Placemaking study are quite hard to read. Suggestion to update it.
- Question asked about the SWM area having a new electoral ward or wards redrawn.

- Concern about bike theft is a big problem in Maidenhead - if you want to encourage cycling you need to make sure people can secure their bikes safely at the station and in the town centre.
- A green dot for the A308/Stafferton Way roundabout missing on the plan.
- Request for publication of timetable of various strategy & plan documents being developed to support the SDP and BLP.
- Concern about that the developer CALA homes is pre-determined.
- Concern about the flexibility of the number of homes being 2,600
- Concern that one planning application will be submitted for whole site.
- Concern for the financial viability of delivering the number of homes.
- Question regarding council members declaring any conflict of interest between representing the community and any business interests of the developers and anyone else who will profit from the developments.
- RBWM had 1546 vacant properties. Question to why, with so many empty domestic properties are we working on the destruction of an acknowledged site with value to protected and priority species.
- Question asked about the percentage of non-permeable surfaces expected on AL14.
- An example development is in conjunction with the RSPB:
https://www.rspb.org.uk/globalassets/downloads/documents/conservation--sustainability/223-0282-20-21-barratt-developments-plc--rspb-16pp-05-07-21.pdf?utm_source=standardcontentpage&campaign_medium=standalone_cta&utm_content=positive_perceptions_standardcontentblock
- Example given from Leeds Climate Innovation
<https://civicingeers.com/project/climate-innovation-district/>
- Question asked on how will the SW Maidenhead SPD relate to the proposed Sustainable Development SPD.
- Design - Unique, interesting well thought out design should be required using durable, high-quality materials in all the buildings and structures. There should be clear cognitive points with views going to specific buildings and areas and guiding people through the site. The design should be at a scale and size that reflects the neighbouring areas.
- Public Art - Bespoke, attractive public art should be used to mark significant points and areas.
- Crime prevention - Paths should be open and well-lit to ensure pedestrians and cyclists feel safe and are safe.
- The IDP schedule is a list of projects and does not contain implementation detail. Without any guidance in the SPD or thinking ahead, developers and landowners will simply seek to minimise their S106 contributions and solutions are likely to be copy-paste from Project Centre rather than optimised for the users and the site.
- Suggest that all the facilities that the new residents require, e.g. educational, recreational, transport were there when residents move in.
- Concerns raised for the club house and who will maintain it after Golf Club and course cease in December 2025, who will have responsibility for the site. The Council must ensure that the site continues to be actively managed and protected and not allowed to become overgrown, derelict and vandalised.
- The OAHN is overstated, as evidenced by the number of unsold units in the new town centre developments. RBWM should share details of the brownfield sites register and empty office buildings to enable a proper assessment of the availability of alternative sites.

- Concern that the Hitachi and Stiefel Laboratories sites off the Lower Cookham Road are brownfield will eventually be used for housing.

South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document – Consultation Statement

Appendix 2 Summary of Representations on the Draft South West Maidenhead Development Framework SPD and the Council’s response

Introduction

This appendix sets out a list of all those who made representations on the draft South West Maidenhead Development Framework SPD. It summarises the main comments made in those representations and sets out the Council’s response to those comments. Where the Council believes that it is appropriate to make a change to the SPD in response to a comment, this is highlighted as bold in the Council’s response section.

The summary of the comments is set out in the order of the different sections of the SPD, with a separate schedule for each of the main sections of the SPD. More general comments not specifically highlighted as relating to a particular paragraph of the SPD are set out at the beginning of the summaries.

List of those who made representations

Adrian Field	Dave Scarbrough on behalf of the Climate Community in Windsor and Maidenhead	K Titford	Rohan Mohindra
Alexa Culver on behalf of Environment Bank	David Grey	Katherine Platt	Roy Bloomfield
Andrew Hill	Deborah Ludford	Kathy Quin	Sandeep Mittal
Andy McCoy on behalf of Binfield Badger Group	Derek Roberts on behalf of the Rushington Area Residents Association	Katy Williams	Sarah Bowden
Ann Redgrave	Edward Hands	Kieran Phillips	Sarah Fogg
B Fidler	Edward Phillips	Lee Bradfield	Sarah Wallace
Barbara Brown	Elizabeth Chan-A-Sue	Lena Walton	Savills on behalf of Taylor Wimpey
Barry Giggins	Fiona Tattersall	Lesley Trivedi	Sibylle Luger
Barton Wilmore on behalf of Maidenhead United Football Club	Gareth Dos Santos	Lynn Bradley	Simon Bond
Beeta Ginn on behalf of National Highways	Helal and Marion Stephan	M Bajaj	Solve Planning on behalf of Elivia Homes
Bob Dulson on behalf of Maidenhead Civic Society	Helen Phillips	M Wood	Stephen Perrett
Bob Sharples on behalf of Sport England	J Earley	Mark Loader	Sue Sewell
Boyer Planning on behalf of Berkeley Homes	Jane White	Mrs M A Owens	Susan Daniel
Bray Parish Council	Jeanette Williams	Nathan Preston	Tanya Condon
Brain Ball	Jennifer Pardoe	Nick Evans	Teresa Burton
Brian Davies	Jo Faulkner	Paul and Kim Erie	Teresa Coles

Bridget Fox on behalf of Woodland Trust	Jo Holden	Paul Bradley	Thames Water
Chris Bailey	John Hudson	Paul Butt Planning Ltd on behalf of Staxlink Ltd	Tim Murphy
Claire Earl	John Lucas	Philip Manning	Timothy Lloyd
Claire Elizabeth Milne on behalf of Windsor Ascot and Maidenhead Community Land Trust	John Sewell	Rachael Piga	Tina Quadrino on behalf of Maidenhead Great Park Interest Company
Craig Thomson	John Walton	Richard Whyte	Toby Lant
Tulley Bunting Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes (Chiltern) Ltd	Woolf Bond Planning on behalf of Anita Thomas and Siobhan McElhinney	Zsofia Macho	

Summary of Representations and Council response

General Comments on the draft SPD

Summary of Representations	Council Response
GENERAL	
Object to building on Green Belt land	The South West Maidenhead Strategic Placemaking Area is one of the sites released from the Green Belt upon the adoption of the Borough Local Plan on 9 th February 2022. The Inspector's Final Report concluded that the exceptional circumstances necessary at a strategic level to justify the release of this land from the Green Belt had been demonstrated.
The land is part of Maidenhead Heritage	Policy QP1b presents a Vision specifically for South West Maidenhead which will create a sense of place and distinctiveness. This vision has been translated into a series of policy principles and requirements (Policy QP1b (5)), with further site-specific requirements included in the site proformas for AL13, AL14 and AL15. The Strategic Environmental Assessment identifies the Heritage assets within the Placemaking area. The provisions made within the BLP and SPD regarding the conservation of heritage assets would be expected to fully mitigate impacts through conservation and enhancement of heritage assets, such as the Scheduled Ancient Monument and Listed Buildings.
The SPD forms part of a suite of documents. All relevant documents to SW Maidenhead should be listed, with order of priority. Request a diagram showing the hierarchy of all relevant documents applicable to SW Maidenhead.	Paragraph 1.1.8 to 1.1.10 of the DFSPD sets out the accompanying supporting documents and Section 3 sets out the Planning Policy Framework. The plans and supporting documents are listed in hierarchical order from National Policy (top level), through Borough Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) to other relevant RBWM Corporate strategies. This hierarchical form of listing is also reflected in the location and navigation of these documents on the Council's website.

A general and repeated comment for the SPD to use firmer / more definitive language – instead of using ‘may’ and ‘possibly’, use ‘will’ and ‘must’	Because the SPD is guidance and not planning policy that is set out in the Borough Local Plan, it is not always appropriate to use firmer language, as this may be construed as using the SPD to write policy.
Many of the requirements in the SPD have not been reflected in the Berkeley Homes Spring Hill Development application.	The South West Maidenhead DFSPD will carry greater weight in decision making once it is adopted. In the meantime, any applications submitted for planning permission on the allocated sites AL13, AL14 and AL15 will be assessed against relevant policies and supporting documents, as set out in Section 3 of the draft DFSPD.
Concern that the SPD may be introducing new policy and hence not compliant with the national Planning Practice Guidance	Some amendments to the wording in the draft SPD have been made to ensure that the SPD is not introducing new policy, including in relation to Housing Mix and Zero Carbon
RBWM has chosen the summer holidays for a major consultation, a year in which many will be abroad this summer for the first time in 3 years. Would a delay of 6 weeks not have made a more meaningful consultation without unduly delaying any development timetable.	Paragraph 1.1.11 explains that the public consultation was two weeks longer than required by the Regulations to reflect the fact it was being held over the summer holiday period, consistent with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement. Public consultation events were organised in person at different venues, and online, and spaced throughout the 6 week period in order to facilitate community engagement.
There is no reference to the circular economy applied to the built environment in the SPD. Developers should adopt principles of design for longevity, adaptability and flexibility to ensure that built assets are fit for purpose for longer.	Paragraph 6.7.3 of the DFSPD highlights Policy QP1b of the BLP indicates that one of the key principles for the South West Maidenhead placemaking area is that development includes measures to reduce climate change and environmental impacts including suitable approaches to sustainable energy, recycling and construction. The circular economy is listed as one of the 4 themes of the adopted Environment and Climate Strategy.
Suggestion that a man made hill is created in the south east corner of the site to provide panoramic views of the surrounding area and to provide a recreational area for locals.	The DFSPD adds detail to the broad principles and requirements set out in the BLP, in particular, as set out in the proformas for AL13, AL14 and AL15, and also in the placemaking policy for the area, Policy QP1b. However, it does not set new policy, nor is it able to change policy in the BLP. Consequently, the introduction of a large man-made hill would not be consistent with the BLP.
Having this huge housing estate will cause chaos to what is already a busy built-up area	The SPD identifies the need to address the impacts of the development including tackling congestion and improving connectivity. Policy QP1b (c), (e) and (f) set out the need for infrastructure ahead or in tandem with development, measures to minimise the need for travel and maximise non-car transport modes, and enhancement of existing and

	provision of new vehicular and non-vehicular connections the whole of the SWMSA .
The development will do nothing for Climate Change and the Council should be stopping all developments on open areas and green field sites.	Policy SP2 of the BLP requires all developments to demonstrate how they have been designed to incorporate measures to adapt to and mitigate climate change.
The DFSPD must be free from any conflict of interest and should therefore be paid for entirely with public funds, with no payments contributed by developers	There is no conflict of interest. It is common for developers to enter into planning performance agreements, including in relation to the preparation of SPDs relating to sites or areas. The PPA does not commit the local planning authority to a particular outcome but is instead a commitment to a process for progressing the SPD. It is right that the Council engages with developers as part of the process of preparing the SPD. Decisions on the content of the SPD lies solely with the Council through approval at Cabinet and the PPA does not imply any obligation on the council to approve any subsequent planning application for the proposal.
The consultation statement does fairly summarise a huge range of concerns raised by residents but fails to address many of the key concerns.	The SPD does address a wide range of issues, including those referred to in the draft consultation statement. It may not go as far as some people would like on some issues as it inevitably balances a range of competing factors, and also the content of the SPD has to work within the framework for the area set out in the Borough Local Plan.
The development is incompatible with the RBWM Corporate Plan. There remains only 3 years to achieve the 50% reduction in carbon emissions required under the RBWM Environment and Climate Strategy 2020. The SPD makes it impossible to achieve this goal (as the SEA indicates unlikely to fully mitigate the adverse impacts associated with net increases in greenhouse gases.)	Applications that are brought forward for the SWMPA will be required to comply with relevant BLP policies, including SP2, QP1b, QP2, NR1, NR2, NR3, EP1, EP2, EP3, EP4 and IF2. These policies contribute to the Council's ambition of achieving carbon emission reductions across the Borough whilst balancing the new for new housing. Ensuring that new development uses less energy, supplies energy efficiently, and incorporates renewable energy will assist, long-term, in the deliverability of this goal.
The SPD fails to map out a lawful framework for achieving the climate change goals. Climate change goals will not be met and the SPD cannot be adopted in this form. It is unlawful.	It is not the role of the SPD to do this. The SPD is intended to add detail to the broad principles and requirements set out in the Local Plan for the SWMPA. The Local Plan was examined by an independent examiner who concluded that the Local plan is sound and legally compliant. The SPD is not unlawful.
Use excess housing numbers in the BLP to reduce building in the area.	The issue of the housing target in the Local Plan, including the need for a 'buffer', has been agreed through the Local Plan process, and supported by

Do not build on AL21 and AL26, Bray Lake. This will maintain the Green Gap between Windsor and Maidenhead – better for traffic and air quality. Reduce the housing numbers on AL13 and AL15 for the same reasons.	the independent Inspector who examined the Plan. This SPD cannot re-open that issue or consider sites such as A21 and AL26 that are outside the area covered by this SPD. Similarly, this SPD cannot prescribe different housing numbers for the AL13 site, although the numbers for AL13 in the Local Plan are expressed as “approximate”. AL15 is not a housing site and hence there are no housing numbers attached to it.
Welcome the notion of distinct neighbourhoods, varied in character, well designed with a mix of housing types and quality spaces. However, concerned the SPD lacks sufficient detail to ensure some of the objectives are met.	The SPD cannot be too prescriptive but has given clear indication as the different character areas within the SWMPA and how cohesion can be achieved, particular through the presence and function of the ‘Green Spine’.
Maidenhead is in danger of becoming an urban sprawl. The beauty of Maidenhead must be protected for the benefit of all	This is recognised in ‘The Vision’ for the SWMPA, which includes protecting and enhancing the special qualities of the Borough’s built and natural environments as well as promoting sustainable development and high quality design.
A supply of housing in future will come from the business parks which can be demolished and become estates as the offices close and people continue to work from home.	This is not relevant to the matters addressed in the SWM SPD. Whilst this comment does not relate directly to any content within the SPD, it is noted that the BLP includes Protected Employment Sites, and there are no current proposals advanced to wholesale redevelopment employment sites for housing. It is therefore unlikely this suggestion will form a feasible solution to the Borough’s housing needs.
BIODIVERSITY	
The Council must be committed to whole-life net zero emissions and immediate biodiversity net gains	This commitment is reflected in Policies SP2, QP1b and NR2 of the BLP and the Interim Sustainability Position Statement, as well as the measures identified in the SPD.
Suggestion that all sites in the BLP create as many new water habitats for wildlife as possible, preserve all plant life (shrubs and trees) older than 30 years (and 60 years)	It is appropriate to consider the biodiversity requirements specific to each allocated site within the formal planning application process. Each site is individual with its own specific set of considerations and requirements, a one-size fits all approach would therefore not be appropriate.
The development will destroy wildlife	Biodiversity mitigation measures will be required and assessed through the planning application process. The Vision for the Placemaking Area includes a <i>“flourishing network of green streets and spaces which will accommodate biodiversity and people</i>

	<i>harmoniously</i> ". The BLP site proformas for AL13 and AL14 also require the conservation and enhancement of the biodiversity of the area.
There should be no development on the land to the south of Harvest Hill Road (AL13). It should instead be turned into a wildlife conservation area with some public access. The land has high wildlife value, parts of it flood seasonally, the site contains ancient oak, ash and willow trees, and the south west part, in particular, contains mature grassland.	This area is part of the housing allocation AL13 in the Local Plan. As such the principle of housing development in this area is already established. The SPD does, however, indicate that a "southern green fringe" should be retained which has the potential for biodiversity enhancement and informal recreation and ensure that development does not take place on areas prone to flooding.
The connectivity corridors need to be a meaningful width for wildlife; 3 to 5 metres with a pedestrian path in the middle is unlikely to accommodate existing protected species which currently inhabit the golf course site. Suggested the corridor should be 50 metres wide, which may not be feasible on the western boundary but should be feasible on the eastern boundary due to the sloping topography.	The planning application(s) for the golf course site will need to set out more detailed proposals for the green infrastructure including connectivity corridors, and demonstrate that they will be meaningful and achieve their objective.
Bats are present on the golf course site; they are a European Protected Species. The LPA is reminded of its Legal duties in this respect.	Ecology reports and assessment of the impact of development on Protected Species generally, not just bats, would be required and considered at planning application stage.
The development purports to be sustainable, however, no plan has been communicated to offset the carbon emissions resulting from the construction of the development site.	The draft SPD encourages developers to consider the 'whole life carbon' emissions of development.
We have a climate emergency and water authorities have declared in many areas that new developments should be stopped as there is not the water resource for them. This is particularly acute in the south-east. The development will further increase pressure on water sources, result in loss of trees and destroy ancient woodland; this is an environmental disaster.	It is recognised that the SPD area is an area of water stress. The Council's Position Statement on Sustainability and Energy Efficient Design provides guidance on designing development to be more water efficient and reduce water consumption. Amend SPD to refer to the area being one of water stress and that the opportunity should be taken to reduce water consumption and design development that is water efficient, cross referencing to the Council's Position Statement.

<p>The Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre (TVERC) Biodiversity Report (2021-05-10) identifies dozens of species on AL13 in the “protected and notable species” appendix. The SPD ought to have expressly acknowledged and discussed in detail this report in the sections on biodiversity, set out the appendices of species and addressed the impact of development on these notable protected species.</p>	<p>It is for the developers to undertake detailed ecology surveys of their application sites, including identifying protected species and identifying the impact of development on them and their proposed mitigation measures.</p>
<p>Building on an undeveloped green site is not sustainable and consequently the development cannot be carbon neutral</p>	<p>The Vision for the South West Maidenhead Strategic Placemaking Area, includes more sustainable patterns of living. Policy QP1b(5i) identifies the need for measures to reduce climate change and environmental impacts including suitable approaches to sustainable energy, recycling and construction. The objective of carbon neutral development is reflected in the Council’s Interim Sustainability Position Statement, as well as the measures identified in the SPD.</p>
<p>The proposals will result in smaller, fragmented habitats</p>	<p>The development proposals will inevitably result in the loss of some habitat, but overall development proposals will have to deliver biodiversity net gain. The Local Plan and the SPD sets out principles for delivering a green infrastructure network that will ensure ecological connectivity.</p>
<p>HOUSING</p>	
<p>There is no real clarity in the consultation as to the placement of the housing and what level of greenspace will be maintained or improved along the border of AL13.</p>	<p>The SPD provides high level design guidance and principles that planning applications should follow, but it is not intended to provide a detailed masterplan setting out the precise location of housing and greenspace – that is for the planning application stage. The Local Plan and the SPD does highlight the importance of retaining boundary planting, and this is illustrated in the framework plan within the SPD.</p>
<p>The Site Allocation Proforma (p100) states the Golf Course development is 89.93 ha to accommodate 2,600 houses, which equates to a density of 12 dwellings per acre. Berkeley Homes are proposing 20 dwellings per acre which is too excessive.</p>	<p>This planning application will be assessed on its own merits; once the SPD is adopted it will carry greater weight in decision making.</p>
<p>There is no huge demand for housing in Maidenhead, the population has only grown by 10% in the last 20 years and is slowing down further. You have already built enough to house any future growth over the next 20 years.</p>	<p>The issue of how much housing is required in the Borough has been determined through the Borough Local Plan process, and the outcome supported by an independent planning inspector who examined the Plan. It is not for the SPD to amend the housing targets in the Local Plan.</p>

<p>The SPD fails to highlight any guidance on building aesthetics and misses an opportunity to set the bar for architectural flair and individuality, which is lacking in the town centre developments. The SPD also misses the opportunity to increase significantly housing stock for families and adds to the over-flatted nature of the town</p>	<p>The SPD focuses on establishing good design principles for developers to incorporate in their planning applications to ensure high quality development. Detailed architectural considerations can be addressed at the planning application stage.</p>
<p>How many of the new dwellings will be 3 or 4 bedroom family affordable homes with gardens. These are what I have read are needed accommodation in Maidenhead to keep young families here</p>	<p>The DFSPD recognises there is an opportunity to provide a mixed community at the South West Maidenhead site whilst accommodating the 2,600 homes. The SPD provides more guidance on the housing mix, having regard to the policies in the Local Plan and supporting evidence.</p>
<p>The plan for high rise (8 storey) buildings is completely out of character with the current 2 storey neighbourhoods, this is in no way in keeping with the local residential areas. It also does not address the need for family housing that the council states is actually required. Maidenhead has a sufficient supply of flats; many of the town centre recently built flats are still vacant a considerable time after completion.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy for the AL13 site indicates that the northern neighbourhood will be orientated towards the town centre and will make the most of its proximity to the railway station and town centre. Building heights, densities and typologies will reflect those in the town centre, but it is recognised that building heights need to be “stepped down” towards the edge of the site in areas adjacent to residential area. Further guidance on building heights is set out in the draft Building Height and Tall Building SPD.</p> <p>Amend design guidance to emphasise and illustrate the importance of building heights stepping down from centre of the site to the edge of the site adjoining residential areas</p> <p>The SPD outlines the importance of delivering family housing as part of the mix of housing on the site and as part of the affordable housing to be provided. However, the SPD would benefit from greater clarity, including linking it more closely to the evidence base, such as the Berkshire SHMA (Strategic Housing Market Assessment) which indicates that across the Borough, 55% of new dwelling should be 3 and 4 bed properties.</p> <p>Amend the Housing Mix section to link the need for family housing more closely to the evidence for family housing, and set out further evidence where necessary on housing mix (see new Appendix 3).</p>
<p>Need more smaller houses for first time buyers and older people downsizing. These two groups would like smaller properties that are</p>	<p>If the demand for these types of properties exist then developers may provide an element of them in their schemes, but these are too specific for the</p>

