

## Comments

### Draft Borough Local Plan December 2016 (02/12/16 to 13/01/17)

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                                   |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 12/01/17 14:33  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | IF2: New Sports and Leisure Development at Braywick Park ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

IF2 - Braywick Park : New Sports and Leisure development. This is an integral requirement driven by the desire to redevelop the Magnet Leisure Centre site and surrounding area (HA3)

But neglects to address how people will walk to the site, what additional transport will be provided and safe access via the town centre

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 12/01/17 14:34                                  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA2: Reform Road ( <a href="#">View</a> )       |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

HA2 Part Council owned Employment presumably relocated out of town

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 12/01/17 14:38                                  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA3: Saint-Cloud Way ( <a href="#">View</a> )   |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

HA3 Council owned. More town centre flats  
Oversupply of flats in the town

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)           |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 10:22  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy TR 1 Hierarchy of Centres ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

States Local Centres as "Cookham; Cookham Rise; Datchet; Dedworth Road West, Windsor; Eton; Eton Wick; Old Windsor; Shifford Crescent, Maidenhead; Sunninghill; Vale Road, Windsor; Wessex Way, Cox Green; Wooton Way, Maidenhead; Wraysbury"

What are selection criteria? Many local ones are missing – does this mean they aren't supported

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 10:26   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy HO 1 Housing Development Sites ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

Clarify in the list of sites which are strategic.

The heading "Strategic locations" HA1..HA11 is clear, but what is the status for example of HA21, Spencer's Farm, listed under "Maidenhead"? Is it strategic or not?

Policy HO 1 is itself strategic. What is the rationale for listing some sites under a sub-heading "Strategic"?

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                                |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 10:27   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy HO 8 Development Involving Residential Gardens ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |

**Submission Type** Web  
**Version** 0.1

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

States among other conditions “the proposal would not have an unacceptable affect on biodiversity in terms of fragmentation of blocks of gardens, which as a unit or in association with adjacent open space and boundary treatments are deemed to make an important contribution to biodiversity and contribute to green corridors and networks”.

> Who defines the green corridors and networks and how?

---

**Comment by** Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)  
**Comment ID** DBLP  
**Response Date** 13/01/17 10:28  
**Consultation Point** Policy HO 9 Extensions and Outbuildings in Residential Curtilages ([View](#))  
**Status** Draft  
**Submission Type** Web  
**Version** 0.1

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

States “A Borough Wide Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document will illustrate further how this policy should be implemented”

Is this Design Guide available?

---

**Comment by** Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)  
**Comment ID** DBLP  
**Response Date** 13/01/17 10:29

**Consultation Point** Policy ED 1 Economic Development ([View](#))  
**Status** Draft  
**Submission Type** Web  
**Version** 0.1

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

The Maidenhead & Cox Green Neighbourhood Plan is in the process of developing the MNP our main concerns are to retain Maidenheads and the immediate area as a good place to live work and to raise children

---

**Comment by** Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)  
**Comment ID** DBLP  
**Response Date** 13/01/17 10:32  
**Consultation Point** Policy HE 1 Historic Environment ([View](#))  
**Status** Draft  
**Submission Type** Web  
**Version** 0.1

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

States "A Heritage Strategy Supplementary Planning Document will illustrate further how this policy should be implemented"

Is this Heritage Strategy available?

See 11.11.2: Possible future CA designations – is it available?

See 11.15.1: "A local list that details local heritage assets will be include in the Heritage Strategy and updated via the Annual Monitoring Report" – is it available?

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 10:33                                  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 11.4 Listed buildings ( <a href="#">View</a> )  |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

States in 4 "The Council will only support development proposals where appropriate changes to the heritage asset are claimed to be justified in order to secure future viability"

Requires change to wording: Not just a claim that appropriate changes to the heritage asset are justified, they must actually be justified. Does it cover the case where the current neglected state of the building is used to claim changes to secure future viability?

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)         |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 10:35  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy HE 6 Conservation Areas ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

See 11.11.4: Street scene – nothing in HE6 to protect it.

States in 11.11.10: Conservation Area Appraisals detail their character and provide key focus for improvement and can be viewed on the Council's website. These documents should be used to guide the design of development proposals and to help determine the appropriateness of development involving or near to heritage assets" – nothing in HE6.

HE6 doesn't mention gardens.

> Review and compare to previous CA polices, comment

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                        |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 10:36   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy NR 3 Managing Flood Risk and Waterways ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

States in 7 "Development should facilitate the improvement and integration of waterways in Maidenhead, including the completion of the Maidenhead Waterway Project"

> Does this include for example upgrades to bridges to MW navigation standard?

