

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 (7<sup>th</sup> 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 – 14<sup>th</sup> July 2.00pm – 6.30pm
    - Maidenhead Library – 20<sup>th</sup> July 12.30pm – 5.00pm
    - Braywick Leisure Centre – 26<sup>th</sup> July 2.00pm – 7.00pm
  - An online briefing event – 27<sup>th</sup> 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](http://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 <sup>th</sup> March 2022	Community Needs <b><u>Presentation</u></b> <b><u>Event Recording</u></b>	45	162
6 <sup>th</sup> April 2022	Connectivity <b><u>Presentation</u></b> <b><u>Event Recording</u></b>	21	101
13 April 2022	Sustainability and the Environment <b><u>Presentation</u></b> <b><u>Event Recording</u></b>	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](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](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://civicingineers.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.

## **Appendix 2 - Summary of Representations on the Draft South West Maidenhead Development Framework SPD and the Council's response**

See separate appendix.