<p>not leasehold. Bungalows would be preferable for older residents rather than retirement flats, which have initial costs and high maintenance costs. Providing smaller freehold units for older people could free up a lot of existing properties for young families.</p>	<p>Council to require in terms of general market housing. General or retirement flats would also free up family housing.</p>
<p>The SPD should include specific housing targets for 3 and 4 bedroom homes. As well as the ratio of family homes to flats, densities should be indicated and building heights.</p>	<p>The Berkshire SHMA provides targets for 3 and 4 bedroom houses but the SPD would benefit from referring more directly to this evidence</p> <p>Amend the Housing Mix section to refer more directly to the Berkshire SHMA evidence on 3 and 4 bedroom houses.</p> <p>The ratio of family homes to flats is best addressed by reference to the Berkshire SHMA and other related evidence (see above).</p> <p>The SPD provides some broad guidance on density and design principles relating to different part of the AL13 site where different densities and typologies will prevail, but it is not necessary to prescribe detailed density guidelines in the SPD. The Building Height and Tall Building SPD addresses the specifics of building height.</p>
<p>If there has to be flats there should be a cap on the height</p>	<p>The SPD does provide some general design guidance on appropriate heights, but the maximum acceptable height at the site is a matter that is being addressed in the emerging Building Height and Tall Building SPD.</p>
<p>INFRASTRUCTURE – HIGHWAY NETWORK</p>	
<p>Do not believe the effect on traffic flow in the area of Harvest Hill has been modelled and considered correctly. No provision has been made for the significant traffic increase that 2600 new homes will bring. The only other access is via the town centre/station and this is also congested at peak times.</p>	<p>Traffic modelling has been undertaken both for the Borough Local Plan and updated for the work on this SPD. This assessed the impact of development on the traffic network in the area. A series of junction improvements are identified as being required (see section 6.6 of the SPD and Appendix 2) to mitigate the impact of the additional traffic on key junctions.</p>
<p>What incentives have been considered for residents to use green vehicles</p>	<p>The Council’s Position Statement on Sustainability and Energy Efficient Design seeks the provision of electric vehicle charging points (see section 6.7 of the SPD) and new Building Regulations means that this will become a more general requirement in the future</p>

<p>The SPD should provide guidance on ways that the area can effectively manage and reduce the number of vehicle trips for waste collection and deliveries in the access and movement section.</p>	<p>This is too specific for this SPD and would be a matter for the planning application stage. It should, however, be noted that Section 9 of the Borough Wide Design Guide SPD contains guidance on waste and recycling storage in new development.</p>
<p>The proposed access point from the end of Rushington Avenue into the site will be impossible to implement; there is a steep bank into the houses at Courtlands, and any access road or path will lead to problems.</p> <p>The junction of Rushington Avenue into the Braywick Road roundabout is already congested at peak times, and clogged up with people dropping off or picking up passengers. Adding traffic will make this junction even more dangerous.</p>	<p>This is something to be explored further as a walk/cycle access point at the planning application stage. It would improve the connectivity of the site, further encouraging walking and cycling.</p>
<p>Harvest Hill Road is not wide enough for pedestrians, bikes and cars without removing yet more hedgerows and trees. How will people be able to safely walk and cycle along here when cars already drive too fast?</p>	<p>The SPD proposes a new segregated walk/cycle route on the north side of Harvest Hill Road to enable people to walk and cycle safely in this area. Speed limits on Harvest Hill Road are likely to be lower once residential development is becoming established.</p>
<p>What is the plan to add access to Shoppenhangers Road through Courtlands/ the neighbouring care home?</p> <p>Where is the plan to improve the junction of Shoppenhangers Road and the A308? Currently all traffic for Windsor / Bracknell has to travel through the town centre adding congestion and pollution.</p>	<p>The Framework Plan in the SPD indicates that this could be a pedestrian access through, using the existing footpath. There is no intention to provide a vehicular access through here.</p> <p>There are no specific plans to improve the Shoppenhangers Road/A308 junction, but the developers for the golf course site will need to assess the impact of their proposals on that junction as part of their transport assessment accompanying their planning application.</p>
<p>How will existing access points be protected, what will the road system and parking be in the northern area? Will private vehicle parking be adequate or will we need residents parking only parking in the surrounding streets?</p> <p>What is the planned parking per dwelling, what are the planned roads within the development?</p>	<p>One of the identified overarching design principles of the development is to deliver development that is highly connected both within the development areas and to the surrounding areas, with focus on enhancing connectivity for walking, cycling and public transport. The approach to and level of parking will be determined at the planning application stage based on a number of factors including the nature of the housing, its location and design factors.</p>

<p>The Green Spine is unlikely to diminish car use to any great extent and the traffic generated by 2,600 homes, plus schools and health facility will be considerable.</p>	<p>It is important that the design of the development provides very good opportunities for people to walk and cycle, as alternatives to using the car. The green spine is an important component of achieving this. Providing facilities on site such as schools and a local centre help to “internalise trips” within the development, thereby reducing the need for people to travel further (and hence more likely use the car) and making it more likely they will walk or cycle</p>
<p>It is noted further SPD documents will be produced to support the BLP and impact the allocations within the draft SWMSPD. Of particular interest will be the new parking SPD as it is identified that one of the biggest opportunities for managing down traffic demand on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) is associated with limiting parking spaces at a destination. This is particularly successful when guidance such as this is supported by the delivery of other sustainable transport measures and infrastructure, which are substantial in the draft SWMSPD.</p>	<p>Noted. A Parking SPD is in the process of being produced.</p>
<p>It is observed that now the footbridge over the A308(M) connecting AL13 and AL14 is no longer the preferred option, we look forward to reviewing the proposed alternative design to be included at the Braywick Road roundabout junction with the A308(M). The potential impact on the operation of the junction with the addition of further facilities is highlighted.</p> <p>The impact of the upgrade of the Harvest Hill Road / Braywick Road junction on the SRN is also noted, and a request made to be consulted for any design / modelling if there is to be interaction between the two junctions.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>INFRASTRUCTURE – COMMUNITY</p>	
<p>Health and Wellbeing: What are the plans for the Borough to ensure that there will be adequate health provision given the proposed scale of the development in Maidenhead, including South West Maidenhead?</p>	<p>The SPD indicates that consideration is being given for a health hub on the site to meet the needs of the development. It may also help to help improve primary health care for a wider area, subject to the views of the health providers.</p>

<p>The golf club land provides a leisure facility that should not be destroyed; it was given by Lord Desborough to the local people for outdoor recreation</p>	<p>The principle of the development has been established by the BLP. The Inspector’s Final report for the BLP considered the arguments of the loss of the golf club as a leisure facility / green lung and concluded that the development of this land would not result in an actual loss of open space useable by the general public.</p>
<p>There is already insufficient local Infrastructure to support the population, doctors, dentists, etc. This will only be made worse. The recycling centre frequently smells, especially in hot weather.</p>	<p>The SPD includes a detailed section on infrastructure provision and Appendix 2 of the SPD sets out a more detailed infrastructure schedule. The local centre on the housing site will also provide new local facilities to support the new housing and this may include a health hub.</p>
<p>The left hand turn only from Shoppenhangers Road to Braywick Road should be changed to turn right hand only as when the development is built it will cause a bottleneck into the town centre and cause a highway hazard.</p>	<p>The developers for the golf course site will need to assess the impact of their proposals on that junction as part of their transport assessment accompanying their planning application. There is a risk that introducing a right turn at this junction will lead to additional delays on the Braywick Road, as it would reduce the ‘green time’ at the traffic lights to allow the additional right turn movements.</p>
<p>There is no need for a new secondary school</p>	<p>The Borough Local Plan policy indicates that both a primary and secondary school should be provided. Whilst there is not a need for an additional secondary school at the moment, pupils generated from development in South West Maidenhead and other developments across Maidenhead will mean that it is needed towards the end of the period that the Local Plan covers (i.e., up to 2033).</p> <p>Provide further information on education provision in a new appendix (Appendix 4)</p>
<p>ENVIRONMENT</p>	
<p>Who will be responsible for maintaining the greenspace? What protections are in place to ensure the borders will not be reduced?</p>	<p>This is a detailed matter to be determined at the planning application stage.</p>
<p>Where are the plans to add trees along Braywick Road to provide shade, absorb pollution, make walking/cycling more pleasant to encourage people to walk and not drive into the town centre?</p>	<p>The Local Plan and the SPD sets out a range of plans to improve walking and cycling provision both within the development areas, but also improving wider links – this includes links to the town centre. The SPD also seeks theretention and enhancing of boundary trees and landscape buffers.</p>

<p>What measures are proposed to reduce noise and air pollution from increased traffic</p>	<p>Planning applications will need to consider the need for any mitigation measures to ensure they create satisfactory living environments for new residents, in relation to noise and air pollution. The Local Plan and SPD set out a series of sustainable travel measures to help reduce reliance on the car, although it is recognised that there will still be increased traffic associated with the development. Over time air pollution linked to cars will reduce with the introduction of more electric cars and continued improved emission standards from existing petrol and diesel cars.</p>
<p>There is an over reliance on the use of public transport and active travel to mitigate the dreadful impact on air pollution by this development. There is no evidence that people will start using this more in the borough and indeed there is no actual plan to improve accessibility to these modes of transport.</p>	<p>It is important that public transport and active travel measures are integral to the new development and are connected to wider walking, cycling and public transport networks. The proposals set out in the Local Plan and elaborated on in the SPD will ensure that new residents and workers in the SW Maidenhead development areas will have better access to these modes of transport.</p>
<p>The golf club land is an important green space which helps to reduce the air quality problems in the area. Building on this land will add to pollution, not reduce it</p>	<p>The principle of the development has been established by the BLP. The SPD highlights that the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the BLP found that whilst there might be a minor negative impact on air and noise pollution, the promotion of non-car travel would help reduce transport related emissions.</p>
<p>EXISTING RESIDENTS IMPACT</p>	
<p>How will impacts on existing residents, through noise dust and congestion, be managed during construction?</p>	<p>Where appropriate, conditions are imposed on the development to help manage these issues during the construction period, using relevant powers available to the authority.</p> <p>Developers are encouraged to join the “Considerate Constructor scheme”.</p>
<p>Will existing residents on Rushington Avenue whose homes are adjacent to the golf course have their views and privacy protected?</p>	<p>Impacts on the residential amenities of existing properties will be considered during the planning application process.</p>

Section 1 Introduction

Paragraph Number	Summary of Representations	Council Response
1	Include information regarding who has funded the SPD and consultation process and by how much	This is not relevant to the content of the SPD. The Cabinet report accompanying the final SPD for adoption sets this out.
1.1.1	The area is referred to at this paragraph, and throughout the draft SPD, as SWMSPA. In the BLP it was referred to as SWMPA. Consider it helpful if the various references in the SPD were consistent with the BLP.	It is considered that the abbreviation SWMSPA for South West Maidenhead Strategic Placemaking Area is suitable clear and is used consistently throughout the SPD.
1.1.3	This plan has not taken into consideration all of the elements highlighted in this paragraph. Local infrastructure, water supply, sewerage and air quality will all be stressed. Consultation with the community is a falsehood with the majority of the current residents of Maidenhead vehemently opposed to this level of development, and in particular any development on the golf course.	The SPD includes a wide range of considerations into account, although water infrastructure was not included in the draft SPD but should be included. It is recognised that there is much local opposition to the development but the principle of development has been established through the Local Plan. Add section regarding water infrastructure.
1.1.5	Update to make clear that comments will be taken into account before the document is finalised	Agree that this needs to be made clear but better done in the section on community engagement Amend Section 2 to make clear the document has been amended to take account of comments where appropriate
1.1.6	How will the timely delivery of new infrastructure required to support the development be achieved? Please share the plans	The infrastructure section of the SPD provides more detail on infrastructure delivery and provides some guidance in relation to priorities in terms of delivery. The detail of timing will be developed through individual legal agreements linked to planning permissions and through the collection of funding through the Community

		Infrastructure Levy and planning legal agreements (section 106 agreements).
1.1.15 Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)	Pg 3 of this document states Lepus prepared the report for the use of Buckinghamshire Council. If this is factually correct then why is RBWM using it and if this is an error it begs the question how many other fundamental errors have been made in this document.	This is not correct; the Environmental Report has been prepared on behalf of RBWM. It appraises the Draft South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document. The Post-Adoption Statement will note this error.
1.1.15 (SEA)	Disagree with the statement at p.11, N16, that the SPD has the potential to deliver enhanced multi-functional GI and biodiversity net gain	The development will be required as a matter of policy, and soon to be law, to deliver biodiversity net gain. Policy also requires delivery of green infrastructure network.
1.1.15 (SEA)	This is a strategic environmental assessment and as such I expect it to provide real measures that have to be implemented in order to meet the current regulations and ensure the borough can meet its environmental targets.	The SEA Directive's objectives are to provide a high level of protection to the environment and contribute to integrating environmental considerations into the preparation, adoption and implementation of plans and programmes to promote sustainable development. If 'real measures' are provided by the plan maker, the SEA process will appraise them. It is not for the SEA process to provide 'real measures' although it may make recommendations.
1.1.15 (SEA)	Please explain how Lepus came to the conclusion that this development will rule out residual adverse effects in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - biodiversity - air quality - water provision / consumption 	See Table 6.2 of the Environmental Report on page 61.
1.1.15 (SEA)	Surprised the HRA concluded that there would be no adverse effects on any Natura 2000 sites as a result of the BLP. Please provide copies of the HRA assessment.	The final HRA produced for the BLP is ref. <u>PS/043</u> (March 2020). This concluded that the BLP in isolation would have no likely significant effect on the Natura 2000 sites. The BLP Inspector confirmed in paragraph 15 of her final report (<u>ID-34</u>) that the BLP "will not give rise to an adverse effect upon the integrity of any relevant sites, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects".
1.1.15 (SEA)	This assessment has been carried out without a visit to the area in question. It is preposterous that an assessment of a development of this scale, that will irrevocably impact the lives	The site has been visited in the past by Lepus team members working on the BLP. The nature of SEA is such that the process is strategic and high level. Site based evaluation is rarely undertaken since the process relies principally on secondary data, much of which is

	of everyone living in Maidenhead, can take place via desk top research.	obtained over longer periods of time. The SEA is only as good as the data available to it. However, it should be noted that SEA is also ‘top’ of the assessment sequencing hierarchy, with the next step being EIA. The EIA process will include many site visits and collect ‘real time data’ at the site scale to inform the EIA.
1.1.15 (SEA)	Welcome the recommendations in Table 6.4 but suggest they do not go far enough. Request the “responsible authority” provides details of all the monitoring that has been undertaken as part of its environment and climate strategy that was adopted in December 2020.	This SEA is not intended to report on the monitoring of the Environment and Climate Change Strategy. Updates on the delivery of the Environment and Climate Change Strategy can be found on the Council’s website .

Section 2 Community and Stakeholder Engagement

Paragraph Number	Summary of Representations	Council Response
2	The fundamental principle of taking the golf course out of the green belt and releasing it for housing development was never discussed at a community level. The community was unable to affect that decision, nor the amount of development required.	The decision to take the golf course out of the green belt was part of the Local Plan process which was subject to extensive public consultation.
2	It is disingenuous to state that this was community engagement given that this was simply telling the community what has already been done. There has been no indication at any of the events that anything would be amended based on community opinion.	The issues raised during the early community engagement helped to shape the preparation of the draft SPD. Further changes to the document have been made following the consultation on the draft SPD.
2.2.1	The community is very concerned about selling off woodlands and greenspaces when we are facing a climate, biodiversity and mental health crisis. The development is not going to benefit the people of Maidenhead. It will degrade our quality of life and our ability to adapt to the effects of climate change. Losing our green lungs will	Development in the area will provide new homes, including affordable homes, and new jobs in the town. The Local Plan policies and this SPD will help to ensure that environmental impacts are properly addressed, including ensuring that there is a strong green infrastructure framework to the new development, biodiversity net

	make air pollution worse. This is going to dramatically affect the health of our community.	gain is secured and good sustainable travel options are available for new residents and workers.
2.2.1	The SPD does not address the environmental concerns raised as a consequence of the DFSPD Engagement. It also does not address the lack of infrastructure to support the development, increased traffic volumes and more green space for mental health.	The Local Plan policy and the SPD seeks to address all of these concerns, by setting out a framework for securing development with high quality design standards, a strong green infrastructure framework, and sustainable travel measures embedded into the developments and connected to the wider network. A section of the SPD is dedicated to infrastructure, setting out the measures that are necessary and their costs, together with mechanisms to secure the necessary funding to deliver those measures.

Section 3 Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph Number	Summary of Representations	Council Response
3.2	<p>Berkeley Homes have recently submitted an application for 214 dwellings south of Harvest Hill Road yet there does not appear to be a plan in place yet for improving the eastern end of Harvest Hill Road for safe vehicular, cycle and pedestrian traffic movements. When will this be in place?</p> <p>The Berkeley Homes application does not appear to address green infrastructure, biodiversity and net gain or measures to reduce climate change and environmental impacts</p>	<p>The design section of the SPD (in section 6) sets out an approach to addressing Harvest Hill Road, recognising it as a key corridor in the new development. It includes proposals for a new walk/cycle route along its length providing a safe route for pedestrians and cyclists. The character of this corridor will change as new development comes forward. Traffic speeds will be reduced.</p> <p>The Berkeley Homes application will need to be assessed against the policies in the Local Plan and have regard to the SPD which will be a material consideration in determining that application.</p>
3.2.3	<p>The text in the table at 3.2.3 is not consistent with BLP. The word “need” should be omitted as this was not referenced in the BLP. Suggest instead the table acknowledges “not all of the site will be developed for employment”. Removal of the word need will ensure</p>	<p>Agree the word “need” does not appear in the relevant Local Plan policy.</p> <p>Amend to remove the word “need” from the Table re site AL14</p>

	that the importance of the Triangle Site in addressing the borough's requirements for employment space is not constrained by the text of the SPD, given the flexibility within the Local Plan itself.	
3.2.3	The table states that the use of site ref. AL15 (Braywick Park) is "Strategic Green Infrastructure". This is not fully consistent with the description contained in the Site Allocation Proforma AL15 at Appendix C of the BLP, which defines the allocation as: "A mixed use Strategic Green Infrastructure site to serve Maidenhead..." For consistency recommend the table under 3.2.3 is amended to refer to 'a mixed use Strategic Green Infrastructure'. Also suggest the table at 3.2.3 is amended with: "...and provision of a range of sporting facilities (indoor and outdoor)."	Agreed that AL15 refers to wider uses Amend uses referred to in the table relating to AL15 to reflect the wider uses set out in the Policy for the site
3.2.8	It is noted the traffic impact modelling is based on the BLP submission. Confirm that as and when individual planning applications come forward the modelling will be reviewed, however, paragraph 3.2.8 of the draft SPD states: "the priority (across RBWM) should be to deliver smaller 'flexible' units..." This change in employment type for AL14 is likely to impact the level of trips and distribution through the network. National Highways advise, where flexible industrial, office and warehousing is proposed they would expect the 'worst case' scenario in terms of potential trips to be modelled and form part of any planning application submissions for AL14.	Noted. This is a matter for the transport assessment submitted by developers at the planning application stage to address.
3.2.8	Given the limited availability of sites for employment space the text of the SPD should not seek to impose restriction on sizes of units beyond that provided within the policy. As the policy states that larger units are appropriate, the word 'will' in the last sentence of paragraph 3.2.8 must be replaced with 'should' thereby ensuring consistency.	Noted. Amend the text to accurately reflect the Local Plan policy (ED1)
3.2.10 & 4.9.1	Mention should be made of the site provisions, conditions and restrictions applied to mineral extraction – dust control, working	This is not necessary. There is no proposal for mineral extraction at this stage, only a requirement to undertaken an assessment of the viability and practicality of prior extraction of minerals. Policies in the

	hours, etc. Also, time scale and limits before mineral extraction must cease	new Minerals and Waste Local Plan would be applied should any such proposals come forward.
3.3.2	When will the tall buildings SPD published for consultation and adopted?	It was published for consultation at the end of August 2022. We hope to adopt the SPD as soon as possible in 2023.
3.4	This section mentions several policies, both adopted and draft, that cannot be implemented if this SPD is developed as written.	Development in the SW Maidenhead should contribute towards delivering a number of the policies and strategies in this section.
3.4.1	The development is incompatible with RBWM's Climate and Environment Strategy which highlights the value of greenspace and trees for climate change mitigation.	The Local Plan policy and the SPD highlight the importance of a strong green infrastructure framework for any development. Whilst it is recognised there will be some tree loss, significant new tree planting will also be necessary and biodiversity net gain secured.
3.4.1	Reference made to "Position Statement on Sustainability and Energy Efficient Design". The Council advise this is an 'interim' position statement pending adoption of a Sustainability and Climate Change SPD. As a 'statement' this does not have the weight of an SPD and this should be made clear.	It is a matter for the decision taker the weight to be attached to this statement. It is clearly that it is not an SPD.
3.4.2	Does the Council have a Biodiversity Action Plan?	A Biodiversity Action Plan is being prepared and is expected to be adopted shortly