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                 |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 10:37  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy EP 3 Artificial Light Pollution ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

Should all or parts of the waterway be included as an area where light pollution should be avoided?

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)          |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 10:39   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy NE 1 Nature Conservation ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

In 5d add “..by contributing to green corridors and networks”. Otherwise, recognition means no action to enhance.

In 5f remove “where appropriate” so it reads “recognise the importance of urban wildlife”. Otherwise, burden of proof rests on LPA and developers will assume not appropriate

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                     |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 10:40  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy NE 3 Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**



**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

In 3b add “..Where removal of a tree or trees of recognised importance is proposed, a replacement of similar amenity value should be provided on site, with native species of tree being preferred”. Otherwise, mitigation can be insufficient.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 10:41                                  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy NE 4 Open Space ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

NE 4 is strategic

Modify 1 and/or 3 to include enhancing bio-diversity with part publicly accessible and part accessible to wildlife, without public access.

Add Important Open Space to Policies map

Reason: Although 9 refers to the Policies Map, the map fails to identify any areas of Important Open Space, for example urban parks.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)        |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 10:45   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy NE 5 Local Green Space ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option No has been selected, detailed comments can be added)**

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

Modify 1 to include Local Green Space designated via Neighbourhood Plans.

Reason: Neighbourhood Plans such as Windsor, and the MNP, are designating Local Green Space and should be given the same protection by NE5 as those shown on the policies map.

Note the statement in 2/2a "Inappropriate development within a designated Local Green Space will not be permitted other than in very special circumstances, except: new buildings for appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and cemeteries, provided they do not conflict with the purpose of the Local Green Space".

This seems to easily allow Green Space to be built on for sport, recreation and cemeteries, after which it will no longer be green. Where is the purpose of each Local Green Space defined? Suggest in MNP for Maidenhead.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 10:46                                  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy NE 4 Open Space ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option No has been selected, detailed comments can be added)**

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

NE 4 is strategic

Modify 1 and/or 3 to include enhancing bio-diversity with part publicly accessible and part accessible to wildlife, without public access.

Add Important Open Space to Policies map

Reason: Although 9 refers to the Policies Map, the map fails to identify any areas of Important Open Space, for example urban parks.

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)            |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 10:47   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy IF 3 Sustainable Transport ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

In 4 (Development proposals should show..) add item or incorporate in d "provide safe access on foot and by cycle, and how such access connects to the Town centre, the nearest station, and to local schools". Current text is vague and the test criteria is unclear.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 10:49                                  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 5.2 Housing needs ( <a href="#">View</a> )      |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

5.2.1 The Housing Market Assessment does not include the future requirements of RBWM by the expansion of Heathrow Airport, which is estimated as an additional 5,000 homes (NB how many and

of which type). In addition, the opening of CrossRail will encourage the movement of population out of London to locations where there is more affordable housing.

5.2.2 This estimate covers a period of some 20 years with a flat estimate through this entire period. This is an unlikely estimate in the extreme. Realistic growth forecasts should be shown based on the existing housing stock and numbers of residents.

5.2.3/4 There is no clear result of these assessments! Only a statement that these assessments will appear in due course. We reserve the right to comment on these sections as and when they are available.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)         |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 10:50  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 5.3 Economic development needs ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

5.3.1 20,000 new jobs across Berkshire by 2021. Currently there is enough office space across Berkshire with some spare; with a generous space allowance per employee. If all of these were office based, Berkshire would need 5,000,000 sq. ft. of office space for the entire area.

5.3.7 445,400 sq. ft. of floor space will accommodate between 1,878 and 4,450 staff members with space allocation of between 100 sq. ft. and 250sq. ft., per person.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)       |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:03  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy SP 1 Spatial Strategy ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option No has been selected, detailed comments can be added)**

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

SP1

- 1 'Dwellings' is not a precise description of the requirement for a mix of homes. At the very least, one bedroom flats should be excluded from the total and only 25% of the total accommodation of two bedroom flats should be included on an annual planning basis. There must be provision for three bedroom units in the configuration of flats - if at all possible.
- 2 This policy further emphasises the derogatory contempt the BLP appears to have for Maidenhead. Furthermore it is incorrectly worded in relation to Ascot. A more appropriate wording would be: "Development within the Borough will be focused primarily on the urban area of Maidenhead and its significant town centre. Elsewhere, the strategy recognises the national and international significance of Windsor and the special characteristics in Ascot with further retail and employment development being directed to district and village centres." Furthermore the 'urban area of Maidenhead' does not appear to be defined, by default is this everywhere around Maidenhead not in the Green Belt ?