Section 4 Area Analysis

Paragraph Number	Summary of Representations	Council Response
4.1.2	Statement is out of date; the plan has not been updated to accommodate climate change emergency, pandemic legacy, heatwaves, pollution and water shortages that has happened in the interim. The only way to meet these is to evolve the plans to remove the golf course land from the development.	The site is allocated in the Local Plan following an extensive public examination by an independent planning inspector, who considered all the relevant evidence. The Plan was only adopted in February 2022. The SPD cannot "de-allocate" the site and hence remove the site from development.
4.2	Braywick Park and Ockwells Park are separated from the development area by motorways and dual carriageways and access	There remains significant green spaces at both these locations but it is recognised that it is important to improve pedestrian and cycle

	will only be granted from a few key places, and not accessible for wildlife. Braywick Park will lose a large area of its green space to a huge new football stadium and associated car parking and has already lost a significant proportion of green space to a new leisure centre and car parking. The accessible green spaces will not be as significant as suggested in the SPD.	connections to both Braywick Park and Ockwells Park as open space and recreation/leisure destinations. These improvements are part of the infrastructure package.
4.2.2	There is an inaccurate assessment of the existing context in the northern section of the site. The buildings here are 2 storey and elevated on a prominent hill. The proposed buildings should therefore not be above 3 storeys in height. 8 storey high density buildings to the north of the site ignores the local context of surrounding developments, a green leafy low density suburb.	This assessment of the context has been re-drafted to more accurately reflect the scale of development in the northern section of the site.
4.2.2	Braywick Park is no longer a significant area of open space as at least a third of it has already been lost to development (leisure centre, car park and school) and more is going to be lost when the football ground is moved to Braywick.	It remains an important open space but also an important leisure/recreation destination
4.2.2	Suggested wording to distinguish between the different character of the green spaces at Ockwells Park and Braywick Park: “Ockwells Park is located to the south-west of the SWMSPA and forms a significant green open space. Braywick Park, which is located to the east of the SWMSPA, accommodates a number of uses and buildings (including indoor and outdoor sports, food/drink and education) and forms a significant sports and recreation hub.”	This more detailed explanation is not necessary for what is intended to be a very brief overview.
4.2	The assessment of the building heights is wrong but also the SPD makes no reference to the topography of this part of the site. There is no evidence on the impact of the long distance views.	Agree that the description should refer to topography. Amend 4.2.2 to refer to the land falling away south of the golf course
4.3	Triangle Warehousing Site should remain green; it floods and is unsuitable for warehousing. Access to this site will be problematic as large vehicles visiting the site can only use the Braywick roundabout. The A330 in Holyport is narrow and cannot accommodate large vehicles.	The site is allocated for industrial and warehousing development in the Local Plan – as such the principle of development is established. The flood risk issues were fully considered as part of the decision to allocate the site in the Local Plan. Similarly the suitability of the site from a highway perspective would also have been considered.

4.3	<p>The character of Maidenhead will be irrevocably changed by the scale this proposed development.</p> <p>This section needs to be changes to reflect how this development will irrevocably change the current landscape, character and views of Maidenhead to one that is much less green and leafy.</p>	<p>This section is an overview of what the area is like at the moment. It is recognised that its character will change as a result of development but the aim is to secure high quality development in the area, based on a strong green infrastructure framework</p>
4.4.2	<p>Ecology AL13 and 14: +10% in the same area should be a prerequisite and mandatory for developers with immediate effect not in 20+ years time. Lack of information with regards to what will happen to existing wildlife.</p>	<p>The DFSPD states that biodiversity mitigation measures will be required and assessed through the planning application process. Section 3 of the DFSPD identifies the relevant planning policies which any application would be assessed against include QP1b, NR2 and the Site Allocation Proforma for AL13 which include biodiversity measures.</p> <p>Monitoring Indicator 9 of the BLP identifies the target that all developments to result in biodiversity net gain (at least 10%)</p>
4.4.2	<p>Only at risk flora and fauna to be considered but no mention of mandatory way of finding and protecting these areas.</p> <p>There is no mention of how the negative impact on wildlife areas elsewhere will be identified and addressed.</p>	<p>Detailed ecological surveys will be required to accompany planning application and appropriate mitigation measures will need to be identified and implemented by the developers. Applications will need to demonstrate biodiversity net gain.</p>
4.4	<p>More detail is required here to provide reassurance. What will be required and how will the planning process make sure that mitigation stays in Maidenhead and indeed within the borough.</p>	<p>See response above. Section 6.7 of the SPD sets out the approach to securing biodiversity net gain and makes clear that biodiversity mitigation and net gain should be focused on the area covered by the SPD, and if necessary on land outside but near to the SPD area, and certainly within the Borough.</p>
4.5	<p>Many of the trees on the golf course are not protected and consequently significant numbers of matures trees must be at risk. Development right up to Rushington Copse will prejudice the survival of these ancient trees. Recommended that more trees across the site are protected, including most of the land within AL13 that lies to the south of Harvest Hill Road and a copse on the Triangle site.</p>	<p>It is not the function of the DFSPD to identify the full extent and number of TPO trees within the development site. The scale of woodland and TPO trees is described without requiring detail. The impact of development on specific trees/ groups of trees would be considered at application stage.</p>
4.5	<p>No clarity as to what trees will be lost and the associated impact on wildlife. There is no mandatory requirement on developers to ensure development will be sufficiently distant from trees to ensure their long-term survival.</p>	<p>Detailed Tree Surveys and Tree Protection Plans would be required at planning application stage.</p>

4.5	All TPO trees need to be retained	Generally TPO trees should be retained. Occasionally there may be very good planning and design reasons to not retain trees. This would need to be fully justified and there would need to be replacement planting.
4.5.1	Will RBWM be conducting a survey to assign TPOs as this land is being transferred to the developer? Under 4.5.1 suggest adding after “there are several large TPO areas that cover most of the land within AL13 that lies to the south of Harvest Hill Road” the words “RBWM will additionally undertake a survey of all the trees and plants at Maidenhead Golf Course to identify all trees and plants that require TPO to be imposed on.”	Detailed tree surveys will be required by the developer for the golf course land, as indeed they will be required for other areas of development within the SW Maidenhead area It is not for the SPD to determine the approach to the use of TPOs
4.5.1	Note that there is a line of trees with TPOs running along the border of where the five houses on Oaklands Grove (SL6 2EQ) meets the south-east edge of the proposed development area. This area should be marked out on the 'Illustrative Framework Plan' (6.2.2) map as style "9" (<i>Retained existing and new planting along the rear of neighbouring properties</i>) - currently this is missing from the map . This would be consistent with the markup of the trees at the rear of the houses on the west-side of Walker Road that is shown to be protecting/saving their treeline.	The Illustrative Framework Plan is a high level plan – it is not intended to show all the detail but to illustrate principles.
4.5.1	Reference is made to several large TPO areas that cover most of the land within AL13 that lies to the south of Harvest Hill Road. Aware of two TPO’s that relate to individual trees; not aware of ‘most’ of the land that lies within AL13 south of Harvest Hill Road being covered by TPO.	The areas referred to are covered by area TPOs.
4.5.2 & 4.13.1 Figure 3	The draft SPD suggests that the tree clump on The Triangle Site has the “potential to be categorized as ancient woodland”. Whilst it then indicates this will be investigated further, figure 3 (p19) infers it is Ancient Woodland. The landowners of the site have commissioned a specialist consultancy (Sylvan) to assess whether the clump on the Triangle Site fulfils the criteria for classifying the site as Ancient Woodland.	Natural England currently maintain an Ancient Woodland Inventory which identifies and maps the extent of ancient woodland nationally. The site referred to in the SPD as “the clump” is identified on the Ancient Woodland Inventory as ancient woodland. This is the factual position. Amend text to state the factual position that the tree clump is identified as ancient woodland on the Ancient Woodland Inventory

	The report concluded it does not, and as such, the clump must not be referred to as ancient woodland in the SPD.	
4.6	No mention under Conservation and Heritage as to the history of the golf course	We are not aware of any designated heritage assets on the golf course, which is what this section is summarising.
4.7.2 & 4.13.4	The current 40mph speed limit along Harvest Hill Road is too fast and often exceeded, there is no footpath in many places, crossing the road is very dangerous as there is no footpath and no street lighting. Implementing the development plan changes as soon as possible would be well received by local residents. A reduction in speed limits will make it safer and quieter, installation of roundabouts, footpaths, cycle track and lighting will provide pedestrians and cyclists immediate benefits.	Noted and welcomed.
4.7.2	No detail on how traffic will be managed. Existing roads are heavily utilised and assessment of traffic increase looks very small for an additional 2,600 dwellings plus business transport. The suggestion of a cycle lane and potentially a bus lane will add further to congestion and goals of a major percentage of movement being on foot or bicycle seem exaggerated and need to be scientifically assessed.	The SPD sets out a range of traffic and transport measures to manage the traffic such, including a range of junctions that will need improving and guidance on the approach to Harvest Hill Road which will change in character as new development comes forward. New walking/cycling routes will be segregated from the main highway carriageway wherever possible, such as those alongside Harvest Hill Road and along the green spine through the housing development, so they should not add to traffic congestion.
4.7.2	The northern part of the SWMPA adjoins Maidenhead Town Centre Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Have you quantified the increased traffic and congestion that will result, with the impact on air quality and the health of residents? How can this be mitigated? What are the detailed proposals?	Additional traffic modelling has been undertaken to inform the infrastructure package set out in the SPD. More detailed transport assessments will be undertaken at the individual planning application stage that will quantify traffic congestion and set out proposed mitigation. The package of sustainable travel measures identified in the Local Plan and the SPD will assist in mitigating impacts.
4.8	The Flood map shows some areas in Flood Zone 2 on the land to the south of Harvest Hill Road. The lower part of these fields flood regularly in winter, and increasing the impermeability of the golf course plus removing mature trees will exacerbate this. The lower lying area more prone to flooding should therefore not be developed.	The Local Plan proforma for the AL13 site requires this to be considered through a flood risk assessment to accompany planning applications.

4.8	Concern that the removal of green space and increase of hard surfaces will lead to the amount of run-off exceeding the capacity of the drainage system and lead to flooding of homes (which historically have flooded). What are the Borough's plans to ensure this does not happen?	The Local Plan requires that development proposals will need to demonstrate the sustainable management of surface water runoff through the use of sustainable drainage systems. This will need to be addressed by developers at the planning application stage.
4.8	A request was made that the following text be added with regards to surface water drainage: <i>"It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding."</i>	The SPD contains a section on water infrastructure and this cross refers to Policy IF7 in the BLP. It adds that developers should contact the water/wastewater company at the earliest opportunity to discuss their development proposals. As such, it is considered that it is unnecessary to include the suggested text in the SPD.
4.8	Braywick Park now floods behind the new leisure centre demonstrating the flood risk in this part of Maidenhead. Not only does this section fail to address flood risk management with AL13 and AL14 (where AL14 already has a major flood area by the M4 slip road) but additionally fails to record any figures regarding likely significant increase risk with the loss of a major part of AL13 grassland and tree cover which currently absorbs rainwater.	This section of the SPD is highlighting the constraints. Section 6.7 of the SPD considers this further and the Local Plan proformas for the development sites address flood risk further, including the need for more detailed flood risk assessments at the planning application stage.
4.8.1.	Would like to see the calculations for the sequential test and would also like to understand what is meant by "no sites at lower risk are reasonably available".	The sequential test was undertaken as part of the evidence to inform the allocation of the site in the Local Plan. The SPD provides a footnote to the sequential test report.
4.8.2	The penultimate and last sentence of this paragraph can be omitted given the acceptability of the site for employment uses; the NPPF identifies employment uses in flood zones 1, 2 and 3a as less vulnerable.	The developer will need to undertake a flood risk assessment to determine the ultimate developable area of the site, even though the principle of industrial and warehousing development as a whole is accepted through the Local Plan allocation. However, it is accepted that these two sentences are not necessary in a section that is summarising the nature of the flood risk on the site. Delete last two sentences of paragraph 4.8.2

4.9.1	The site lies within a mineral safeguarding area. The negative impact noted in the SEA on minerals is not similarly noted or resolved in the SPD. How long will extraction take and what are the consequences for infrastructure delivery?	Section 3 of the SPD explains that the purpose of the minerals safeguarding area is for an assessment to be undertaken of the assess the viability and practicality of mineral extraction. If any extraction is considered appropriate, matters of timing and infrastructure implications would be considered at that stage.
	The SPD has not investigated and set out a strategy for mineral extraction and sewer infrastructure	See response above re mineral extraction. Re sewer infrastructure, this is a matter for the developers to liaise with Thames Water. However, it would be helpful to provide some high level guidance and signposting to policy on water infrastructure. Add short section on water infrastructure in section 6.7
4.9.1	The SPD is misleading where risks to future food supplies are concerned, stating most of the land is classed as Grade 4 agricultural land, but contains no reference to Grade 3 investigations	The Council produced a note for the Inspector as part of the BLP Examination (RBWM_062) explaining why Grade 3a Agricultural Land was not included in the site selection process. When undertaking this work in 2019, the Council found that the available GIS data did not differentiate between Grades 3a (good quality) and 3b (moderate quality). The Inspector accepted that this approach was proportionate and appropriate.
4.10	Doctors' surgeries in Maidenhead are already under extreme pressure; new medical facilities should be provided to meet the needs of new residents, not just relocating an existing surgery to the site, moving services further away from existing residents.	The SPD sets out proposals for including a health hub as part of the local centre. This would meet the needs of new residents of the development, as well as potential involving relocation of existing facilities, subject to further consideration by health providers.
4.10	The Green Lane allotments are located a long way from the south of the development site. Allotments are already much sought after in and the South West Maidenhead area should provide its own allotments for local residents. This will also help in keeping some biodiversity on site.	The Local Plan proforma for the site indicates that the infrastructure provided on the AL13 site should be capable of accommodating food production. Section 6.7 of the SPD highlights this and suggests different forms of food production that could be provided, including food production.
4.10.2	This paragraph is not supported by any meaningful evidence base and as such must be removed.	This paragraph is based on discussions with health providers both as part of preparing the infrastructure delivery plan for the Local Plan and subsequent discussions as part of preparing this SPD.
4.11	Pressure on existing facilities such as water, sewage, energy, etc; commitments must be secured from suppliers to increase provision in advance of the new development not once problems arise.	Key suppliers (eg Thames Water) have been consulted as part of the preparation of this SPD. The Local Plan requires necessary

		infrastructure to be provided in advance or in tandem with development.
4.11	A water usage target should be mandated in the draft planning document and it should also mandate the installation of water butts on the new development.	It is not the role of this SPD to mandate targets such as this. However it would be helpful to refer to guidance on more efficient use of water/reduction in water consumption. Add reference in section 6.7 to the guidance in the Council's Position Statement on Sustainability and Energy Efficient Design regarding water efficiency measures
4.11	Thames Water acknowledges upgrades to infrastructure in Southwest Maidenhead will be required after 2025, which is the period in which most development is set to take place. Without upgrades the system is likely to become overwhelmed. This SPD is an opportunity to coordinate the upgrades, however, section 7.2 does not consider utilities. This should be addressed.	The Local Plan Infrastructure section sets out policies in some detail in relation to utilities, notably water infrastructure, although it would be helpful to signpost this from the SPD. Add additional text in relation to water infrastructure in section 6.7
4.11	The SPD relies on old evidence, why has this not been updated with the latest evidence on climate change? Little attention given to more frequent droughts. There is no evidence on water sustainability.	It is recognised that this is an area of water stress Add additional text in relation to water infrastructure in section 6.7, and signpost to the Council's Position Statement re Energy Efficiency and Design regarding water efficiency measures
4.11	There is no mention here about the provision of clean water for this development. Is water supply covered in the "Statement of Common Ground in 2020" signed by the Council and Thames Water, and has it been revisited in light of more recent projections for sustained water storages in this area?	See above responses re water infrastructure. The Statement of Common Ground was specifically for the Local Plan process. There is no need to revisit it but the Council has engaged with Thames Water on this SPD and will continue to do so through the planning process. However developers will also need to work closely with Thames Water to ensure there is adequate water supply and sewerage provision.
4.11	Paragraph 4.11 remains valid, but state it should also be taken into account the timescales involved in providing new wastewater infrastructure (18 months to 5 years). It is therefore vital the Council and Developers work alongside Thames Water so they can build up a detailed picture of what is being built where, get	Noted and agreed. The proposed text is already addressed in Local Plan policy IF7 but it would be helpful to refer to this in the SPD

	confidence of when that development is going to start and what the phasing will be. Request developers engage with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity. Additional text recommend.	Add section re water infrastructure, including a cross reference to Policy IF7.
4.11	Additional text requested as follows: <i>“When considering sensitive development, such as residential uses, close to the Sewerage Treatment Works, a technical assessment should be undertaken in consultation with Thames Water. The technical assessment should confirm that either: (a) there is no adverse amenity impact on future occupiers of the proposed development, or; (b) the development can be conditioned and mitigated to ensure that any potential adverse amenity impact is avoided.”</i>	The Local Plan already sets out a range of environmental protection policies that cover matters such as air pollution, noise and odour. These detailed technical assessments can be addressed in discussions with developers and assessed against the relevant Local Plan policies.
4.11	Thames water support the mains water consumption target of 110 litres per head per day as set out in the NPPG and support the inclusion of this requirement in the policy. In order to achieve this the following text is recommended: <i>“Development must be designed to be water efficient and reduce water consumption. Refurbishments and other non-domestic development will be expected to meet BREEAM water-efficiency credits. Residential development must not exceed a maximum water use of 105 litres per head per day (excluding the allowance of up to 5 litres for external water consumption) using the ‘Fittings Approach’ in Table 2.2. of Part G of Building Regulations. Planning conditions will be applied to new residential development to ensure that the new water efficiency standards are met.”</i>	As noted in earlier responses, it is recognised that the placemaking area is in an area of water stress. Whilst it is not for the SPD to set new water efficiency targets, it is appropriate to refer developers to guidance in the Council’s Position Statement on Sustainability. Add reference to the guidance in the Council’s Position Statement on Sustainability on water efficiency
4.11.3	Suggested wording: “New fibre optic/latest technology cabling will be provided to all new and existing properties in the South West Maidenhead area to offer improved data speeds to everyone.”	This is a matter for broadband providers, working with the developers, to deliver.
4.12	Noise and air quality issues could both be improved by protecting all the mature trees currently on the site. Noise from air source heat pumps could be an issue	Section 6.7 of the SPD sets out the approach to trees. The sustainable travel measures outlined in the SPD combined with improving environmental standards such as the introduction of electric vehicles will help reduce air pollution over time.