3

a. Strategic locations for development:

It is assumed that the above line is a heading and not part of the list (as it would indicate that ALL sites within the BLP are to be directed to in the first instance.) Due to the wording of the preceding sentence, the text can be deleted with the remaining list reordered a. to e. Development should not be exclusively focused on the Maidenhead urban area. Additional land must be found on the outskirts of Maidenhead - whether Greenbelt or not - to accommodate family homes, with car parking and gardens. a Remove b c d Maidenhead Golf Course is recreational land, although in the Green Belt the manipulation of the process to change its status is unwarranted and akin to a change of status of a National Trust property or a Royal Park. e This area is one of high traffic pollution, given the development of the M4 superhighway no development should be permitted until after this is completed and there are at least two years of pollution measurements following this. f

- 1 Maidenhead Town Centre infrastructure MUST be designed into the proposed plans and NOT placed as an afterthought. Based on the amount of office and residential space proposed in Maidenhead town centre, there must be an allocation of parking space for offices - at least 5 spaces per 1,000 SQFT and at least 1 space for each bedroom in residential blocks of flats. Maidenhead town centre will be the main focus for sustainable growth in the Borough to support its role as a focus within the wider Thames Valley. High density development, well designed with appropriate infrastructure will make the most of the town's transport links and the development of a well-integrated transport hub centred on Maidenhead railway station to take advantage of Crossrail connections.
- 2 Tall Buildings must be limited to the limits described in the AAP and parking must be provided on-site. Within Maidenhead town centre, development of tall buildings which enhance its image will be encouraged providing they do not compromise its character and appearance and that of nearby areas, including Conservation Areas. Unless detailed in a Supplementary Design Statement, the compromising of character and appearance is open to wide interpretation.
- 3 NC out of the MNP scope
- 4 NC out of the MNP scope
- 5 Golf Course Associated Infrastructure:-
  - a Doctors' Surgery b Infant School c Shops d Widening of Harvest Hill Road

9 proximity to the motorway

10 The Green Belt will be protected from inappropriate development in line with the guidance contained in ministerial statements, legislation and policy, and those sites proposed for development which are presently designated as Green Belt are identified in Policies HO1 and ED2 and are supported by evidence which justifies their inclusion as appropriate for development.

The NPPF is based upon policy being “written simply and clearly”\* the above policy statement is neither. The stated aim of protection of the Green Belt and inclusion of development also attributed to Green Belt may cause confusion. It is accepted that the BLP’s target audience is local residents with no planning experience as well as developers. By introducing an element of ambiguity to the lay reader, inappropriate expectations may be introduced especially as there is no clear detailing of the Green Belt boundary changes. A slight rewording may address this, for example:

“The Green Belt will be protected from inappropriate development in line with the guidance contained in ministerial statements, legislation and policy. Those sites proposed for development in Policies HO1 and ED2 which as of December 2016 are designated as Green Belt are supported by evidence which justifies their reclassification as appropriate for development. Accordingly, the Green Belt boundary is confirmed as detailed on the Policies Map.”

\* Ministerial Foreword – National Planning Policy Framework

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                            |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:06   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 5.10 Sustainable and community led development<br>( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

5.10.3 The Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan has consulted widely in various locations through Maidenhead and Cox green and the main area of concern with residents is parking. Off-road parking for where they live in flats or residential roads. The existing parking strategy is inadequate and does not recognise the reality of car ownership today. Realistically if you live in Maidenhead and are in employment, you have a car. Therefore, provision of 0.75 of a space per unit in a development of Flats must be increased, at the very least, to 1 per bedroom.

5.10.4 If this section appears as a defensive measure to override the MNP, then this needs to be more specific in its wording and to override strong community support is not what localism is all about.

The allocation of major sites and the density of housing within them are all designated as strategic policies. This means that they cannot be challenged or modified by the Neighbourhood Plans. No localism.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:08   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy SP 2 Community Led Development ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

1. Community led development proposals will be supported where:

a. proposals are in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Borough Local Plan set out elsewhere in this document, and accords with the other policies contained in the Plan

As a policy, this is not needed as it is not specific to community led development in that if any application meets the criteria within the BLP it is deemed acceptable. Therefore, this is simply a statement of how ALL applications are dealt with. Inclusion within the preamble to the policy is more appropriate.

b. proposals for development are contained in a made Neighbourhood Plan that has been subject to public consultation in line with the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations and can therefore demonstrate clear community support.

Similarly, this is just a statement of what the law is and therefore not required. Suggest moving to the preamble.

2. Proposals for affordable housing in Neighbourhood Plans may be supported in suitable Green Belt locations as an exception to normal policies of control provided that sufficient justification for such an exception has been provided. This should include how the scale of the scheme and range of dwelling sizes, types and tenures is appropriate to the location and level of identified local affordable housing need, and it can be demonstrated that the scheme will be well managed and financially viable over the long term and that any benefits provided by the scheme can be retained by the local community in perpetuity

There is no reason why this policy cannot state “WILL”(2 line 1) be supported, as it further states the criterion that must be met. If the local community has supported it, the hoops have been jumped through and the safeguards (as stated) have been put in place the policy should not introduce an element of ambiguity about the decision. This phraseology departure would be contrary to the majority of the BLP policies

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:09                                  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 6.2 Design ( <a href="#">View</a> )             |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

There should be one overarching principle applied to the design of our housing infrastructure. New development should provide the homes that people want to live in which means generous internal and external space which contribute to the health, happiness and well-being of the population.

6.2.10 Proposals which exceed 8 floors should NOT be considered. Berkshire House, which is an aberration in the town centre, is an unwanted example of a tall building. The acceptance in the BLP of taller buildings will require a considerable excavation to provide adequate onsite basement parking for staff in office developments or for residents in flats.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:10                                  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy SP 3 Design ( <a href="#">View</a> )     |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |



**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option No has been selected, detailed comments can be added)**

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

1 Support although vague

2

a Vague b Views – the acceptance of tall building will have impact on a view of Maidenhead from the North and South and a cluster of tall buildings will detract from Maidenhead's 'aspect' in the Thames Valley. c Define interesting. It should not mean adding cosmetic enhancements to an otherwise bland form. d Replacement buildings must not change the nature of residential areas; the development of apartment blocks should be resisted when they are in predominant areas of family houses. e Aspirational! Encouragement of sustainable modes of transport should not be a way of avoiding the provision of adequate car parking. Maidenhead is an area of high car ownership NPPF suggests that the provision of car parking should follow the pattern of car usage in the area. "movement and access: delivering easy and safe access and movement for cars, pedestrians, cyclists, and service vehicles, maximising opportunities to enhance permeability and encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport where possible"

> Relevant to building density/height and parking provision? f NC g Uncluttered! We have an ageing population - if uncluttered means lack of seating and benches - this is clearly wrong. Can we address the problem of estate agents signs disfiguring our streets particularly around flatted developments h In Maidenhead Town Centre, parking must be underground for office and apartment development to provide the number of spaces required:- 5 spaces per 1,000 sqft of office space and 1 car parking space per bedroom. Parking spaces should also be provided for visitors, deliveries, care workers and trades. "parking: delivering adequate levels of parking that is logical, safe and secure for users and not dominating the landscape"

What level is adequate?

Does "not dominating the landscape" imply underground in the Town centre?  
Should this be more specific?

1 i. What are adequate levels of community space. Who decides? j. k. Making every housing unit fully accessible for all users regardless of disability will have a significant influence on design. It will require wider circulation spaces, wider doors, larger bathrooms, staircases suitable for stairlifts etc. l. Expand this to include specific policies. Eg Walkways should be wide and overlooked by housing. Play spaces should be highly visible from adjacent houses. m. Outdoor equipment to include Baby Buggies, Bikes, Wheelchairs, etc. Also have regards to the need for generous internal storage so that Garages are not used as stores rather than for parking n. Sustainable? Define.

2 Tall buildings must not exceed 8 floors and must provide car parking as h above. Within Maidenhead town centre (as defined on the Policies Map) including the area of the Town Centre Area Action Plan, greater flexibility on building heights will be permitted. Tall buildings will be supported where they demonstrate exceptional high quality design and do not cause unacceptable impacts. Advice provided by Historic England or similar bodies on tall buildings should inform development proposals" Very Vague – Supplement in MNP

4. Developments should be designed in partnership with:

a. the Council through the pre-application service

b. the local community through Neighbourhood Plan groups and other engagement methods appropriate to the proposals and in line with standards set out in the adopted Statement of Community Involvement

c. Design panels as appropriate for major schemes, with the cost of the design panel to be borne by the applicant.

Comment: N.Plan Group consultation mechanism will need to be considered post adoption of the N.Plan. How will developers know how to contact the N.Plan Group and who will it be ? - How are they recruited and supported? "What are criteria for major?

How is the design panel constituted? He who pays the piper calls the tune

1 We reserve the right to review this section once the Design Guide Supplementary Planning document becomes available.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)      |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:12                                       |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 6.4 Townscape and landscape ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

Townscape assessment is not always accurate. Ref 88 Braywick Road development.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)              |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:15   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy SP 4 Townscape and Landscape ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option No has been selected, detailed comments can be added)**

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

2. Using the Townscape Assessment, development proposals in the urban areas should maintain and enhance local character in terms of both the immediate surroundings and streetscene; and at the wider settlement or character type area, respond positively to defining features.