4.12	The reference to “vibration” should be omitted as it does not add any further detail that that in the BLP.	Agreed Agreed – remove vibration from the title of this section and the content page
4.12	Areas in Maidenhead exceeded the WHO target for safe air quality during the Heatwave demonstrating the impact of high density development	Earlier responses have highlighted how a combination of high quality sustainable travel measures and changes to vehicle emissions over time should improve air quality
4.12	It is disappointing that proposed protection from increased road noise and pollution considers new residents but not existing ones.	See response above
4.12	Air quality must be consistently measured before development starts to give a baseline and then carefully monitored.	Monitoring does take place in the areas most affected, namely the Air Quality Management Areas
4.12	Care must be taken that existing local residential roads do not become car parks/rat runs and that the resulting increase in traffic from such a huge development is properly accounted for, not just ‘wishful thinking’ that the new residents won’t have cars or need to drive to work	Noted. This is a matter for detailed parking standards in the development. These are likely to vary depending on how accessible the development is to the station and the town centre, and the type and size of homes provided.
4.12	Bus services in Maidenhead have been declining for many years which will only decline further with future budget cuts	The SPD sets out measures to ensure that bus services can be properly integrated into the development. Funding will be sought from the development to secure this.
4.12.1	How is RBWM going to promote non-car travel?	This SPD sets out a range of measures to promote non-car travel, notably the provision of high quality walk/cycle links, integration of public transport into the development and the inclusion of a local centre enabling people to access local community facilities without have to use their cars.
4.13	The map of this area does not reflect that Braywick Park has been developed with a leisure centre and a school and has plans for a football stadium.	The Plan is intended to show the main planning and environmental constraints in the area rather than where existing areas of development area are or where plans may be being proposed.
4.13.1 Figure 3	Whilst SPD figure 3 illustrates the extent of flood zone 3, given the acceptability of employment space within flood zone 3a, this should be recognised through a footnote to this illustration.	This is not necessary or appropriate. The Plan is intended to show the constraints at a high level, not explain the detail of how they might be applied on a site-by-site basis.
4.13.2	The weaknesses identified for accessibility for pedestrians also applies to all the wildlife currently located on this site.	Noted – the text indicates poor connectivity generally, not just for pedestrians.

4.13.6	Please share the mitigation plans, in particular for the increased pressure on existing facilities and infrastructure, including on the highway network.	Section 6.6 of the SPD sets out transport mitigation measures, section 7 explains the approach to infrastructure more generally and Appendix 2 sets out a fuller list of infrastructure projects that need funding through section 10 agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy. Other infrastructure (eg utilities) will be provided direct by the developers in consultation with utility providers
--------	--	--

Section 5 Vision

Paragraph Number	Summary of Representations	Council Response
Section 5 General comment	The vision would be noble if it were not to the detriment of 132 acres of publicly owned Green Belt land with many areas of dense woodland containing thousands of mature trees. This plan decimates biodiversity that has been established for hundreds of years.	Section 6 of the SPD sets out the approach to a range of environmental matters, including biodiversity, trees, and delivery high quality design in the development
Section 5 General comment	Concerned that developers will not adhere to biodiversity policy requirements; no detail on how the +10% gain is to be achieved. If Biodiversity Net Gain cannot be achieved within the placemaking area there is no indication of how or when RBWM intends to engage with possible offset providers.	Biodiversity requirements and biodiversity net gain are policy requirements in the Local Plan and, in relation to the 10% net gain, will become legal requirements later in 2023. Section 6.7 of the SPD sets out more information on the approach to securing net gain, seeking to maximise biodiversity mitigation within the development area and then within the placemaking area. Developers are expected to work with the Council to secure the best biodiversity solutions locally.
Section 5 General comment	Plans on show at the consultation events showed very little 'green', particularly on Maidenhead Golf Course and no mention of 'blue'; it seems the SPD has already moved some way from this 'vision'.	Disagree. A strong green infrastructure framework underpins the design principles in the SPD. However, the Policy requirement in the Local Plan proforma for site AL13 for a central green space on the site in the transition area between the two neighbourhoods is not as well represented on the Framework Plan (Fig 4) as it could be.

		Amend Figure 4 Framework Plan to highlight the transition zone between the two neighbourhoods where a central green area would be located include appropriate explanatory text in the key.
Section 5 General comment	Wildlife will not be able to move from pockets of green areas across Braywick Road and the A404. There are no green underpasses planned.	Development will need to provide, as part of the green infrastructure network, good ecological/wildlife connectivity through the development areas to allow wildlife movement
5.1.2	The approach to Maidenhead from the motorway as a result of this plan will be an industrial estate and warehousing, not green fields. A large new school will front Harvest Hill Road, not hidden behind a leafy buffer. The green space at Braywick has been reduced and both Braywick Park and Ockwells Park are separated from the development site by busy roads. It is hard to see how building a high density development on green space makes for a greener existence, or increases biodiversity.	The SPD recognises the importance of the Triangle site as a key gateway to the town of Maidenhead, and this is reflected in the Pro forma for the allocated site AL14 and policy QP1b of the BLP which requires high quality new development. The SPD expresses a vision that will create continuity across the development area through the use of strategic green infrastructure to ensure that the identity of the new development reflects the perception of Maidenhead as a green town.

Section 6 Design and Delivery Principles

Sections 6.1 – 6.3 Design

General Comments on Design Section

Para No.	Summary	Council Response
6	The Windsor, Ascot and Maidenhead Community Land Trust welcome a wide range of housing types, densities and tenures. Seek solutions to problems of affordability / enable affordability to be passed on from generation to generation. Opportunities for community led development which are socially and environmentally sustainable.	Noted. See comments in relation to section 6.5
6	SPD refers to “Northern Neighbourhood” and “Harvest Hill Neighbourhood”. BLP refers to “northern” and “southern” neighbourhoods. It would be helpful if the references in the SPD were consistent with the BLP.	Noted and agree clarification is needed. Amend to make clear that the Southern Neighbourhood in the Local Plan proforma is now called the Harvest Hill Neighbourhood in this SPD
	<p>The strategic rationale for the green spine south of Harvest Hill Road (HHR) is reduced if there is no longer a requirement for the bridge over the A308M.</p> <p>It should be replaced with a network of green streets south of the HHR.</p> <p>The Green Spine is too wide south of the HHR. This will lead to design problems and isolated blocks of development. It would also</p>	The ‘Approach to the Green Spine’ section already focusses on legibility and directness of access to the Local Centre as the purpose of the green spine (north and south of HHR) as well as overall good connectivity via sustainable means. The removal of the bridge over the A308 does not affect this, the primary reason for an intact and legible green spine extending to the south of HHR.

	<p>affect parking layout. If it is to be retained then it should split at the local centre and extend further to the east.</p>	<p>The proposal to split the green spine and locate it further east would dilute its coherence and legibility, as would replacing it south of the HHR with a network of green streets.</p>
	<p>The role and function of the Southern Green Fringe needs to be clearer</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Amend text at: Annotation 6 on the Framework Plan for the southern green margin, paragraph 6.3.25, and annotation to 3rd row to Green Spine diagrams at 6.3.26, to reflect the intended combined biodiversity and informal recreation function of the southern green fringe.</p>
<p>Building Heights generally</p>	<p>Development of 5 or 6 storey blocks (or 6-8 storeys) are too high – this is high ground and development of this scale will dominate the surroundings and be clearly visible from Cliveden.</p> <p>The site is not in the town centre or even the town centre fringe.</p> <p>Building heights would not be sympathetic to the surrounding area which is mainly 3 storeys and would affect quality of life of nearby residents including due to overlooking. Site is already higher than properties on eastern side.</p> <p>Taller buildings separate people from the street, are not good for people’s health and are not suitable.</p>	<p>The Local Plan proforma for the AL13 site distinguishes between the two neighbourhoods, highlighting that the northern neighbourhood will be orientated towards the town centre with building heights and densities reflecting those in the town centre.</p> <p>The northern neighbourhood is close to the town centre.</p> <p>Concerns are recognised about the relationship with the surrounding residential areas, and there should be a principle that building heights step down from the centre to the edge of the site as a result.</p> <p>Amend the guidance to highlight the issue of the relationship with surrounding properties and illustrate with a diagram the principle of stepping down heights towards the edge of the site</p>

	The SPD fails to highlight any guidance on building aesthetics and misses an opportunity to set the bar for architectural flair and individuality which is lacking in the town centre developments viz the new car park (eyesore) on Stafferton Way.	The SPD is intended to focus on design principles. Detailed architectural considerations will be considered fully at the planning application stage.
	The SPD states that the dense flats may be 6-8 storeys high and this is supported by flats in Broadlands which are this height. This is incorrect. These flats are only 3-4 storeys high and are all below the development on golf course and indeed cannot be seen. The heights of dwellings at town end of development should be of similar height to Rushington Avenue. Should be more guidance on building heights.	Noted. Further guidance on the approach to building heights at this northern end of the AL13 site is set out in the Building Height and Tall Building SPD, a draft of which was consulted on recently.

Comments on Illustrative Framework Plan (Figure 4)

Para No.	Summary	Council Response
General	When finalising the document, it is considered that a clearer key with larger symbols would be beneficial.	Noted – will increase symbol sizes in Figure 4 to make them clearer

4d	<p>There are significant changes in existing levels, as well as unregistered land and existing residential properties, which would prevent a frontage onto Kimbers Lane from being feasible. Feedback from public engagement has also identified significant concern about any proposals, which include development fronting this location. Accordingly, notation 4d should be reworded to remove reference to built form fronting both sides of Kimbers Lane.</p>	<p>The note sets out an important planning and design principle with regard to built frontages onto Kimbers Lane. The developer should look to identify solutions that respect the principles set out in the SPD where there are constraints</p>
5	<p>Reference is made to the 'Harvest Hill neighbourhood' however, this has not been defined in the draft SPD and accordingly it is unclear which elements of the allocation this note relates to.</p>	<p>The Harvest Hill Neighbourhood is defined variously at annotation 2, 4b and 5 of Figure 4, within the 'Approach to Harvest Hill Neighbourhood' section, the 'Approach to Green Spine' section, as well as housing and community needs sections.</p>
6	<p>This notation identifies that the southern green margin will contribute to biodiversity gain across the South West Maidenhead area. At present, no agreements are in place between the stakeholders and this land is in private ownership. It is unclear what role this area is expected to make, nor how this will be delivered or secured, or how it will relate to the wider South West Maidenhead area. It should not be expected or assumed that these areas should (or indeed can) offset other developments within the wider allocation. Site specific strategies should be provided with each application and if unfeasible to deliver on site, and where there are multiple applications, a strategic approach should be taken to securing off-site credits</p>	<p>The role of the southern green margin is identified as contributing to biodiversity gain across the South West Maidenhead area, as well as informal recreation. As an ecological facility it should connect to the wider network of wildlife corridors and habitats.</p> <p>It is for developers to ensure there is coordination across different application sites</p>

10	Reference is made to “ <i>a series of key junctions</i> ”, however, only one label has been included on the diagram and, as such, it is unclear which other junctions are also considered to be key. We would suggest that the other key junctions are also identified, which could also be ordered in relation to their scale and therefore, significance.	Agree clarification would be helpful. Amendment - Label '10' duplicated to refer to every symbol of the same type denoting 'key junction'.
Green Spine	Suggest the addition of an annotation to the Plan that, in the area south of Harvest Hill Road, this function of the green spine could be accommodated via green streets, enhancement/management of existing boundary vegetation and through the incorporation of good planning and design practice.	No change to the function of the Green Spine Amendment - Clarification added to the Green Spine table (at 6.3.26: row 5, 2nd sentence) identifying that it will be distinguishable from the surrounding green streets which feed in to it, creating a hierarchy between the spine and surrounding streets.
Table at p.26 Item 4	This description of the green spine does not reflect its different requirements along its length and as such contradicts the SPD elsewhere where it acknowledges the ‘form and function’ of the green spine will vary.	The function of the green spine remains unchanged, however: Amendment: the text has been amended to reflect a more flexible use language whilst ensuring it continues to serve its purpose.
Illustrative Framework	Where green streets are shown in the Illustrative Framework Plan on the land south of Harvest Hill Road, on our client’s land in an east-west direction, the potential for such links and their location(s) are limited by land ownership constraints and physical features – principally, the existing hedgerow which borders our clients land to the west. Whilst only an illustrative plan, we consider it important that what is shown is ultimately deliverable.	It is important that landowners/developers in preparing their planning applications work together to deliver green streets and good east/west connectivity.

Triangle site Annotation 3	<p>It is essential that the text at annotation 3 of the Illustrative Framework Plan notes the internal arrangement and layout of the site will have regard to market needs at the time of formal application submission/determination.</p> <p>It should also recognise the requirements associated with larger units which are acceptable on the site and that this could readily result in divergence from the illustrative layout.</p>	<p>The layout included in this section is clearly indicated as illustrative. It would not be appropriate or necessary to change the text to refer to market needs at application stage, as the Local Plan policy provides the framework for what should be provided on site.</p> <p>Annotation 3 has been amended to reference the acceptability of larger units, only where they are required to secure a delivery of a mix of units as part of a comprehensive scheme, in line with Local Plan policy.</p>
Triangle Site Annotation 3	<p>Point 3 references consideration of street scene and public realm matters, the needs of operators/users of the buildings are important, especially with respect of servicing arrangements which could hinder the aspirations in the SPD. Additionally, given the limited opportunities within the borough to meet the needs for employment floorspace, this will impact upon the ability to achieve extensive separation of vehicular and pedestrian movements on the site.</p>	<p>The creation of good public realm in this development is critical.</p> <p>The text at the 4th sentence of annotation 3 of the Illustrative Framework Plan has been amended to reference servicing arrangements, however, this is not incompatible with achieving a high quality and safe public realm.</p>
Triangle Site Annotation 3	<p>The last sentence of annotation 3 is considered to be overly detailed for the SPD in referencing 'active elevations', given the evolving needs and demands of the Borough's business market.</p>	<p>The SPD is seeking to establish important design principles and this reference is not considered to be inappropriate or too detailed</p>
Braywick Park	<p>Appropriate to show existing facilities located within the park</p>	<p>Whilst this is not considered necessary, the changes to Figure 4 more clearly distinguish the built form and green space at Braywick Park, and the leisure and recreation facilities are regularly referenced throughout the SPD.</p>

Braywick Park Annotation 8	<p>Suggest that a distinction is made between Braywick Park and Ockwells Park given the important indoor and outdoor sports provision at Braywick Park, rather than the informal outdoor recreation space at Ockwells Park.</p> <p>Suggested change to text: “In addition to being a strategic green space, Braywick Park accommodates a range of indoor and outdoor sports and leisure facilities, a SEN school, a restaurant and a garden nursery. and Improvements.....”</p>	<p>It is not considered necessary to distinguish between the characters of the two parks at Braywick and Ockwells given that, combined, they provide important strategic green spaces and leisure facilities for the whole of Maidenhead. The policy context section of the SPD already sets out the appropriate uses in the AL15 designated area.</p>
Figure 4 and Annotation 13	<p>Annotation 13 of Figure 4 shows a proposal for a station forecourt on land the Council / developer do not have control of so it would be impossible to implement. It shows a key junction with links to the station and a high density hub which if implemented would result in the loss of a strip of ancient woodland.</p>	<p>The pink shaded area labelled ‘Station Forecourt’ has been removed from Figure 4 as it has been misinterpreted as a redevelopment area.</p> <p>The text for annotation 13 remains unchanged as it reflects the vision to create a direct access to the station.</p>
	<p>A footpath / cycleway link to the station is proposed but there are ownership constraints, and the land is so steep it would not be possible to implement to a standard that is safe and would meet Highway standards. It would also require the removal of mature trees.</p>	<p>Pink shading removed (as comment above)</p> <p>Annotation 13 suggests development form should safeguard the long-term potential to realise the possibility of connecting the SWMPA with the Station and Town Centre beyond. As a consequence, the green spine is shown extending to the northern-most boundary of the development area where it would meet the existing footpath and a key junction indicated.</p>
	<p>The landscape buffer for Courtlands and Crescent Dale would be removed and replaced with 8 storey high, high density buildings set on significantly higher ground.</p>	<p>The AL13 proforma in the BLP and the SPD indicate that building height, densities and typologies in the northern neighbourhood will reflect those in the town centre given its proximity. Despite the indication that densities are likely to be higher in the northern</p>

		neighbourhood the SPD encourages a variety a of building heights to be considered and is not prescriptive in this regard.
	A safe pavement/cycleway needs to be built that goes up the length of Harvest Hill Road	The Harvest Hill Road section of 6.3 and Appendix 2 (Infrastructure Schedule) identifies the need for a walk/cycle route on the north side of Harvest Hill Road

Comments on Access and Movement Diagram (Figure 9)

Para No.	Summary	Council Response
Figure 9 and annotation i	The delivery of additional frontage onto Kimbers Lane is not considered feasible. Further it is considered that the incorporation of further development along this frontage would also detrimentally impact the existing character of the country lane.	This is an important planning and design principle with regard to built frontages onto Kimbers Lane. The developer should look to identify solutions that respect the principles set out in the SPD where there are constraints
	It is unclear how the southern green margin can successfully perform a role as a legible and accessible pedestrian and cycle route through the development, whilst also still delivering biodiversity enhancements as referenced in the Illustrative Framework Plan.	<p>Pedestrian and cycle connectivity and biodiversity are not considered to be mutually exclusive.</p> <p>The descriptions of the southern green margin within the SPD are sufficiently flexible to enable a variety of design solutions to combined ecological and informal recreation uses.</p>

	<p>Concerned regrading the compatibility of the aspirations for Kimbers Lane and the nearby surroundings given the existing waste transfer facility, which does not appear to be adequately addressed in the draft SPD as an existing constraint. This issue would be further exacerbated by the pending appeal decision (ref:APP/T0355/W/21/3289347) associated with the waste transfer facility, which would increase the number of HGV movements along Kimbers Lane substantially.</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.12.4 identifies there is an existing inert waste recycling site to the western end of Kimbers Lane.</p> <p>It is unclear how this existing use would restrict improvements to make links to Ockwells Park safer and more legible.</p> <p>The outcome of the appeal is unknown at the time of preparing this response.</p>
Item 9	<p>The existing planting to be retained and new planting should be a meaningful width (3-5m) with a pedestrian path in the middle, but unlikely to work for some Protected Species. Widths should be 50m</p>	<p>This is not considered to be appropriate or necessary</p> <p>A suitable planting width would be determined at planning application stage and could be specific to any individual situation, such as existing planting, length/ nature of existing property, rear boundary type, which will vary.</p>

Comments on Other Diagrams in section 6.3

236

Para No.	Summary	Council Response
Figures 4 and 9	Question the proposed location of the green spine as shown on Figures 4 and 9 because it would direct pedestrians and cyclists to the outer extremity of the southern green margin to an area of scrub vegetation. It therefore does not represent the likely desire line for journeys from the local centre southwards.	<p>The green spine provides a continually connected and legible route for pedestrians and cyclists throughout the South West Maidenhead areas, from the station and the northern neighbourhood, through the local centre and southern (Harvest Hill) neighbourhood, connecting to the southern green margin at the furthest southern point, which could be used for informal recreation as well as biodiversity gain. It is a key route into which other pedestrian and cycle routes can make their way to, gathering up pedestrian and cycle movements.</p> <p>Amend text at Annotation 6 of Figure 4 to reflect the potential dual function of the southern green margin to include informal recreation, which makes the continuation of the green spine to this point in keeping with the legibility.</p>
Figures 5 and 6	Suggest show Braywick Road on these diagrams	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Diagrams amended to show Braywick Road including the appropriate annotation</p>
Figure 7	Suggest the title is amended to: “Illustrative cross sections – Accommodating family housing”	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Amend title to include ‘Illustrative cross sections’ and additional text included before the illustrative sections to clarify they are not intended as a specification of building heights.</p>

P47 – 48	<p>Section C indicative cross section for the green spine demonstrates an inefficient use if the space and discords with the text box at p45 where it refers to an ‘oversized residential street’.</p> <p>Suggested redesign of the layout of the green spine.</p> <p>Also observed if parking in area ‘F’ is not allowed for more than occasionally it will have the effect of pushing parking into rear parking courts which can be undesirable from a design perspective.</p>	<p>The cross sections are for illustrative purposes and do not show a definitive design for the layout of the green spine, rather they set down some general principles</p> <p>The SPD establishes that the approach to parking will vary in the different character areas</p>
Figure 11 (b)	<p>Surely a better junction for vehicular access will also be required between Shoppenhangers Road and Harvets Hill Road?</p>	<p>The text referenced here is explaining how best to improve provision for cyclists and pedestrians at either end of Harvest Hill Road; it is not concerned with vehicular access.</p>
Figure 11 (d)	<p>The individual TPO trees along the south side of Harvest Hill Road in section d may prevent a segregated cycleway being provided on this side of the carriageway.</p> <p>Suggested the best location for an east-west cycleway would be along the north side of Harvest Hill Road. Do not need one on both sides of the carriageway.</p>	<p>Retention of TPO trees need not prevent a segregated walk/cycle route, however, the route may need to deviate to accommodate the trees</p> <p>It is possible that a cycle way may not be needed on both sides of the road, however, a footway will be required on the south side as well as the north.</p> <p>Amend text at Figure 11 d: to reflect the above</p>
Figure 12 (p56)	<p>Object to the requirement that the green spine to the south of Harvest Hill Road (HHR) should be greater in width that HHR. Do not agree it is necessary or justified in the location south of the HHR, and certainly not beyond any ‘way finding’ function (i.e. beyond the entrance of our development parcel).</p>	<p>As stated above, the purpose of the green spine is more than just way finding.</p>