**The Townscape Assessment is approaching seven years old and to many would be considered out of date especially if it is to be used as the baseline for the BLP, by the end of this policy's lifespan the baseline would be nearly three decades old.**

3. Using the Landscape Character Assessment, development proposals in rural areas should maintain and enhance the quality, distinctive local characteristics and features that contribute positively to landscape character and rural views.

**The Landscape Character Assessment is now historic, its compilation for 2004 may not be classed as relevant today.**

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)    |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:16                                     |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 6.6 River Thames Corridor ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option No has been selected, detailed comments can be added)**

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

The river Thames is an important tourist attraction in Maidenhead and provision must be made to include within its aspect, places to eat with a view of the river, and places to sit for walkers and enhanced access for wheel-chair users, with an ambition to have a wheel- chair route from Maidenhead to Cookham.

---

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b> | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
|-------------------|---|

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:17   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy SP 5 River Thames Corridor ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

The river Thames is an important tourist attraction in Maidenhead and provision must be made to include within its aspect, places to eat with a view of the river, and places to sit for walkers and enhanced access for wheel-chair users, with an ambition to have a wheel- chair route from Maidenhead to Cookham.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:19                                  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 6.8 Green Belt ( <a href="#">View</a> )         |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

An assumption must be made that Government will significantly reduce the protection of the green belt in favour of new settlements. The government have recently proposed at least 10 new settlements as the way forward. The Council have dismissed new settlements with one word: 'inappropriate'. If this is not the case, Maidenhead as a place to bring up families will no longer apply. The proposals to meet Government housing requirements by building blocks of flats in preference to houses will Not meet the needs of families who want a house with a garden and parking for their cars.

6.8.13 We need the release of substantial area of green belt land for the Borough to meet housing needs. These green belt sites should be carefully chosen so that the green spaces in our towns are not compromised.

6.8.19 Cycle ways, footpaths and bridle- ways criss-cross the green belt. These should be improved and enhanced to encourage cyclists to commute greater distances. Footpaths must provide benches to encourage older members of the community to walk and surfaces must be improved to encourage Wheel Chair Ramblers.

6.8.22 Farming methods mean more animals are kept in sheds and this practice in itself will mean more farm buildings in the Green Belt.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                    |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:19   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy SP 6 Development in the Green Belt ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

In all likelihood to meet the requirements of the Governments allocate housing a new settlement on an area of Greenbelt will be required over the period covered by this policy.

This likelihood should become part of this policy and included

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)      |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:21                                       |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 7.2 Amount and distribution ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option No has been selected, detailed comments can be added)**

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

7.2.2 The spatial strategy proposes the provision of 14,298 new homes within the Borough in strategic locations as identified in 5.9 'Policy SP1 Spatial Strategy', sites in existing settlements, previously developed sites in the Green Belt, and a limited number of sites which will be released from the Green Belt due to the exceptional circumstances identified by this Local Plan. The spatial strategy pursues with vigour the more intensive use of urban land, particularly in town centre locations.

Does this preamble imply a preference, and a directional instruction to developers, to err on the side of intensive? Would it not be more preferable to use the wording:

“The spatial strategy recognises a more intensive use of urban land where appropriate, ....”

How with increased densities will developers achieve quality along with acceptability?

What are the exceptional circumstances?

7.2.3 The result of the step change in the level of housing provision within Maidenhead town centre will result in higher urban density development and revitalising the central area by increasing the number of residents and increasing the vitality and vibrancy of the Town Centre particularly into the evenings and weekends. The Council is also allocating a number of smaller brownfield sites elsewhere which will make a valuable contribution towards meeting the identified need for housing. There is a number of sites where a mix of uses is proposed including housing, employment, retail and community facilities and details are provided on the individual site proformas.

A proper and comprehensive infrastructure assessment and delivery plan is required to address the resultant infrastructure requirements of a 'step change' in the level of housing provision. Currently this is absent.

7.2.4 The Council will be supportive of new residential development on the number of small sites that are impractical to identify in advance which unexpectedly become available during the plan period providing that the sites are suitable and appropriate for residential development. This source of land recycling is expected to provide for at least an additional 1,840 new dwellings over the plan period based on recent trends.

The wording of this preamble introduces ambiguity as it states that it is “impractical to identify in advance” but has an expectation of “at least an additional 1,840 new dwellings”. It is a generally accepted principle that ‘past performance is not an indicator of future outcomes’ especially as the ‘recent trends’ are based upon earlier planning legislation and guidance. If an audit of recent trend applications had the Draft Plan’s policies applied a suggested amendment would be:

“On small sites not identified within this Plan which unexpectedly become available during the plan period will be considered for residential development providing that the sites are suitable, appropriate and compliant with this Plan’s Policies. This source of land recycling is anticipated to provide at least an additional 1,840 new dwellings over the plan period based on the application of this Plan on recent trends.”