Detailed points in relation to the text (sections 6.1 – 6.3)

238

Paragraph Number	Summary	Council Response
6.1.2	<p>The overarching design principle below is just ludicrous when this plan is set to destroy 200 acres of green belt land including the 132 acres of the golf course land.</p> <p>“Ensure that development is designed to incorporate measures to adapt to and mitigate climate change, including the delivery of net zero carbon development on site where this is feasible.”</p>	<p>The Local Plan proforma for AL13 includes a series of measures to mitigate the impact of the development, many of which are reaffirmed within the SPD.</p>
6.1.2	<p>The principles focus on AL13 and AL14 but should also cover AL15 and suggest adding:</p> <p>“Create a high-quality strategic sporting hub for Maidenhead, comprising a range of high quality indoor and outdoor sporting facilities which meet identified needs.</p> <p>And Braywick Park is visible from A308 and QP1b requires a strong and identifiable gateway into Maidenhead from the South, so add:</p> <p>Create a distinctive, sustainable, high quality new development which provides a strong and identifiable gateway into Maidenhead from the south.”</p>	<p>The text suggested is not considered to be compatible with the Local Plan proforma for AL15, where it is identified as a ‘Strategic Green Infrastructure site’, with a variety of uses, not just a sports hub.</p> <p>The suggested text on providing a gateway into Maidenhead is the same wording used in clause 5b of Policy QP1b in the BLP and there is no need to repeat this in the SPD.</p>

6.1.2	<p>Bullets 2, 3 and 4 seem to have been ignored in the northern neighbourhood. How can high-density flatted developments 'include varied residential character and mix of housing types'. Where are the 'centre of activity' and 'vibrant local centre' which will 'facilitate more sustainable lifestyles'? Are they both the 'town centre'?</p>	<p>The 'varied residential character and mix of housing types' relates to the whole of the SWMPA rather than a particular area within it.</p> <p>The northern neighbourhood is identified as comprising a low traffic, high density development due to its proximity to the town and station. The southern (Harvest Hill) neighbourhood includes residential areas to the north and south of Harvest Hill Road and is focussed around the school and local centre and is therefore intended to primarily comprise family housing.</p> <p>The SPD has been amended to include an area of transition between these two neighbourhood areas to the north and south. This area would mark a distinctive transition through green space from one neighbourhood area to the other. This recreation and ecological space would serve the northern neighbourhood as well as the southern and the legible green spine would encourage a sustainable connection from the northern neighbourhood to the local centre.</p>
6.1.2	<p>There is a risk that the 'higher hierarchy' version of the green spine would have the effect of dividing and isolating some residential development blocks, contrary to paragraph 6.1.2 which seeks to avoid piecemeal or isolated part of development.</p>	<p>The continuous nature of the green spine on the north / south axis is the legibility and coherence that would ensure developments do not appear isolated or piecemeal.</p>
6.1.2	<p>Suggest paragraph 6.1.2 wording is altered from "... including the delivery of net zero carbon development on site where this is feasible" to "...unless it can be demonstrated that this is not feasible, in which case the requisite contribution to the Carbon Offset Fund should be secured as a planning obligation." It should be a requirement, not a preference, that net carbon is achieved on the site</p>	<p>Amend text to remove reference to delivery of net zero carbon development.</p> <p>This is because the subject is considered at length in Section 6.7.</p>

6.2	The level of information contained in the draft SPD does not enable Thames Water to make an assessment of the impact the proposed development will have on the waste water/sewerage network infrastructure and sewage treatment works. To provide more specific comments details of the type and scale of development together with the anticipated phasing would be required.	It is not appropriate for the SPD to contain this level of detail; this is a matter for the developers to liaise with Thames Water at the planning application stage. However, it is considered appropriate to provide some high level guidance and signposting to policy on water infrastructure. Add short section on water infrastructure in section 6.7
6.2 Figure 4	It would be impossible to build a 4m wide footpath / cycleway linking the train station as the developer would not have control of the land. The steep topography would make the footpath / cycleway unsafe. Widening the path would result in the removal of a strip of ancient woodland.	The green spine is indicated to extend up to the northern boundary of the site, where an existing footpath connects to Shoppenhangers Road and the station forecourt beyond. Whilst it may not be achievable in the short term, the text for annotation 13 remains unchanged as it reflects the long-term vision to create a direct access to the station from the SWMPA.
6.2 Figure 4	The gardens at Rushington Avenue should not have to retain their planting along the rear gardens to contribute to connectivity for wildlife benefit. If private gardens are removed from the hatched area, what remains is a narrow strip of 10m. A 10m buffer zone is inadequate to provide any landscape screening or mitigation against the impacts of the proposal on neighbouring properties and would not be sufficient to protect existing mature trees. The green hatched area should remove land outside of the Council's control and the green hatched area should be extended within the development area by up to 30m.	The SPD does not require neighbouring properties to retain existing planting within their rear gardens. Annotation 9 refers to retaining planting along the rear of neighbouring properties.

Figure 4 & Figure 9	If the continuation of the green spine is needed south of Harvest Hill Road, a more appropriate location would be for the green spine to split in the local centre and then extend further east before crossing Harvest Hill Road	Disagree. This would dilute the continuity and legibility of the green spine.
6.2.2	A masterplan for the whole SW Maidenhead development will be required before anyone planning application can be considered for a particular phase. It is not possible to comment on individual planning applications without seeing how each piece of the jigsaw fits into the entire development. The principal developer for SW Maidenhead must prepare a phased masterplan illustrating the sequence, layout and areas of build. This must be produced prior to the submission of any detailed planning application.	The SPD is intended to provide a framework for planning applications to come forward in a way that delivers comprehensive and coordinated development, by both providing design principles and a coordinated approach to infrastructure delivery. The Council is unable to prevent planning applications being submitted prior to the adoption of the SPD.
6.2.2	Table makes a number of statements using the word “should” – needs to be more affirmative by using “must” or “will” or “need to”	Use of the words suggested risks using the statements being interpreted as policy rather than guidance which would not be appropriate in an SPD.
6.2.2 Illustrative Framework Plan Item 12 on Map	As an owner of a property on the south side of Harvest Hill Road (HHR) it is critical for us that the junction of HHR and Braywick Road is improved / reconfigured before construction on the south side of HHR begins. It is already very dangerous to cross as a pedestrian from HHR over Braywick Road to Bray/Braywick Nature Park and School. Before the crossing is made busier with construction traffic and large lorries a safe crossing needs to be constructed.	Section 6.6 of the SPD and Appendix 2 (Infrastructure Schedule) identify this junction as being in need of improvement. It is agreed that this should include crossing facilities across Braywick Road for pedestrians and cyclists, connecting up with the proposed new pedestrian/cycle route on Harvest Hill Road.

<p>6.2.2 Illustrative Framework Plan Item 12 on Map</p>	<p>A safe pavement / walkway needs to be built and made available that goes up the length of HHR at the beginning or an early stage of the development. Currently there is no safe pavement or cycle route up the full length of HHR from Braywick Road to Shoppenhangers Road. Once construction traffic starts using HHR it will be very dangerous to walk or cycle up HHR in its current condition.</p>	<p>Agreed. The SPD proposes that a segregated walk/cycle route should be provided on the north side of Harvest Hill Road. Section 7.2 of the SPD highlights that this is one of the pieces of infrastructure that should be delivered early on in the development.</p>
<p>6.2.2</p>	<p>Pocket parks are not going to be sufficient for wildlife and health. Significant areas of greenspace and woodland are required to have healthy habitats for wildlife, clean air, shade and a place for recreation and improved mental health and wellbeing.</p> <p>The plans currently show high density development abutting the Ancient Woodland of Rushington Copse.</p>	<p>Pocket parks are not the only open space proposed. A central green area, a green infrastructure network including green spine, and a southern green fringe will all contribute towards open space, recreation and habitats for wildlife.</p> <p>The Local Plan proforma indicates that buffers will need to be provided to protect Rushington Copse.</p>
<p>6.2.2</p>	<p>The Illustrative Framework Plan is misleading as it shows Braywick Park as being entirely green but there are large buildings and a car park there. There are also plans to build a new football stadium there.</p>	<p>Figure 4 has been updated with the Leisure Centre and other main buildings having been excluded from the green shading at Braywick Park. They are now identifiable as built areas.</p> <p>However, the football club does not have planning permission for a new stadium and it is not allocated in the BLP, as such it would not be appropriate to reflect this on Figure 4.</p>
<p>Table at page 27</p>	<p>A clear distinction should be made between Braywick Park and Ockwells Park. Suggest point 8 in the table should include reference to the existing sports facilities at Braywick Park.</p>	<p>This is not considered necessary – the policy context already sets out the role of the AL15 allocation.</p>

6.3	Within the Design Principles (section 6.3), the proposed methodology for urban block structure should make reference to maximising opportunities for both natural heat (solar gains) and ventilation through the optimal orientation of buildings (see BLP Policy SP2(1)(a)).	Agree that reference should be made to natural heating and ventilation, but it is important that this does not compromise the integrity of a walkable and legible neighbourhood. Amend parts 1 and 5 of the section on block structure (6.3.6) to refer to maximising opportunity for natural heat and ventilation.
6.3	Disappointing that the proposal for an active-travel connection to the triangle site via a bridge over the A308(M) appears to have been discounted due to cost. We would like to see the green spine also extend south to the triangle site through the creation of a green bridge.	Section 6.6 of the SPD indicates that the option of the bridge and an alternative solution were reviewed and it was concluded that the alternative could provide comparable benefits.
6.3.1 Figure 5	In the area marked AL14 - allocated as an Industrial Site - A new, large supermarket should be mandated to be built to serve the community in this area that is increasing in size.	The AL14 site is allocated in the Local Plan for industrial and warehousing purposes to help meet the need for that type of development. The SPD cannot change the allocation in the Local Plan. The policy for the AL13 housing site includes the requirement for a local centre to include local retail facilities. This will be more convenient and accessible for those living in the new housing development.
6.3.2	This is a major change from the BLP. In that plan the northern end of the golf course is not in the town centre and is not even in the town centre fringe. This is a very significant change serving presumably to somehow justify high density multi storey development in this location	The Local Plan proforma always recognised that the northern part of the AL13 site would be orientated towards the town centre making the most of proximity to the railway station and the town centre facilities. It indicates that the building heights, densities and typologies will reflect those in the town centre. The guidance in the SPD concerning the northern neighbourhood reflects the local plan policy.

6.3.2 -6.3.4	<p>There should be guidance on dwelling types</p> <p>Should also include proportion of private rented properties and breakdown of tenure types</p>	<p>The policies relating to mix of housing and housing tenure are outlined in HO2 and HO3 of the Local Plan. This includes requirements for different tenure types for affordable housing. Section 6.5 of this SPD sets out further detail and evidence as to how this should be applied in relation to the SPD area. The design guidance discusses housing typologies at various points, particularly in relation to delivering family housing. It is not appropriate to set a proportion of private rented as the Local Plan policy and related evidence base does not provide a basis for this.</p>
6.3.3	<p>How different are the lifestyles and why? If the objective is to develop two balanced and inclusive communities with varied residential character and a mix of housing types, this plan is doing the opposite. It means that people living nearer the town centre will have a more constrained lifestyle. There is nothing very inclusive about that.</p>	<p>The Local Plan says that two distinct neighbourhoods each forming a clear sense of place, should be created. It is clear from the Local Plan that they will have different characters.</p>
6.3.5	<p>Unless money can be found for a bridge across the A308(M) it seems unlikely that the number of walkers and cyclists prepared to navigate the A308 Holyport roundabout to access the Triangle site will do much to alleviate the amount of road traffic to AL14.</p>	<p>Having reviewed the option of the bridge and the alternative, it is considered the alternative approach involving improved pedestrian and cycle access around the Braywick roundabout and to the AL13 site and to the town centre could provide comparable benefits to the bridge and is the preferred approach.</p>
6.3.8 Northern Neighbourhood	<p>What vehicular access is to be permitted? What is the public and private parking provision? These should not be down to the developer to determine. This must be determined by the planning team.</p>	<p>At the northern end vehicular access would be on to Shoppenhangers Road via the existing access to the golf course club house. Further access points would go on to Harvest Hill Road. Parking provision will be determined at the planning application stage having regard to the detail proposals at the time. The final decision on this rests with the Council who determine the planning application.</p>

6.3.8	It's contradictory to say you'll have a green spine for active/sustainable travel and wildlife but you will also accommodate cars. You say this is a sustainable development next to the station, so keep the cars out.	The SPD is clear at various points that priority should be given sustainable modes of travel in the green spine – notably pedestrians and cyclists (e.g see Box in para 6.3.26) as well as public transport. It is not appropriate to exclude cars from the development as a whole.
6.3.8	“the central green spine as the main focus of movement, activity and recreation” The central green spine, created by felling dense, mature woodland is a complete misnomer – this is just a spine!	The Local Plan and SPD make clear this needs to be a green spine and detailed guidance is included to set out the character and form of the green spine.
6.3.8 Approach to Harvest Hill Neighbourhood diagram	The shading on this diagram is unclear, and the text requiring the ‘built form’ to draw attention to the green spine is ambiguous. Does this mean higher densities, taller buildings, closer to the street frontage? This requires clarification.	The darker shading illustrates potentially higher density/taller buildings. An additional diagram is added to illustrate how buildings should step down in height towards the edge of the development which clarifies this point. Add diagram to illustrate the stepping down of building heights to the site boundary
6.3.9	<i>“Building at density must be coupled with adequate provision and accessibility to high quality public realm and a mix of open space from private to public, active and passive. The environment must be one which makes higher density living attractive”</i> . Should this not be moderate density living?	Higher density living is the right phrase to describe what is envisaged, consistent with the proforma in the Local Plan for the AL13 site. Moderate density would potentially be misleading.

6.3.9	No evidence to suggest high density development creates community. High density should be defined by persons or dwellings per hectare	This paragraph does not claim any connection between high density and community. It simply outlines that where high density is necessary there should be a series of facilities and a quality of environment which support community. (In essence agreeing with this point acknowledging that, without this high quality public realm and suitable facilities high density development will lack any ability to accommodate functional community).
6.3.10	Definition of sustainability in this plan is inaccurate and outdated. It doesn't relate to the affordability of the project but to the protection of the environment for future generations	The allocation of the site in Local Plan has been tested through a sustainability process, assessing the site against social, economic and environmental objectives and the independent planning inspector considered that the Plan, including the SW Maidenhead sites were sound, having regard to sustainability evidence. The affordability of the project was not a factor in that sustainability assessment.
6.3.9-6.3.10	Why do these and subsequent paragraphs not also apply to the northern neighbourhood? Are you creating two different classes of neighbourhood? A high density inner city flatted development in the north and a more pleasant residential neighbourhood in the south?	See response above. The two distinct neighbourhoods reflect the characters described in the Local Plan proforma. Do not agree with the description of the neighbourhoods in the comment.
6.3.12	In this case there needs to be a design statement about how big these amenity spaces should be, how near to dwellings and how they will be maintained. Otherwise community spirit and cohesion will be jeopardised by play problems which, commonly, are top of the list of resident gripes exacerbated by a blurring of defensible space.	The SPD is setting some design principles to guide future planning applications. It is not intended to provide detailed standards.

6.3.13	This is redundant. No need to plant any new trees. Change the policy and leave the nature trees on the site	Provision of street trees as part of new streets is an important principle to achieve a high quality development
6.3.13	A welcome paragraph though it would help to suggest that selected tree species should be a) drought tolerant mindful of predicted climate in 20 years, b) resistant to all known diseases, c) good at providing shade.	Agree it would be helpful to refer to the environment in which they are located. Amend to add reference to them being suitable for the environment in which they are located
6.3.16	Paragraph 6.3.16 of the SWMF SPD states that an element of off-site provision to meet the open space requirements of the development of site AL13 could potentially be met via the existing provision at Braywick Park. In our view, the SPD should more strongly discourage this approach. However, if an element of off-site provision is to serve that development, it will be necessary for a financial contribution to be secured towards enhancing the quality of provision at Braywick to cater for the increased demand and usage which would arise.	Agree that reference to financial contributions towards playing pitches should be included in the SPD. Add to section on open space (section 6.5) to indicate the likely need for financial contributions to off-site playing pitch provision.

6.3.16	<p>Concern that the carrying capacity of the playing fields at Braywick Park may be reaching the maximum already, without have additional demand form a new school. RBWM has recently commissioned a new playing pitch strategy which will be completed by spring 2023. The findings of PPS should inform whether or not there is enough capacity for a school's use on this site. It maybe that the school may need to pay for the installation of a hybrid pitch at Braywick Park.</p> <p>Reworded to Ideally, all the school sports facilities would be located on the main school site. Should this not be possible, an element of off site provision could be provided in Braywick Park to cater for peak usage (e. for major sporting events) <i>subject to the results of the playing pitch strategy 2023</i>. Access to the off site sports provision would need to be improved to allow safe access for the school.</p>	<p>Amendment proposed is not necessary here but as per response above, there is a need to highlight the likelihood of financial contributions to playing pitches being required in section 6.5 which should also highlight the work on the Playing Pitch Strategy.</p> <p>Include reference to playing pitch strategy in new section on playing pitch provision in section 6.5</p>
6.3.18 – 6.3.19	Must highlight that these are purely illustrative	Not necessary. The start of section 6 indicates that the diagrams in this section are illustrative. The principles in the text are not illustrative.
6.18 – 6.19	Reference to a third neighbourhood (the Triangle site) is confusing in the light of Local Plan policy – suggest referring to only the two neighbourhood on AL13 site	<p>Agree</p> <p>Delete reference to the Triangle site as a neighbourhood – refer to it as an employment area</p>

6.3.19	Planting a few new trees to create “tree lined” main routes will do nothing to mitigate the loss of mature trees from this site.	The SPD highlights the importance of protecting as many mature trees as possible and integrating new tree planting in the design of the developments.
6.3.19	Does not recognise that larger units are acceptable on the site and consequently is inconsistent with policy ED1. To address this, the word ‘could’ in the third sentence needs to be replaced by ‘should’.	Amend the text to more accurately reflect the wording in the Local Plan Policy ED1.
6.3.21 – 6.3.23	Substitute “can” with “need to”	Agree this can be made firmer. Amend “can contribute” to “will contribute” in the second line of para 6.3.21
6.3.22	This plan aims to decimate the high quality green space and replace it with a space that by the very nature of it being “multifunctional” cannot be high quality	Whilst recognizing that the character of the area will change, the aim is to provide a high quality publicly available green space in the new development
6.2.23	The Green Spine connecting the local centre to the town centre to the north is considered a strategic link. However, do not consider the Green Spine should continue at the same scale to the south of Harvest Hill Road where its purpose is no longer strategic in nature. The scale of the Green Spine south of Harvest Hill Road is not proportionate or necessary to achieve its objectives. Do not need the formal designation of a ‘green spine’ to achieve ‘green’ streets and ecological and landscaped corridors.	It is the ambition that the green spine will become the preferred route for pedestrian and cycle access to the local centre and encourage more sustainable methods of travel. It is therefore considered the green spine to the south of Harvest Hill Road remains part of the ‘strategic link’ and consequently, its continuation at the same scale is both proportionate and more coherent than navigating a ‘local network of green routes’. The alternative ‘local network of green routes’ proposed is unlikely to have the same desired effect on encouraging reduction of vehicular use and would dilute the legibility of the SWMPA.

6.3.23	There's no doubt that every one of us has to consider more sustainable forms of transport. But the idea that public transport, cycling and walking along this route will reduce traffic both within the site and on Braywick and Shoppenhangrs Roads has to be seen as aspirational rather than realistic. Two schools and a substantial medical centre are unlikely to be catered for in this way. The site is elevated and the distances are too great	Noted – but the aim should be to reduce traffic in and around the site by providing good sustainable alternatives to the car. Provision of facilities on the site mean that those living on the site will have shorter distances to travel to those facilities making the use of non-car modes easier.
6.3.25	Support the reference to provision of a “southern green margin” alongside the A404(M) and A308(M) (at paragraph 6.3.25) and that this can be used to maintain ecological continuity. However, we note later comments in respect of this land and the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) (e.g. paragraph 6.7.11) on which we have commented below.	Noted
6.3.26	How exactly will this green spine ensure “ecological capital”. Please define this further! There is nothing in this document that truly addresses ecology except in the context of making a place ‘look’ green. Certainly, any wildlife that is currently located on the site will have disappeared by the time the development is complete!	Developers will need to design the scheme to deliver this objective.