Piecemeal development of rear gardens should be discouraged particularly where it involves the demolition of good housing stock. That isn’t sustainable development.

7.2.6 HAO1 allocations are all defined only as ‘housing units’ how will the proposed mix be established and controlled.

The BLP is a forward looking plan but offers no forecasts on the impact of Crossrail, Heathrow or Brexit.

7.2.8 The approach to identifying sites seeks to meet the identified need for housing in line with the expectations of national policy and guidance and reflects the requirement for all local authorities across the Housing Market Areas to do more to increase housing land supply. It is important to note that the Borough Local Plan housing requirement does not represent the only source of new dwellings that can be accommodated. Ancillary accommodation created through the extension of properties and some forms of shared accommodation do not require planning permission but will still make an important contribution to meeting housing needs as will provision arising from changes to permitted development rights.

The wording in the sentence may above may introduce confusion within the planning process as it appears to suggest that extensions to properties do not require planning permission. In the context of permitted development some extensions may not, but others do. The insertion of the word “some” at the beginning of the sentence would remove this perception.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)        |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:22   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 7.3 Housing development sites ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

In addition to our proposed Development Policies, we have revisited our previous assessment of potential Green Belt sites. We do not agree with our consultant advice that this is beyond the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan - especially in view of the proposals within the Borough Local Plan, currently out for consultation.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:24   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy HO 1 Housing Development Sites ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

Comments relating to specific sites are collated within the response to individual pro-formas.

Clarify in the list of sites which are strategic.

The heading "Strategic locations" HA1..HA11 is clear, but what is the status for example of HA21, Spencer's Farm, listed under "Maidenhead"? Is it strategic or not?

Policy HO 1 is itself strategic. What is the rationale for listing some sites under a sub-heading "Strategic"?

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)   |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:25                                    |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 7.5 Meeting housing need ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**



**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

Housing need is about more than allocating one bedroom per couple.

No mention is made about the relationship between the proposals and the existing housing mix in Maidenhead. There is a demand for 3/4 bedroom houses with appropriate living space to bring up families and this is one of the main features which makes Maidenhead an attractive place in which to live.

Therefore, the mix should, at least, reflect the need for this type of housing and not the numbers game of meeting the target by building blocks of flats that don't meet this need.

The method of establishing and benchmarking the 'needs and demands' is not referenced. The collation and assessment of the relevant data is required to determine the specific need of the existing community as a priority over market demand.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)           |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:27  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy HO 2 Meeting Housing Need ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

1. The provision of new homes should contribute to meeting the needs of current and projected households by having regard to the following principles:  
be shown by mix reflecting the current housing stock. on this point... simply 'housing units'.  
high rise flatted developments everywhere

a. Target percentages should be neutral/silent  
Maidenhead does not need or want

This mix should be based on real need not the 'one bedroom per couple' calculation. Housing policy in the past has been led by a narrow definition of need, which has led to a proliferation of one and two bedroom flats. A single person or a couple only need one bedroom. A family with a child only need two bedrooms. There appears to be no place in planning for a spare room or for change in circumstances. This is clearly nonsense. Families in particular need space: space for children to play;

space to escape the television; space to do homework Space for socialising. Rather than downsizing to one bed units, elderly people may need space for live-in carers or for children and grandchildren and friends to come and stay. Housing mix should seek to redress the balance caused by the large number of one and two bedroom flats built in Maidenhead in the last couple of years. b Requires clarification. (of the resident or community) c NC Supported Due to the lack of supplementary guidance for (a) above, the Neighbourhood Plans will be an invaluable source of reference to determine the appropriate mix, type and size of dwellings for development proposals

2 How is this managed? Who fixes these priorities?

3 Development proposals should demonstrate that housing type and mix have been taken into account and show how they seek to demonstrate how dwellings have been designed to be adaptable.

There is no definition of housing mix - this is required.

4. Development proposals should not result in a net loss of existing dwellings or land that provides for residential uses unless such a loss is justified by specific circumstances. The Council will only support development proposals that would result in the net loss of residential accommodation where one or more of the following criteria are met:

- a. retention of the residential use would be undesirable due to proven environmental constraints
- b. the development proposal would provide an essential community service or another form of residential accommodation

The highlighted sentence, as a qualifier, may be interpreted as being at odds with the intention of the substantive policy i.e. a row of terraces replaced with a large house, does the loss of dwellings constitute justification as specific circumstances?