6.3.26	<p>There is considerable detail on creating a local centre for the Harvest Hill neighbourhood, yet no consideration of the facilities required by the Northern Neighbourhood on the grounds it is near the station and town centre.</p> <p>The schematic at the top of p45 makes the station look closer than it is, and even though regeneration of Maidenhead may eventually unite the station and the town centre, many properties in the Northern Neighbourhood will still be half a mile away and up a hill. This new neighbourhood needs a focal point of its own, with basic facilities to generate a sense of community and also deter people from using cars for small purchases, eg last minute groceries.</p>	<p>The local centre is a specific policy requirement of the Local Plan for the Harvest Hill neighbourhood, but it is not for the northern one because of its accessibility to the town centre. That does not mean to say that an element of mixed use development along the green spine at a design focal point would not be acceptable. Improved walk/cycle connections to the town centre will, however, make the town centre as the key destination for basic facilities.</p>
6.3.26 – 6.3.29	<p>The principle of the Green Spine performing a structural, functional and ecological role is laudable but without an access point at its northern tip it fails in its main aim of providing a direct link to the town centre. To be successful it will also require a seismic shift in public attitudes and bus services which seems unlikely.</p>	<p>Noted, but it is important to create the right facilities and design to enable that shift to take place. The diagrams show several potential access points for pedestrian/cycle access to the town centre.</p>
6.3.27	<p>Sustainable drainage is shown in cross sections but otherwise not covered. If sustainable drainage is not properly designed, constructed and maintained, downstream pollution and flooding may result. Some RBWM document for SW Maidenhead needs to define who is responsible for the design (in phases), interim maintenance prior to adoption, final adoption and ongoing maintenance of such schemes.</p>	<p>Policy NR1 in the BLP requires the provision of sustainable drainage systems in new development and the proforma for AL13 also requires the use of Sustainable Drainage Scheme (SuDS). The detail of how this is delivered will be determined at the planning application stage.</p>

6.3.27 and Figure 9 6.3.30, 6.3.31 and Figure 10	Suggested that the junction between Harvest Hill Road and Braywick Road is a traffic light junction where cars can turn right as well as left. It should encompass also a pedestrian crossing as many residents currently cross the carriageway to access Braywick Court School, Braywick Nature Centre and Braywick Sports Centre.	Noted. The detailed nature of any junction improvement at this location has not been determined yet and will need to be considered as part of the transport assessment for planning applications. Agree that a pedestrian crossing is needed at this location for the reasons stated and part of that improvement and this is assumed in broad infrastructure costings in Appendix 2 of the SPD.
6.3.27 Figure 9 Item 'd'	When this junction is redesigned for the long-term (once the road is busier with traffic from the new residents) it is key to consider that any traffic light control (or similar measures) at this junction could cause traffic to be backed up and prevent existing residents exiting from their driveways onto the HHR.	As per the response above, the detailed design of the junction improvement in this location (Harvest Hill Road/Braywick Road) has not been determined yet. Concern noted.
6.3.27 Figure 9 Item 'g'	If a pavement were to be built on both sides of Harvest Hill Road a place for existing residents to place their bins on collection day will need to be built in to the plan so that they do not block the new pavement / cycle lane	Noted. This will need to be addressed in planning applications for the developments.
6.3.27 Figure 9 Item 'j'	<p>Whilst the location of the access point j is noted, the further detail is considered superfluous at this stage. Building scale and orientation within the site will be necessitated by the requirements of operators, within the context provided by the plan of seeking a gateway scheme.</p> <p>Since the whole Triangle Site is within a single ownership this will provide scope for the co ordination of development within the submission of planning applications. This ability for a single application to cover the Triangle Site and the ability to provide an overarching masterplan means that significant elements of the current draft SPD are considered unnecessary;</p>	<p>The SPD provides little detail at this point in relation Fig 9 item J.</p> <p>It is important for the SPD to provide appropriate guidance to guide development and infrastructure provision and it is considered that it does. The need for the SPD and its guidance has not been overtaken by the evolving needs of the Borough's businesses.</p>

	especially where this has been overtaken by the evolving needs of the Borough's business.	
6.3.29	Mentions the possibility of improved East/West road links south of Maidenhead. Unless a corridor is safeguarded for such a link this will presumably be impossible. Suggest withdrawing paragraph 6.3.29 and provide further detail to properly upgrade Harvest Hill Road.	The Local Plan and the SPD are not proposing new road links but are proposing measure to improve accessibility and links by other non-car modes, particularly walking and cycling (eg an east/west walk/cycle link alongside Harvest Hill Road). As such, no need to safeguard a corridor.
6.3.29 – 6.3.31	An admirable ambition but it is unlikely to encourage much of a reduction in car ownership on site. Vehicular movement has to be accommodated as part of enhancing permeability	Agree that vehicular movement does need to be accommodated within the development.
6.3.31	6.3.31 deals with the Harvest Hill Road corridor. Our understanding is that RBWM will lead on the delivery of coordinated proposals for the corridor. This section should make clear that RBWM will lead on this aspect.	It is the Council's intention to lead on the delivery of proposals for the corridor, notably the East/West cycle link along Harvest Hill Road – this is made clear in the "delivery" column in Appendix 2 for this item.
6.3.31	Approach to Harvest Hill Road – Harvest Hill Road Corridor: It states under the third bullet point: <i>"To create an attractive, diverse, safe and inviting corridor that shifts mode of travel from vehicular to a more people focused approach"</i> . Surely, this should state <i>"that complements"</i> as access roads will continue to be required, particularly for elderly population?	It is clear from the SPD and the design principles that vehicular access will still be required and planned for, but the emphasis should be about shifting the approach to a more people focused one.

6.3.31 p.55 'd'	<p>Individual TPO trees may prevent segregated cycleway and generous pedestrian public realm on both sides of the carriageway.</p> <p>Consider the best location for an east-west cycleway would be along the north side of Harvest Hill Road.</p> <p>Do not consider there to be a need for one on both sides of the road, and p.64 refers to a “new segregated walking/ cycling route along the north side of Harvest Hill Road”.</p>	<p>Agree that north side of Harvest Hill Road is the best location for an east/west cycleway, and that a cycleway is not needed on both sides of the road.</p> <p>Amend to indicate that the preferred location for a segregated walk/cycle route is on the north side of the road.</p>
6.3.1 – 6.4.1 + 6.6.1 + 6.6.12	<p>More needs to be done to Harvest Hill Road than currently shown, including the junctions with Braywick Rd and Shoppenhangers Rd where both need right turns.</p> <p>Consider creating another access onto Shoppenhangers Rd (current golf course entrance is tight)</p>	<p>The SPD (Appendix 2) indicates a need to improve the Harvest Hill Road/Braywick Road junction – the detail of that improvement will need to be developed as part of the transport assessment for planning applications. The transport assessment will also need to consider the Harvest Hill Road/Shoppenhangers Road junction.</p> <p>Creating another access onto Shoppenhangers Road in addition to the golf course entrance would involve third party land/property.</p>
6.3.33	<p>Cannot achieve this statement without improving Harvest Hill Road at the eastern section where it is narrow, twisty and steep</p>	<p>There is limited scope to improve the road in this location due to properties on either side of the road. It is important to consider that the road will perform a different role in the future than its current role, with slower speeds throughout as it will go through the heart of a new residential area.</p>
6.3.33	<p>A substantial upgrade of Harvest Hill Road will be required if no other link road provided. A 20mph speed limit and footpath on one side of the carriageway will not be sufficient. The entire road will require widening, straightening, roundabouts, lighting and surfacing.</p>	<p>The character of Harvest Hill Road will change when development comes forward, with traffic slowing and responding to a different context. A new link road is not required.</p>

6.3.33 Figure 12	Object to the requirement that the green spine should be greater in width than Harvest Hill Road. Do not agree it is necessary or justified.	Would re-affirm the intention set out in paragraph 6.3.39 with regards to the “legibility of the green spine to the north and south” and it being “promoted as the preferred choice for movement for residents on both sides of Harvest Hill Road.” It is considered necessary and justified on the basis that “The continuity of the green spine helps overcome the barrier of the road corridor and ensure the cohesion of the whole community across the Harvest Hill corridor.”
6.3.38	Regarding continuity of the green spine as it crosses Harvest Hill Road (6.3.38), it is vital that this at-grade crossing with pedestrians and cyclists having clear priority in both directions.	A careful design solution is required at this location to ensure continuity of the green spine. Add sentence to indicate that a careful design of the crossing point and associated highways solutions are necessary to ensure the continuity of the green spine and pedestrian and cycle safety and legibility are maintained.

Masterplanning and Design control

Para. No.	Summary	Council Response
6.3.43 – 6.3.45	Paragraph 6.3.43 and bullet points at 6.3.45 – The wording of these paragraphs should be reviewed and reconsidered. Design Codes will not be appropriate nor required for every planning application. In some instances, including in the case of ‘Land South of Manor Lane’ (ref: 22/01717/FULL), the relevant information will be included within the Design & Access Statement which accompanies the planning application. This demonstrates how the land use and design matters have been considered and how delivery will accord with the Borough Local	The text in the SPD recognises that landowners and developers will bring forward proposals in different ways and at different scales. All sites should however adopt a consistent approach to help support the overall objective of securing comprehensive and well considered proposals. Masterplans and Design Codes are well known and used tools to help articulate and enable good design to be secured. They help in the consideration of the relationship of a site to its wider context, local character, and other important elements that contribute to placemaking.

	Plan, draft SPD and other material considerations. Accordingly, these sections of the draft SPD should be revised to reflect that Design Codes will not always be necessary.	<p>For larger multi-phase proposals Site Wide Masterplans and Design Codes will be very important and the Council will need to formally consider and approve them as part of any overall sequence of evolving detailed proposals.</p> <p>For smaller sites which are single phase and where material is submitted in detail it is appreciated that aspects which may be otherwise covered by a Site Wide Masterplan & Design Code are likely to be integrated into the detailed design drawings/material that are to be considered for approval.</p> <p>Amend text to acknowledge that for such single phase & where detailed proposals are set out, the 'Design & Access Statement' could be used to explain the masterplan and overall approach to detailed design for the proposals, covering matters similar to that which would otherwise be contained in a separate Design Code.</p>
6.3.50-6.3.54	Paragraphs 6.3.50 – 6.3.54 – As above, these paragraphs should be revised to acknowledge that Applicants may include the relevant detail within a Design & Access Statement and not every application should be required to submit a Design Code. If a Design Code is required, it should be limited to Custom Build/ Self-Build dwellings only. Additionally, detailed schemes should not include Compliance Checklists as suggested at paragraph 6.3.53. This would be illogical for detailed planning applications, where any such checklist would just repeat information already submitted as part of any application. This is an unnecessary and prescriptive addition.	<p>The requirement for applicants to need to show how they have considered and comply with policy and guidance set nationally and locally, including via the SPD, will be retained for all applications.</p> <p>Amend text of para 6.3.50 to acknowledge that for smaller sites which are single phase & submitted in detail, then the accompanying 'Design & Access Statement' could explain the masterplan and overall approach to detailed design. This would replace the need for a separate or additional 'Compliance Checklist' for this type of application/approach.</p>
6.3.46	Suggested changes to text: Site Wide Masterplans and Design Codes should be submitted alongside and as part of supporting material related to the relevant planning application/s. For larger sites with subsequent	The requirement for such material to be required by condition and needing to be approved by the Council 'prior to' the approval of reserved matters is an important step to allow the Council to ensure that such matters are properly considered and agreed before

	<p>future phases, it may be appropriate for the preparation of Design Codes for any future sub-area or phase to be required by condition to be submitted and approved by the Council as part of the prior approval of reserved matter applications and commencement of development on that sub- area/phase. A summary of how the overall process is provided in Figure 13 below.</p>	<p>applicants embark on detailed design work. This is considered a typical and reasonable approach to enable a sequenced evolution of detailed design, avoiding risk of retrospective consideration or justification.</p> <p>The wording does not preclude applicants from submitting such material at the same time of reserved matters applications should they so wish.</p>
6.3.45	<p>The SPD should allow for individual proposals for sports and leisure uses to be brought forward on Braywick Park (AL15) without requiring a 'site-wide masterplan' or any design codes. Such requirements would be disproportionate and unnecessary given the separate nature of any such proposals to the masterplanning of a large-scale mixed-use development to the west of the A308 Braywick Road.</p> <p>We therefore seek the inclusion of additional bullet point in paragraph 6.3.45 of the SWMF SPD to clarify RBWM's approach for any such proposals.</p>	<p>All proposals will need to demonstrate how they have considered and comply with policy and guidance set nationally and locally, including the need for high quality design and placemaking as required by the Borough Local Plan and SPD.</p> <p>The use of masterplans and design codes are well known and used tools and can apply to all forms of development.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the level of detail may vary depending on the nature of different proposals, and therefore will be considered based upon their specific context and the nature of development that they relate to.</p>
6.3.42 – 6.3.49	<p>Could usefully include a reminder of the advantages of community/stakeholder engagement as part of the process.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Amend by including additional text to para 6.2.45 to state "All proposals will need to have evolved with community and stakeholder engagement, and demonstrate how this has informed the overall approach."</p>
6.3.54	<p>Compliance checklist implies adherence by the developers. This supplementary document uses soft words like 'should/, 'can', etc. - implying the clauses are optional rather than obligatory to apply</p>	<p>The Compliance Checklist process is intended to provide a mechanism by which applicants can consider and explain how their proposals accord with an approved Design Code. The SPD is setting out further guidance on the overall process.</p> <p>Any proposal would ultimately be considered on its overall planning merits.</p>

		The language used is because the SPD guidance and not policy (which is contained in the Local Plan). The SPD cannot write new policy where more forceful language might be appropriate.
6.3.56	Since most of the fundamental design decisions have already been taken by the Council/developer and incorporated into policy there is no point in a design review at that stage.	<p>The South West Maidenhead area contains significant development of a strategic nature and at a key gateway location into Maidenhead.</p> <p>The role and purpose of any design review process would be to consider how proposals align with and accord with the placemaking policies and ambitions as set out in the Borough local Plan and this SPD. By suggesting these be undertaken at pre-application stage it will help to guide and inform the preparation of applications to ensure they are appropriately meeting the policy requirements.</p>

Section 6.5 Community Needs

Paragraph Number	Summary of Representations	Council Response
6.5.1	Housing Mix Box – the 50% family housing 50% flats is not consistent with the Local Plan and are inappropriate. The SPD cannot create new planning policy	<p>Noted. It is recognised that this box should link more closely to the policy position in the Local Plan, particular reference to the Berkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) mix for larger units and the evidence base that indicates what an appropriate mix might be in this instance.</p> <p>Update the box and supporting text to refer more clearly to the policy and supporting evidence, including the SHMA and the proforma. Include more evidence on housing mix in an Appendix (see new Appendix 3).</p>
6.5.2	<p>In order to achieve 2,600 dwellings within the Placemaking Area “it will be necessary to ‘blend’ flatted development and family housing throughout the Placemaking area.”</p> <p>It is not sufficiently precise or justified to require a lower proportion of flats on the southern part of the site and would not reflect the aim of providing mixed communities. Suggest the wording should be changed to “a lower provision of flats and greater emphasis on family housing in the area south of Harvest Hill Road.”</p>	<p>See response above. Justification for the mix referred to in the SPD should be more closely linked to the SHMA and other evidence. It should be noted however that the Local Plan policy indicates high density development around the local centre to reflect the area’s accessibility and to contribute to its vibrancy.</p> <p>Update housing mix section to refer more directly to the relevant Local Plan policy and hence where the mix 3 and 4 beds units will increase and 1 and 2 beds will decrease</p>
6.5.4	Reference needs to be made to viability to align with Local Plan policy	This is intended to be a very high level summary of the main policy requirements. Reference to viability is not necessary here – the detail of the policy and NPPF is available if people wish to read the whole policy.
6.5.6 Table 1	The evidence supporting the proposed mix should be made publicly available	Agreed

		See new Appendix 3 for evidence in support of the proposed affordable housing mix
6.5.6	Add extra text to end of paragraph to provide flexibility re alternative affordable mixes to be evidenced by local circumstances/market conditions at the time, given the long build period of the development	Agree some flexibility would be appropriate, but based on changes to affordable housing need. Add sentence to provide some flexibility on affordable mix if needs evidence changes over time
	Community Uses suggested such as: Exhibition Space for touring exhibitions, performance space for local musicians, outdoor market, pop-up shops, charity events, social (such as specialist interest groups meeting place, parents' coffee mornings, physical and mental health – such as yoga classes, addiction meeting groups, counselling venue, place of worship, arts venue, political meeting place) Suggested that any working group comprising community representatives, groups and stakeholders established to consider the multi-purpose community building would visit examples of other community buildings.	Noted – thank you for the suggestions.
	Noted there is no church or pub proposed in the plans, yet traditionally the church, pub and post office were seen as the heart of a village / small community. There does not seem to be any up to date vision in the document of what gives life and heart to a community.	Noted – the developer will need to work up the specification for the local centre, including the community facilities, with community representatives, groups and stakeholders
6.5.8 to 6.5.11	It is good to see accessible and adaptable dwellings, wheelchair accessible and self-build / custom build included in line with BLP policy H02 but disappointing that there is no specific mention of point 5 of H02 on community-led housing approaches.	Agree it would be helpful to refer to this. Add reference to Policy HO2 re community led housing approaches
6.5.11	Apparent typo - 'to' should be deleted	Agreed Delete 'to' in first sentence
6.5.13	If the school is not to be delivered for 11 years, the space should be made available to the public in the interim	Noted

6.5.13	The ownership of the multipurpose Community Building through a CLT going forward could bring long term benefits to the community. Any future income could be used for community benefit (virtuous circle of funds).	Noted
6.5.14 - 6.5.18	Suggest would be more successful to site local shopping centre with community building and medical facilities	That is the intention. Health provision on the site is being explored.
6.5.19	This development is too dense to provide any meaningful open space, in particular there will be a net loss of public open space considering 132 acres of the golf course land is currently public open space though it is currently leased by the Golf Club.	Noted. The development would have to meet Local Plan open space standards. The Local Plan policy and design section of the SPD outlines the importance of there being a strong green infrastructure framework to the development
6.5.20	Refine paragraph to indicate that facilities could be shared with nearby sites given improved connectivity in the development area	It is for developers to demonstrate how open space standards will be met across the development in a comprehensive and coordinated way

Section 6.6 Connectivity

Paragraph Number	Summary of Representations	Council Response
6.6.2 Box	Make clear the improvements along the Braywick Rd should be linked to the Triangle site as they are solely required to link that site to the town centre	This is already made clear in section 7 in the paragraphs relating to the Triangle site contributions.
6.6.3	Cycling now and in the future will increasingly include battery powered bikes and scooters. Each dwelling must have secure private storage for these which must include appropriate low cost charging points.	The box at paragraph 6.6.6 specifically refers to the provision of secure high quality parking facilities. Add reference to the need for charging points for electric bikes as part of cycle parking

6.6.4	Provide more details of the refurbishment of the bridge over the A404(M) should be provided – if intention is to widen, this will require new structure and will be complex	There are no more details at present but these will be worked up in due course, including consultation with National Highways. An indicative cost of the works is provided in Appendix 2
6.6.5	The last sentence of this paragraph indicates that if the bridge is not feasible and an alternative is promoted, this should include benefits for public transport users alongside pedestrians and cyclists. However, neither site specific proforma in the Local Plan for AL13 or AL14 requires consideration of public transport. This must therefore be omitted from the last sentence of the paragraph to ensure consistency.	15. (h) of the Site Allocations Proforma for AL13 states: “Alternatively, if demonstrated not to be feasible, alternative sustainable access options would need to be explored and implemented that provide comparable benefits for the movement of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users in the area.” Clause 5 of the Site Allocation Proforma for AL14 states: “Promote sustainable travel and mitigation measures such as improved public transport provision and walking and cycling routes ...” and clause 6 states: “Ensure that the development is well-served by public bus routes/ demand responsive transport/ other innovative public transport solutions , with appropriate provision for new bus stop infrastructure, such that the bus is an attractive alternative to the private car for local journeys”
6.6.6	The alternative to the bridge for the green spine linking AL13 and AL14 is poor. Crossing the Ascot Road, A308 Windsor Road, The Bingham, the entrance / exit to the petrol station and both carriageways of the Braywick is not the green and attractive walk to work anticipated. What are these crossings going to do to traffic flow on and near to the Braywick Road roundabout? Has this been factored into the traffic modelling used to inform the plan?	It is considered that the alternative measures will be provide a good alternative to the bridge, enabling connections to be made to both the AL13 housing site and to the town centre. The crossings are not factored into the traffic modelling. It is recognised that crossings will affect traffic flow but it is necessary to balance the needs of all users. More detailed design work needs to be done but it can be expected that, even with the crossings, significant improvement in traffic flows would be achieved by the proposed Braywick Roundabout improvements.
6.6.10	There is no budget for new bus services, but even if it were, it would not be fair for this development to benefit from cheaper travel unless the whole of the Borough benefitted from cheaper travel.	Developers would be expected to make a financial contribution towards establishing new/diverted bus services. A trial cheaper fare scheme would be a means of encouraging greater patronage. It would encourage new residents to use buses early on, and hence encourage modal shift.
	Electric cars still result in non-exhaust emissions and as such are only part of the answer to pollution	Noted. The Local Plan and the SPD also set out proposals for sustainable travel measures to reduce reliance on the private car and

		hence limit emissions. The location of particularly the northern neighbourhood of the AL13 site close to the town centre and train station, and inclusion of a local centre to reduce, also encourage trips by non-car modes, thereby helping to reduce emissions.
	Add “where feasible” at end of para 6.6.10 as it is dependent on the bus operator	It is not considered necessary to caveat in this way. Clearly we will need to work in partnership with bus operators. The current wording already provides flexibility by indicating that these are the measures that should be considered.
6.6.12	The box should state which of the schemes RBWM will be taking forward.	The table in Appendix 2 sets out who it is anticipated will take forward the various infrastructure schemes
6.6.12	Development at AL13 and AL14 should not wholly fund the junction improvements at Holyport Road / Windsor Road, and it is noted that the detail of any improvement to M4 8/9 is not known and therefore the extent of the cost uncertain. It is therefore suggested that the introduction to the list of improvements should state: “As part of mitigating the impact on the wider road network, contributions to provide/fund improvements...”	Disagree. See more detailed responses in relation to comments in section 7 about the approach to funding necessary infrastructure provision and the fact that SW Maidenhead development will also have a wider impact.