5. Development proposals that would result in the partial loss of an existing unit of residential accommodation to non-residential use will only be permitted where one or more of the following criteria are met:

- a. the nature and intensity of the non-residential use would not detract from the occupation of the retained residential accommodation, or
- b. the retained residential accommodation would be of a satisfactory standard including living space and residential amenity.

A 'satisfactory standard' is not defined, perhaps a reference to the intended supplementary guidance for design should be included to avoid defending/challenging different standards.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:29                                  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 7.7 Affordable housing ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option No has been selected, detailed comments can be added)**

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

7.7.3 The high cost of home ownership in the Borough has always presented an issue of affordability for many of the Borough's residents and leaves many people unable to afford market housing. In addition the high cost of renting on the open market leaves many local people unable to afford this tenure without dependency on benefits. This increases the demand for the provision of affordable housing. The current SHMA shows that there is a need for an additional 434 new affordable homes in the Borough every year.

The evidence base that the BLP relies upon states that over 60% of the annual housing requirement is for affordable housing, this is an established need not an aspiration. NPPF 7 requires the planning system to have a social role of "supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations;...". This is reinforced within the NPPF in paragraphs 47 and 50. There may be a case to incentivise a higher percentage of affordable housing above that set in the BLP thereby demonstrating a policy of addressing the established need.

Furthermore, other policies within the BLP seek to promote employment growth which by its very nature results in either a residential or transportation requirement the new employees. Those unable to afford housing within the Borough will obviously need to commute, therefore associated transport plans/strategies will need to take into consideration additional transportation levels and requirements.

SHMA covers a wide area and does not identify where affordable housing is needed. 434 p.a. The affordable need indicated in the SHMA equals 61% of the RBWM-wide total need of 712 p.a. – twice the current 30% policy. 'Affordable' and particularly social housing should be evenly spread across the borough, avoiding creating concentrations and potential social issues.

7.7.7 The delivery of affordable housing will be provided in accordance with the following order of priority.

- a. on-site as part of the development and distributed across the development as much as is reasonable and practical to create a sustainable, balanced community.
- b. on an alternative site, only if provision would result in a more effective use of available resources or would meet an identified housing need, such as providing a better social mix and wider housing choice.
- c. a financial payment to be utilised in providing affordable housing on an alternative site.

If the guidance regarding mix is followed as required by Policy HO2 then (b) and (c) above are the extreme exception. The promotion of an inclusive, cohesive community should be the default position thereby ensuring that exclusive, elite developments are not created. Similarly, excluding exceptional circumstances, creating concentrations of any type of tenure should be avoided to ensure diversity and sustainability.

7.7.11 On the basis of the results of the SHMA and the HELAA, it is clear that the Council will not be able to deliver sufficient affordable housing to meet the level of identified need. The Council will therefore explore opportunities to deliver affordable housing from other sources of sites. The details will be determined on a site-by-site basis through negotiation.

Unless sufficient resourcing is applied to exploring opportunities to deliver affordable housing, the sustainability of development within the Borough will be cumulatively diminished. The disparity between the established need and policy levels may grow exponentially over the plan period.

7.7.15 Need to avoid aggravating an existing 'cluster' of social rented (a sub set of affordable) in the town centre

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)         |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:31  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy HO 3 Affordable Housing ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

1. Affordable housing units will be sought on sites of 0.5Ha or over, or schemes proposing 15 or more net additional dwellings subject to the minimum requirement of 30%. The tenure, size and type will be negotiated on a site by site basis, having regard to housing needs, site specifics and other factors:
  - a. Development proposals that provide for a wide range of affordable housing products in line with government initiatives will be encouraged.
  - b. Constraints on the development of the site imposed by other planning objectives.
  - c. The need to achieve a successful housing development in terms of the location and mix of affordable homes.
  - d. The costs relating to the development; in particular the financial viability of developing the site (using an approved viability model) in which instance the Council will consider off site contributions in lieu of onsite provision.

To reinforcement the importance of this policy, it is suggested that "*considered sequentially*" be added to the end of the first paragraph thereby stating the hierarchical weight the considerations have.

The prescribed threshold of this policy may encourage small scale (and possibly inefficient) developments just under the threshold. Development, regardless of their size, impact upon existing communities. Therefore, and having regard for the content of preamble 7.7.11, consideration should be given to all developments of between 1 and 15 units being required to provide a financial contribution towards affordable housing in the locality. The level of contribution could be of a lower level than for larger developments to assist with the viability of schemes.

2. If a site allocated or identified for housing is sub-divided so as to create two or more separate development schemes one or more of which falls below the threshold of fifteen units or 0.5 hectares in area, the Council will seek an appropriate level of affordable housing to reflect the provision that would have been achieved on the site as a whole had it come forward as a single scheme for the allocated or identified site.