Section 6.7 Sustainability and Environment

Paragraph Number	Summary of Representations	Council Response
6.7	Draft SPD only states a ‘preference’ towards net carbon being achieved on site. Instead, the Council should demand that the new developments are committed to (measured) net zero, or Passivhaus	<p>The SPD has to work within the framework set out in the Local Plan policy and other relevant strategies and policies that are set out in this section of the SPD.</p> <p>The SPD states not just that it is a preference but also an expectation – i.e. that it ought to be capable of delivery on site.</p>

6.7	Developers are “encouraged to consider” the whole life carbon impact of their development. This wording is vague and does not demand anything from developers. The Council should carry out assessments using the targets set by RIBA. Offsetting could be encouraged, after all reduction measures have been exhausted.	<p>The SPD has to work within the framework set out in the Local Plan policy and other relevant strategies and policies that are set out in this section of the SPD. As such we cannot make this a hard requirement, but encourage developers to move towards this approach.</p> <p>Amend wording re ‘whole life carbon’ to encourage developers to work towards this and that this will be given significant positive weight in determining applications</p>
6.7	Reference to “consider whole life carbon” not referenced in Interim Sustainability Statement. Cannot introduce new policy	<p>Noted</p> <p>Update text in box to ensure this does not read as a policy but make clear what the Council’s objectives are and the weight it will attach to this issue in determining planning applications.</p>
6.7	<p>‘net zero’ is not well defined in either the ‘Interim’ Position Statement or section 6.7 of the draft SPD. The ‘Interim’ Position Statement should not be assigned the weight of an SPD, as section 6.7 appears to suggest.</p> <p>The definition of ‘net-zero’ and the ways it could be achieved should be considered as of the Sustainability and Climate Change SPD.</p>	<p>The SPD indicates that it is net zero (operational).</p> <p>The SPD does not indicate that the Interim Position Statement carries the same weight as an SPD.</p> <p>Agree there is scope for the Sustainability and Climate Change SPD to address such matters further.</p>
6.7	An approach to mitigation of light pollution throughout the placemaking area should also be established due to, among other things, the impact this can have on biodiversity. The SPD should specify that any outdoor lighting should be assessed for harm caused in accordance with zone E2 (low district brightness).	<p>Light pollution is addressed in Policy EP3 of the Local Plan (including in the supporting text the different zones). Policy EP3 is referenced alongside other environmental policies at paragraph 6.7.25 of the SPD. It would, however, be helpful to reference light pollution in the preceding paragraph.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 6.7.24 (second bullet point) to refer to light pollution</p>

6.7	Air Pollution: The draft document does not acknowledge the increase in air pollution that will be a consequence of new residential and non-residential areas. Due to proximity to town, station and long stay car parks, car-free neighbourhoods could be considered, with a target number of dwellings being car free. Green barriers to polluting areas are mentioned around the new neighbourhood but should also be considered around the school as schools are generally exposed to higher levels of air pollution.	Paragraph 6.7.24 of the SPD recognises that air pollution is a potential issue alongside other forms of pollution and the relevant policies in the Local Plan that will help address this are referenced. Agree that car-free neighbourhoods could be considered in locations close to the town centre/station. The landscaping scheme around the school can consider buffers at the application stage, although consideration will need to be given to where any pollution sources might be located.
6.7	Biodiversity: 10% net gain is very low, and the wording of the document permits this net gain to happen off-site. Instead, the document should mandate at least 10% biodiversity net gain on site.	10% is the standard set by Government that is due to come into force in November 2023, although the Council believes that developers should be applying this approach at the earliest opportunity.
6.7	Access to local public transport, including bus stops, should be mandated	This is included in section 6.6 of the SPD.
6.7	Paragraph 5.7.3 of the SEA states that the introduction of 2,600 new homes will inevitably increase energy consumption, traffic and pollution, however, SPD has not used any tools to calculate the AL13 impact	The SPD includes a range of measures to minimise energy consumption, notably a series of sustainable travel alternatives to the car as well as setting out an approach of zero carbon in relation to new buildings. The SPD does not seek to prescribe an overall carbon “assessment” but does set out the above measures.
6.7	No reference in the SPD to the River Basin Management Plan	Paragraph 6.7.22 refers to Policy NR1 of the Local Plan and the supporting text to that policy (para 12.2.9) refers to the River Basin Management Plan. It is not possible to refer in this SPD to all the detailed elements contained in NR1.
6.7.1	This plan, and indeed RBWM, need to demonstrate they are able to meet the targets set out in the Environment and Climate Strategy. This would require major modification of this SPD to remove the loss of mature woodland and minimise, if not cease, all development on green space, and in particular the golf course land.	The site is allocated for residential development for approximately 2,600 homes in the Local Plan and this provides the policy basis for SPD, along with the detailed proforma for the site set out in the Local Plan. The proforma provides an extensive list of policy requirements, including in relation to trees and green space, and the additional guidance in this SPD helps to deliver on those policy requirements.

6.7.5	Developers must not avoid community payments due to viability – if the carbon fund payments are not mandatory and measured in the SPD then what would prevent developers resisting payment	The Council has to have regard to viability considerations in determining planning applications.
6.7.5	This paragraph encourages developers to consider the ‘whole life carbon’ impact of their development. However, the SPD has not outlined how the whole life is to be measured, as such there is no means of proving compliance. Without the evidence on the measures and mechanisms to demonstrate compliance with this objective there is no information to confirm it will not harm deliverability. It must consequently be omitted.	Disagree. Developers are encouraged to work towards a ‘whole life approach’ and can discuss with the Council at the time of their application how this could be measured, including by reference to good practice. The Sustainability and Climate Change SPD may be able to consider this further.
6.7.6	Energy Statements should reflect Building Regulation methodologies. Any energy and emissions reductions beyond these standards should be supported with sufficient evidence stating why national standards need to be enhanced locally. In the absence of any evidence why higher standards are both necessary and will not undermine deliverability, this paragraph must be omitted.	It is clear that developers need to be working towards achieving higher levels of carbon reduction in order to work towards net zero targets. The SPD sets out the Council’s existing policies and strategies in this respect, and the objectives it wishes to achieve through this SPD in this respect. The wording in the box in para 6.7.1 has been updated to reflect this approach. The text in 6.7.6 signposts developers to where they can find further guidance to help meet the Council’s objectives.
6.7.8	Refer to transitional arrangements	This is not appropriate. The transitional arrangements only apply to building notices submitted before 15 June 2022 and required work to begin by 15 June 2023. This will not apply to the main development sites in SW Maidenhead area which do not yet have planning permissions. Amend paragraph 6.7.8 to refer to June 2022, not July 2022
6.7.8	Suggest every dwelling should have a private parking space and every parking space should have a charging point connected to that household.	The detailed parking arrangements will be considered at the planning application stage and will vary depending on the size of the dwelling and its access to services and facilities. Paragraph 6.7.8 makes clear that electric charging points are now required for every new residential building through changes to the Building Regulations.
6.7.9	Amend to refer to provision elsewhere in the borough, or through a net gain credit scheme	Amendment not appropriate as it could involve mitigation being provided outside the Borough which is not considered appropriate.

6.7.9	Policy NR2(3) only requires a net gain in biodiversity and does not specify the minimum of 10% the SPD does. The minimum 10% only becomes a requirement once the relevant section of the Environment Act 2021 is in force. The SPD should therefore be revised to acknowledge this.	The draft SPD already includes a footnote to this effect, but the main box could also reference this. However, we believe that developers should be applying this at the earliest opportunity. Update box to indicate that the 10% BNG requirement is being introduced shortly
6.7.9	The SPD should be revised to acknowledge that AL13 and AL14 are separate allocations and as such the BNG expectations are to be achieved on each site.	This is not necessary or appropriate. Policy QP1b(5)h) requires biodiversity net gains across the area (i.e. the placemaking area) and doesn't distinguish between the two allocated sites. 6.7.9 does distinguish between the two sites in terms maximising biodiversity provision through on-site mitigation within those allocated areas, and then across the wider place making area, consistent with Policy QP1b.
6.7.9 (BNG text box)	The hierarchy approach represents new policy rather than building on or providing more detailed advice or guidance on policies in the adopted local plan. The hierarchy approach to identifying off-site alternatives to addressing BNG represents new policy rather than building on providing more detailed advice or guidance on policies in the adopted local plan. The proposed policy will have an impact on the wider pattern of development in the district. The Planning Code requires that this should be considered through the development plan process and be the subject to independent examinations.	The first two bullet points in the box are consistent with Local Plan Policy QP1b(5)(h) and the site proformas for AL13 and AL14 which are themselves policy. The latter part of the text in the box would benefit from emphasising the importance of delivering the best biodiversity outcome whilst still securing provision in proximity to the placemaking area where possible, and if not then elsewhere in the Borough. Amend text in Box to reflect the comment above.
6.7.9 (BNG text box)	The hierarchy set out would operate to constrain the number, quality and types of habitat that can be delivered off site and fails to recognise the role that habitat banks can play in contributing to Biodiversity Net Gain.	As a matter of good planning practice, it is essential that the biodiversity impacts of development (and any net gain) are mitigated/provided for locally. Indeed, this principle is recognised by the Government's consultation Biodiversity Net Gain Regulations and Implementation (January 2022) which sets out that "Policy and guidance will encourage off-site biodiversity gains to be delivered locally to the development site..." (page 56) and highlights the "spatial hierarchy preference for local enhancements" (page 55).

6.7.9 onwards p.76-77	The principles set out on pages 76 and 77 are good and do not need changing but the design does not implement them. There needs to be a fundamental review of the design of the site to ensure all trees and habitat areas are protected and enhanced.	Noted. It would not be possible to deliver about 2,600 homes and other uses whilst protecting all trees. However, significant new tree planting will need to be carried out in the SW Maidenhead area.
6.7.9 onwards p.76-77	The biodiversity value of the site must be accurately established to inform the design of wildlife corridors and areas for habitat creation.	Developers will need to undertake full ecological surveys to establish the biodiversity value of the site which will inform the design of wildlife corridors, areas to be protected and areas where habitat can be created.
6.7.9	SPD requires more information on what a 'biodiversity net gain credit scheme' would look like	This is too detailed to include in the SPD.
6.7.9 & 6.7.14	Trees should be retained. Priority should be given to development proposals which respect the existing tree pattern and concentrate buildings on the fairways. A commitment to this by the Council might increase support from residents for this development. Developers should be required to identify exactly which wooded areas they would be intending to remove and why. The retention of Rushington Copse is a small percentage of the trees on site. Existing trees and hedgerows which extend from the Copse to form a border along neighbouring properties, particularly along Rushington Avenue, where the new housing will be relatively dense close to the town centre, should be retained to provide green lings for both new and existing residents.	The Local Plan proforma for the site sets out the main requirements in relation to trees on the site and this is reflected in the SPD. The developer will need to undertake a detailed tree survey to understand the value of the trees on the site and this should inform the detailed design and layout of development, having regard to the proforma requirements. The Local Plan proforma indicates that tree and landscape buffers along the site boundaries of the AL13 site should be retained and reinforced.
6.7.11	No evidence to suggest southern green fringe may be capable of accommodating biodiversity net gain and no land agreements in place	The text is identifying an opportunity to maximise the level of biodiversity provision on the AL13 site allocation, in line with the principles set out in the SPD and policy in the Local Plan. Developers should work together to achieve this.
6.7.11	Suggest the SPD more explicitly recognises the challenges of providing BNG across the Placemaking Area.	The degree of challenge will not be known until developers submit their planning applications and accompanying biodiversity net gain assessments. The approach set out allows for off-site solutions if necessary and justified.
6.7.12	Minor rewording proposed to refer to mitigation and enhancement	Agreed. Amend reference to mitigation and enhancement

6.7.14	Change to metric 3.1	Agreed. Amend reference to metric to refer to 3.1
6.7.15	Loss of trees implicit in the SPD is contrary to RBWM Environment and Climate Strategy.	The Local Plan AL13 allocation for the site was approved with an indicative dwelling number for the site and a series of policy requirements in the proforma to assist with mitigating its impact, including in relation to trees.
6.7.15	Rather than removing trees the development brief should identify opportunities to increase tree canopy cover.	Paragraphs 6.7.15 (Box) indicates the need for significant new tree planting in the SW Maidenhead area.
6.7.15	Concerned that the fate of trees in AL13 not adequately protected. The BLP policy NR3(4) does not restrict protection to mature trees only, nor does it call for retention 'where possible', but rather calls for protection and retention where harm is 'unavoidable'. The stronger wording of the BLP should be replicated in the SPD.	The wording in the SPD summarises the approach set out in the proforma for the AL13 site in the Local Plan.
6.7.15	The SPD should be modified to protect the ancient woodland at Rushington Copse with a 100 metre planted buffer (other comments suggest 50m)	The proforma in the Local Plan for the AL13 site requires the protection of Rushington Copse including buffer zones where necessary. 100m buffer zone would be excessive, having regard to the need to accommodate development.
6.7.15	Concern that any loss of mature trees and woodland would be incompatible with the requirement to deliver biodiversity net gain. Where ancient woodland or veteran trees are lost or damaged there will always be net loss of biodiversity and it is impossible to secure net gain.	It is a policy, and soon to be legal, requirement to deliver biodiversity net gain. The SPD sets out further guidance on the approach to achieving this in the context of the SW Maidenhead area.
6.7.15 and 6.7.16	Concern about the possible impact of development on Rushington Copse. The draft SPD is lacking in detail to ensure the retention / protection identified in AL13 and AL14 happens in practice.	See response above re the need to protect Rushington Copse and include buffer zones where necessary. The detail of buffer zones and retention/protection measures will need to be provided at the planning application stage in the light of detailed tree surveys.
6.7.15 and 6.7.16	Preference is to create new habitat, including native woodland, around existing ancient woodland. This will help reverse the historic fragmentation of this important habitat, contribute to biodiversity net gain, and can also provide accessible green space for nearby residents.	Noted.

6.7.16	Surveys of existing trees and woodland, and habitat opportunity mapping for new woodland creation should be completed before any firm decisions are taken on the scale, location or layout of development on the site.	Tree surveys will be required to inform layouts and the ultimate scale of development included in any planning applications.
6.7.16	<p>It is noted that the Ancient Tree Inventory (ATI) for the area is not complete. Recommend an exercise to complete the ATI (which lists ancient, veteran and notable trees outside woods) across any sites allocated or proposed to be allocated for development, in order to comply with NPPF p.180c.</p> <p>Recommend that if the scale of development proves incompatible with legislative requirements (to protect ancient woodland, ancient/veteran trees, contribute to local nature recovery networks and deliver biodiversity net gain) then the scale of development should be adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>Requested change in wording to require surveys as an essential prerequisite to bringing forward designs for the site.</p>	<p>Developers will need to undertake tree surveys and this will identify the value of trees on the sites.</p> <p>Regard will have to be had to paragraph 180c of the NPPF in relation to any ancient woodland, ancient or veteran trees in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>The wording already highlights that the tree surveys are very important. Policy NR3 that provides more detail on the policy requirements regarding tree surveys, is referenced in paragraph 6.7.16 of the SPD.</p>
6.7.16	<p>A tree survey would accompany any application on the site, as such the reference to the value of the clump can be omitted from the SPD as this would be thoroughly assessed through the determination of a planning application consistent with policy NR3.</p> <p>It must be acknowledged in this section 'the clump' is not ancient woodland.</p>	<p>The paragraph already highlights that tree surveys will be very important – this applies across the area. No need to highlight particular area.</p> <p>Amend to take out reference to the golf course and the Clump.</p> <p>The Clump is identified as ancient woodland on the Ancient Woodland Inventory.</p>
6.7.18	Berkeley's Spring Hill Development proposals submitted for full planning consent do not include any green infrastructure for food production	That is a matter for the consideration of the planning application, not this SPD.
6.7.19	The SPD should insist that all drainage ponds and other infrastructure associated with the development will be provided within the AL13 site boundary.	The detail of the sustainable drainage measures are best addressed at the planning application stage.

6.7.19	Paragraph 4.8.1 advises that AL13 is within Flood Zone 1, whereas this paragraph suggests there are areas of flood risk on both sites (AL13 and 14). Clarification requested on flood risk on AL13, otherwise requested it is omitted from this paragraph.	<p>Inconsistency noted. A small amount of AL13 is within flood zone 2. This is consistent with the statement in the Local Plan proforma (bullet point 19).</p> <p>Amend paragraph 4.8.1 to say that ‘almost’ all of AL13 is within flood zone 1</p>
6.7.21	The last sentence of this paragraph should be omitted to ensure consistency with national guidance regarding the acceptability and appropriateness of less vulnerable uses in flood zones 1, 2 and Development 3a.	Disagree – the last sentence is not inconsistent with the earlier statement about acceptability and appropriateness of less vulnerable uses. As part of the BLP Examination, the Council and the Environment Agency agreed that the extent (and therefore quantum) of any development suitable within these Flood Zones will need to be considered at the detailed planning application stage. The last sentence is consistent with this.
6.7.23	<p>Not identified why the impacts on the Scheduled Monument would be ‘minor’. Historic England’s comments suggest that any development could harm the SM as it is not possible for any new housing development to proceed without some form of flood / surface water scheme in place.</p> <p>Reasonable chance of further Mesolithic discoveries in the area</p>	<p>The SPD does not say this.</p> <p>Any high-level assessment by the Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal or the Strategic Environmental Assessment of this SPD would not be sufficient evidence at the planning application stage to conclude on the likely impacts of the scheduled ancient monument – further more detailed assessment would be required to support a planning application including, as referred to in the SPD, a setting study.</p>

Section 7 Infrastructure Delivery

Paragraph Number	Summary of Representations	Council Response
7	Concern regarding the funding gap - No current agreement between developers on the funding of key infrastructure. Agreement on infrastructure funding is a necessary precondition of a meaningful SPD. What happens if no equitable agreement emerges?	A key role of the SPD is to coordinate infrastructure delivery and funding. It therefore provides an equitable approach to funding infrastructure, including addressing the funding gap that it sets out. This will be secured through section 106 agreements linked to planning permissions that the Council will negotiate with developers.
7	Concerned that work is not sufficiently progressed to provide confidence to the infrastructure requirements, estimates or the apportionment of contributions across the South West Maidenhead sites. Suggest the detail presented in the SPD is limited to allow this work to conclude. Also suggest the SPD should be suitably and strongly caveated to the effect that ongoing work will impact on the final detail of the SPD.	The work provides sufficient level of detail for the purposes of an SPD. It is recognised that as more detail emerges (e.g., more detailed designs and/or costings) then the infrastructure schedule will need to be updated and the SPD provides for this by publishing updates to the costings and the funding gap on the Council's website. Furthermore, significant inflation means that it will be important to keep costs updated by indexing. Ensure SPD provides for updating of costs and the funding gap over time to take account of more up to date information of costs of schemes and to index for inflation
7	Consider it premature to conclude that there is a necessity for major improvements to J8/9 resulting from the AL13/14 sites.	It is prudent to allow for improvements to the junction including a limited contribution from SW Maidenhead development.
7	Risk that RBWM will struggle to appropriately evidence that the necessary infrastructure can be delivered under CIL and/ or s106 in accordance with Regulation 122 tests. Also concerned with the proposed delivery mechanisms and suggest that higher contingency allowances than would normally be deemed appropriate would conflict with Regulation 122 legality tests. The development should not be required to more than mitigate its own impact.	Local Plan policy requires comprehensive coordinated delivery of infrastructure and the SPD sets out a framework for doing that in a way that is considered to be consistent with CIL regulation 122. It provides a simple but comprehensive approach to ensure equitable contributions from developers. The SPD should explain this further. An alternative more bespoke approach to negotiating development contributions which would also be compliant with regulation 122, and this should also be set out in the SPD, but this is not the Council's preferred approach.

		Update the SPD to more clearly set out the simple comprehensive approach to contributions, making clear its compliance with CIL regulation 122, and also set out the alternative (not preferred) more complex approach.
7	Suggest that the starting point should be to calculate the level of on-site infrastructure that would technically be required from the schemes and any extra-over costs incurred would need to be addressed within some sort of equalisation / credit system, to ensure that the respective schemes are only required to meet their appropriate level of cost.	The SPD sets out such an approach, but because this is based on “ringfencing” Community Infrastructure Levy contributions to the SW Maidenhead area to deliver the most locally significant infrastructure, it is essential that SW Maidenhead developments collectively fully fund that infrastructure through CIL and section 106. SW Maidenhead development will have a wider impact than the infrastructure schedule set out in Appendix 2 of the SPD and the more complex approach referred to above would need to take account of these also in the more technical approach referred to in these comments.
7.1 Text Box	Review text box – cannot introduce new policies	It is consistent with BLP policy to fully mitigate impact of development so is not introducing new policy. However, given the changes referred to above, the statement in the box should be simplified. Wording in box simplified to reflect other changes in this section
7.1 and Table 2	All S106/CIL allocations need to be justified. RBWM’s playing pitch strategy and built facilities strategies are now out of date. These have been recommissioned and work should start in October 2022, this will give robust evidence needed when seeking contributions towards new sports infrastructure needed for the new community in South West Maidenhead. I would therefore suggest it is premature to put figures in table 2 for this, unless they are based on Sport England’s Sport Facility Calculator and Playing Pitch Calculator.	Agreed. It is considered that contributions to playing pitches will be required, but for the reasons set out in the comment, it is not appropriate to include a cost estimate in Appendix 2 at this stage, but to highlight that contributions are likely to be needed. Add text in section 6.5 (open space section) to indicate that financial contributions to playing pitch provision are likely to be required.
7.1.3, 7.1.10	Recommend the removal of the Precautionary Approach and instead suggest any contribution calculation is based on the direct costs of infrastructure, which includes appropriate allowances for risk and	It is right to be cautious about costings at this stage, particularly in the current inflationary environment. However, the Council has undertaken some work on the costs, particularly in relation to

and Table 2	contingency. Concern that the precautionary approach and additional £10m in Table 2 is not justified/seeking higher contributions than the base cost	<p>education, and considers that a combination of regular indexing of costs and updating of costs as further detail becomes available, will help to mitigate this risk. Use of the CIL Index which is the Government's preferred approach to updating CIL charging levels is considered an appropriate way of indexing infrastructure costs.</p> <p>Remove the 10% uplift to the costs set out in Table 2 in the draft SPD but update costs where additional evidence is available, and index those costs to Dec 2022 using the CIL index</p>
7.1.2 – 7.1.5	<p>Add reference to the CIL Reg 122 tests for planning obligations – need to be careful the approach is compliant</p> <p>Will the developer build the infrastructure or the Council – if the latter, need mechanism for this and needs to be transparent arrangements to ensure costs are robust and justified</p>	<p>Agree it is helpful to briefly set out the policy and legislative background to s106 and CIL</p> <p>Include additional text section 7 providing brief policy and legislative background to CIL and s106.</p> <p>Appendix 2 provides an indication of who may deliver the infrastructure, and this has been updated with the latest information. As and when the schemes are brought forward there would be more detailed schemes/designs and related costings.</p>
7.1.5 & 7.1.23	<p>There are schemes outside of the SPD area which will generate impacts upon the Borough's infrastructure and consequently these must also be acknowledged within the table which follows at 7.1.5. The need to consider impacts of development outside of the SW Maidenhead area must also be acknowledged within the split of development funding highway improvements as illustrated in table 4 (paragraph 7.1.23).</p> <p>Increases in traffic flows from other development is not included in this and therefore the proportions assigned to the development sites in SW Maidenhead are unjustified and inconsistent with the Regulations. They must therefore be revised to ensure that this consistency is achieved.</p>	<p>Noted. But there are also various forms of infrastructure outside of the SPD area that will be impacted by development in the SW Maidenhead area that SW Maidenhead development ought to contribute towards. The "simple comprehensive approach" set out in the SPD seeks to balance out these two factors in an equitable way, ensuring that the necessary infrastructure is delivered but without overly complex assessments and negotiations. This is the Council's preferred approach.</p> <p>As referred to in responses above, it is recommended that the alternative more complex approach is set out in the SPD as well. This will involve wider and more technical assessment of impact on a range of different types of infrastructure. This is likely to delay development.</p>

7.1.10	A Regulation 122 compliance statement should be prepared which alongside the annual infrastructure funding statement sets out that infrastructure can be delivered whilst complying with Regulation 122	<p>The approaches set out in the final SPD to infrastructure funding are considered to be compliant with Reg 122. There is no need for such a statement but the infrastructure funding statement may provide updates as appropriate, and evidence regarding costs and receipts will be updated as appropriate on the website.</p> <p>Updated approaches to infrastructure funding are set out and are considered to be Regulation 122 compliant</p>
7.1.12 – 7.1.13	Land costs - Council has failed to demonstrate that the land north of Harvest Hill Road would not have given rise to the need for education/community facilities, regardless of the wider development. So it is not appropriate for developers of smaller sites to fund the land cost of a school	Disagree. The AL13 site is a single allocation for land north and south of Harvest Hill Road and it is right that landowners for different parts of the site contribute towards the land costs for the schools/community facilities – land costs for schools are a legitimate infrastructure cost. Historic allocations in an unadopted draft local plan are not material to this issue.
7.1.12 & 7.1.13	Regarding school and costs – clarity must be provided as to the level of costs per acre/hectare that have been reflected in the respective calculations.	<p>Agreed. Further work has been done on this.</p> <p>Update SPD to set out the cost of school/community land and add this to the infrastructure costs set out for the Council's preferred approach and to the costs for the individual infrastructure elements set out in Appendix 2. Also provide a cost per unit basis for the land should developers decide to adopt the alternative approach to infrastructure funding.</p>
7.1.13	The Council's initial improvements to the Braywick roundabout include a filter lane from the A330 onto the A308(M). The Council's reliance on this land to achieve highway improvements must therefore be considered in determining extent of site specific contributions from the AL14 site. This is not currently achieved.	The filter lane and hence the land are necessary to make the development of the Triangle site acceptable highway terms. As such there should be no adjustment to the level of contributions.
7.1.12 – 7.1.13	There needs to be a robust evidence base in place to justify the school provision being sought. The Council's own evidence indicates that the 7 FE secondary school is not intended to serve solely the AL13 allocation	Appendix 2 in the draft SPD made clear that not all of the funding for the secondary school would be sought from SW Maidenhead development. However further information to explain the pupil generation and costs would assist and is available.

		Include new Appendix setting out more evidence on pupil generation for the primary and secondary school and on costs
7.1.12 – 7.1.13	As more robust evidence is required on costs etc, this may delay the SPD and delay delivery	The final SPD includes additional and up to date costs and a commitment to keep them under review. Development need not be delayed provided it delivers a comprehensive and coordinated approach to infrastructure delivery, in line with the Local Plan policy
7.1.15 – 7.1.26	<p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How CIL monies are used to fund infrastructure works - How / whether s106 contributions can be required from the AL13 schemes to meet the ‘funding gap’ whilst complying with CIL Regulations 122; and - How the respective cost items have been calculated, including rates, measures and contingency allowances for works costs items and land values for costs towards school delivery 	<p>CIL money is available to fund infrastructure to support the growth of the area. The Council ultimately decides how it is spent. Appendix 2 of the SPD provides an indication of how it might be spent.</p> <p>It is completely appropriate to the Council to seek section 106 contributions in addition to CIL contributions to deliver the policy requirement for comprehensive and coordinated infrastructure delivery in South West Maidenhead. It is considered to be compliant with CIL regulation 122.</p> <p>Further information is included in Appendix 2, within section 7, and in new Appendix 4 in relation to costs, indexing and land costs</p> <p>Update section 7, Appendix 2 and include new Appendix 4 to explain the basis of the infrastructure costs</p>
7.1.21	The first two points include elements of duplication and should be consolidated into a single requirement for walking / cycling off-site	Disagree – these are two distinct elements, both of which are required.
7.1.21	<p>It is not agreed that the Triangle Site will account for 45% of traffic growth from the SW Maidenhead sites at Braywick Roundabout. This approach does not consider the impact of wider growth at the junction.</p> <p>This calculation of impacts is based on an assumption that AL14 will be delivered in its entirety for B2 floorspace (which is unrealistic – remains a difference between the Council and Promoters expectations of development mix at the Triangle site).</p>	<p>See response above regarding the impact of wider growth on SW Maidenhead infrastructure, and the fact SW Maidenhead will also have a wider impact on infrastructure beyond the area.</p> <p>The formula set out in the Triangle site contributions part of section 7 will mean that contributions will vary depending on the mix between B2 floorspace and B8 floorspace.</p>

7.1.23	<p>Lack of evidence regarding the derivation of the improvements specified.</p> <p>It is noted that no assessment has been provided that the level of contributions to be sought will not impact upon the viability and deliverability of the proposal.</p> <p>The lack of viability evidence with respect to the nature of potential infrastructure improvements has been a consistent matter raised through the Council's preparation of the Local Plan and it remains unresolved in the SPD.</p> <p>No clear evidence the Council's expectations are realistic.</p>	<p>The junction improvements identified were also identified as part of the Borough Local Plan traffic modelling. The updated traffic modelling has confirmed the need for them.</p> <p>An updated viability assessment of the AL13 housing site has been undertaken using the same viability model and approach as that used in the evidence for the Local Plan viability assessments (and found sound by the Local Plan Inspector), but updated for major changes in costs and values and based on the guidance set out in the draft SPD. The assessment indicated that the development is still viable. As such the Council considers that the infrastructure that is needed to support the development is realistic and viable.</p>
7.1.27	<p>The Planning Practice Guidance indicates that it is not appropriate for SPDs to set out new formulaic approaches to SPDs</p>	<p>The Council is providing a simple but comprehensive approach to infrastructure delivery and funding that is its preferred approach to ensure that the comprehensive approach required in policy is achieved. The amounts set out are expressed as a guide, but are included to ensure that development can comply with the policy requirement to deliver comprehensive and coordinated infrastructure provision across the area.</p> <p>Should developers choose not to adopt this approach, the final SPD sets out an alternative more complex approach.</p> <p>Revise SPD to set out an alternative more complex approach to infrastructure funding should developers choose not to adopt the Council's preferred approach</p>
7.1.27	<p>S106 contributions should be based on a per dwelling approach rather than per sq m approach because the quantum based on sq m is unknown, could vary a lot and hence could lead to funding gaps</p>	<p>Disagree. Because the dwelling type/size is likely to vary considerably across the site given the site proforma and site characteristics, it is considered to be more equitable to base contributions on a per sq m basis. Whilst the precise amount of sq m is not known the same applies if the approach was based on dwelling numbers.</p>

7.1.27	Concern that with a number of different land parcels it is difficult to know when development will be delivered and when infrastructure is required. Recommend preparation of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan setting out the infrastructure required and what is a priority.	Noted. Appendix 2 of the SPD sets out infrastructure requirements for the SW Maidenhead area, although not for any wider impacts. Section 7 provides an indication of priorities in terms of earlier delivery of infrastructure. Further updates will be provided on the Council's website as required. Further information on the need for and timing of school provision is set out in a new Appendix 4
7.1.27	Alternative calculations of s106 contributions for 1 parcel of development provided, including assessment of traffic impact of that development on key junctions, whilst accepting a cost per dwelling for other elements	Approach set out does not adopt a comprehensive approach to provision of infrastructure in SW Maidenhead and mixes and matches different approaches. SPD to set out a preferred simple comprehensive approach and a more complex approach and make clear that it would not be appropriate to mix and match approaches
	Full costs breakdown should be provided for any contributions sought	Costs are set out in Appendix 2 Update costs and costing information in Appendix 2 based on latest information, including indexing to December 2022
7.1.27	A per square metre approach may jeopardise the viability / deliverability of smaller dwellings, particularly apartment schemes in higher density areas.	Disagree. It has the opposite effect. If contributions were charged on a per dwelling basis, then proportionately the costs would be higher for smaller units.
7.2	National Highways observe it will be important that infrastructure improvements are in place as various stages of development open to prevent the unsafe operation of the SRN.	Noted
7.2	Note this has not been included with the Berkeley Homes Spring Hill Development proposals submitted for full planning permission	The timing of infrastructure provision and financial contributions towards infrastructure in relation to the Berkeley scheme are a matter for negotiation as part of the section 106 agreement, should the Council be minded to permit the scheme.
7.3	It is important that each developer will be able to accurately calculate their infrastructure costs and s106/CIL liabilities in order to be included in their viability assessment.	The responses set out above outlines two potentially different approaches to determining developer contributions, including section 106 contributions, with costs and potential levels of contribution provided. They also indicate this information will be

		<p>updated as appropriate on the Council's website. The assessment of CIL is based on the Council's charging schedule which is updated annually by the CIL index.</p> <p>As set out in section 7.3, it is important to note that the starting point for considering viability is the viability work undertaken to inform the Local Plan. It is for the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage.</p>
--	--	--

Appendices

Paragraph Number	Summary of Representations	Council Response
Appendix 2	Provides indicative costings of the various infrastructure improvements. Those associated with highways particularly are derived from preliminary design. Given the uncertainty of these it is not justified to rely upon them for determining the extent of contributions.	It is considered that for an SPD these costings are soundly based. The SPD makes clear that these will be kept under review as more information becomes available and in the light of indexing.
Appendix 3	This is partially out of date, both the school and leisure centre have been built for some time. Therefore this section needs to be updated. Whilst supporting better linkages there is a basic concern that AL15 (Braywick Park) should be omitted from the SPD.	Noted. However, Appendix 3 (Appendix 5 in the final version of the SPD) reproduces extracts from the Local Plan so cannot be changed.
Appendix 3	A small concern is if Braywick Park is used to meet bio-diversity targets which could impact on the ability to meet sports targets.	Noted
Appendix 3	Any loss of playing fields must meet requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 98 and 99, this includes new sports facilities.	Noted – the SPD does not propose any loss of playing fields but recognises there may need to be financial contributions to improve playing pitch provision.

CABINET

THURSDAY 15 DECEMBER 2022

Present: Councillors Andrew Johnson (Leader of the Council; Growth & Opportunity) (Chairman), Stuart Carroll (Deputy Chairman of Cabinet; Children's Services, Education, Health, Mental Health, & Transformation) (Vice-Chairman), Samantha Rayner (Deputy Leader of the Council; Business, Corporate & Residents Services, Culture & Heritage, & Windsor), Phil Haseler (Planning, Parking, Highways & Transport), David Hilton (Asset Management & Commercialisation, Finance, & Ascot), Donna Stimson (Climate Action & Sustainability), Ross McWilliams (Digital Connectivity, Housing Opportunity, & Sport & Leisure) and Gurpreet Bhangra (Environmental Services, Parks and Countryside)

Also in attendance virtually: Councillors Brar, Price, Sharpe and Tisi

Officers present: Tony Reeves, Andrew Durrant, Adele Taylor, Kevin McDaniel and Karen Shepherd

Officers in attendance virtually: Emma Duncan, Rebecca Hatch, Adrien Waite, Lin Ferguson, Becky Anderson, Ian Manktelow, Jason Mills, Ian Motuel and James Thorpe

South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document

Cabinet considered adoption of the South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Councillor Haseler, Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways and Transport explained that the Borough Local Plan adopted in February 2022 after a rigorous and lengthy examination by an Independent Inspector, identified the South West Maidenhead area for major housing and employment development. The adoption of the SPD would help coordinate development across the area, providing more detail to supplement the policies and proposals in the adopted Local Plan. It would be an important material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Policy QP1b of the Borough Local Plan indicated that a Development Framework SPD would be produced. The SPD provided the opportunity to ensure that development in the area came forward in a strategic and comprehensive manner. It set design principles to ensure coordinated and high quality development, outlined other key requirements and principles for development, and set out the infrastructure requirements and how they could be delivered in a timely manner.

The South West Maidenhead Placemaking Area comprised three BLP allocated sites:

- Site AL13 – Desborough, Harvest Hill Road, South West Maidenhead – housing allocation for approximately 2,600 homes, two schools and a new local centre.
- Site AL14 – “The Triangle site” – allocated for industrial and warehousing development.
- Site AL15 – Braywick Park – allocated for mixed use strategic green infrastructure accommodating indoor and outdoor sports facilities, public park, special needs school and wildlife zone Policy.

QP1b stated that to ensure the development of the placemaking area as a whole came forward in a strategic and comprehensive manner, planning applications on individual land parcels should accord

with the principles and requirements set out in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The policy indicated that the SPD would be produced by the Council in partnership with the developers, landowners, key stakeholders and in consultation with the local community.

Councillor Haseler explained that Supplementary Planning Documents added further detail to policies in the development plan. They could be used to provide further guidance for development on specific sites, or on particular issues. They did not create new policy, they did not replace existing policy and they could not amend existing policy in the Borough Local Plan. An SPD was a material consideration in planning decisions but they did not form part of the development plan. In preparation of the SPD, early public engagement took place in the form of three online events together with the opportunity for everyone to submit written comments afterwards. There was extensive publicity about the events in advance including writing to nearly 1,000 homes in the vicinity of the main development sites, consulting an extensive list of people on the planning policy consultee database, holding a press briefing (with subsequent articles and publicity about the events in the local media), and regular use of social media to publicise the events. The draft SPD was published for a 6 week public consultation in July 2022, the Council again wrote to nearly 1,000 local residents and a wide range of consultees on the consultee database. Three staffed drop-in sessions were held, two at the Maidenhead Library and one at the Braywick Leisure Centre and an online event held via Microsoft Teams. About 90 written representations were received from residents and other stakeholders.

As expected, a wide range of comments were received. A Consultation Statement had been produced, summarising all engagement and consultation undertaken in the preparation of the SPD. It also summarised the responses received and provided a response to the issues raised. The changes made following consultation on the draft SPD were summarised at section 2.8 of the report.

Councillor Haseler explained the consequences of not adopting the SPD such as an uncoordinated approach to development across the area, a lack of coordination of key infrastructure provision with the risk that not all infrastructure was provided, or not provided for in a timely manner. It also risked the lack of joined up thinking in relation to key design principles across the area.

Councillor Haseler proposed the recommendations and Councillor Johnson seconded the proposals stating this was a critical piece of planning policy.

Councillor Hilton stated that the Supplementary Planning Document set out clearly how it would integrate and enhance the quality Maidenhead. He noted that the policy was promoting net zero carbon and taking a whole life carbon emissions approach would help the Council become carbon neutral.

Councillor McWilliams reiterated the importance of the site to resolve previous issues around the delivery of affordable housing and recognised the various targets set out within the document and the numbers of homes this equated to.

Councillor Johnson was pleased that the Supplementary Planning Document would ensure that local people would benefit from the affordable housing supply as well as from the significant infrastructure provision referred to.

In response to Councillor Stimson's query relating to the carbon calculation Councillor Haseler explained this was set out in section 6.7 of SPD itself as net zero carbon operational and that took into account whole life carbon and Council would therefore give weight to applications that considered this.

In response to Councillor Price's concerns that developers were not planning to build the affordable houses first Councillor Haseler stated that no applications had been received for the main site yet and therefore this would be dealt with as part of the planning process.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY that:

- i) The report be noted;**
- ii) The adoption of the South West Maidenhead Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document, as set out in Appendix B of the Cabinet report, be approved; and**
- iii) Authority be delegated for minor changes to the Supplementary Planning Document to be made prior to publication to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways and Transport.**