Sustainability of development is a thread therefore the cumulative impact of previous development should also be considered. This policy should be expanded to include development proposals adjacent to development completed within the previous ten years (whether by the previous developer or not) insofar that when combined would have resulted in the application of this policy requirement. In these instances a lower requirement towards affordable housing provision would be acceptable in the suggestion for HO3 (1) above.

3. The delivery of affordable housing will be provided in accordance with the following order of priority:

- a. On-site as part of the development and distributed across the development as much as is reasonable and practical to create a sustainable, balanced community.
- b. On an alternative site, only if provision would result in a more effective use of available resources or would meet an identified housing need, such as providing a better social mix and wider housing choice.
- c. Planning conditions and/or obligations will be used to ensure that the affordable housing will remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for the subsidy to be recycled to alternative affordable housing provision.

3(a) above may inadvertently lower the affordable housing provision as it does not make it clear that the remaining balance of provision would be applied across (b) and/or (c).

To ensure that the affordability provision remains with the community affected by the development, 3(c) should be amended with the addition of "within the locality" to the end of the sentence

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)     |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:35                                      |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 7.9 Gypsies and Travellers ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)

Do you agree with this content? (Once an option No has been selected, detailed comments can be added)

If you disagree, please tell us why?

7.9.1 Separate Local Plan please advise when this becomes available

---

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Comment by         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)         |
| Comment ID         | DBLP  |
| Response Date      | 13/01/17 11:36  |
| Consultation Point | 7.11 Housing layout and design ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| Status             | Draft   |
| Submission Type    | Web   |
| Version            | 0.1   |

If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)

Do you agree with this content? (Once an option No has been selected, detailed comments can be added)

If you disagree, please tell us why?

7.11.1 This agrees in favour of intensification and then goes onto mention character how are these two aspects of design going to be reconciled?

There may be a benefit to the wider environment but forcing people, particularly families, into cramped high rise apartments is not the way forward. Read RIBA 'the case for space'

7.11.3 Developments should provide an attractive and safe residential environment. The preferred policy approach below sets out considerations which are specific to residential developments. It supplements Policy SP3 which sets out design principles which are applicable to all proposals, including residential.

The use of 'preferred' above may be interpreted as optional, NPPF 57 states that "*it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development...*". Therefore the deletion of "preferred" accords with Government direction whilst stating the importance of layout and design.

7.11.4 The Borough Wide Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document will provide further advice on expected standards of accommodation including minimum space standards.

It is suggested that the acceptable minimum space standards should be referenced from the Royal Institute of British Architects – ‘Space Standards for Homes’ as well as from the Department for Communities and Local Government – ‘Technical housing standards: nationally described space standard’.

Crucial SPD to come but will it have teeth?

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:38   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy HO 5 Housing Layout and Design ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

1. Development proposals for residential development should achieve high standards of design and landscaping to create attractive and safe residential areas.

Design is not limited to the external appearance and therefore, as the Policy heading states, layout is an important consideration. To recognise this it is suggested that an amendment to this policy is made to reflect the inclusion of the internal design, e.g.:

*“1. Development proposals for residential development should achieve high standards of design, both internally as well as externally including landscaping to create attractive and safe residential areas.”*

We generally support the statement, but this is a subjective target – in whose opinion? And what ‘gives’ as soon as a developer says it is not financially viable?

2. In addition to the requirements of 6.3 'Policy SP3 Design' Design, development proposals for residential development will be required to demonstrate how the proposal aims to mitigate the impact of climate change, and how the layout and design of the scheme meets the following criteria:

2b Who decides what unacceptably affects residential amenity?

2c Factor into planning the carbon debt of demolishing existing housing stock. Detached house 50 Tonnes of Carbon. Payback for new energy efficient house 50 Years.

f. provide car parking which is convenient and accessible and close to the housing being served, Avoid parking courts and lock-up garages.

High car ownership is firmly established, therefore the resulting requirement for adequate car parking provision off the highway is a prerequisite priority for residents. Therefore, it is suggested that 2(f) be amended "provide adequate car parking....." *adequate being one car parking space for each bedroom.*

3. A Borough Wide Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document will illustrate further how this policy should be implemented.

For the purposes of completeness and guidance, the Parking Supplementary Planning Document should also be included within 3 above. This ensures that the adequate car parking provisions are in accordance with the expected requirements.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                  |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:40   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy HO 6 Housing Density and Amenity ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

Higher densities invited in and around town centres. No limits on density/locations. Wording such as 'Informed by', 'satisfactory', 'adequate' are all very subjective – in whose opinion? – making this a very loose policy.

Only those with good access to transport nodes etc. should be permitted.

Add point 1d: The density of development will be informed by the need to provide adequate parking space particularly as leisure facilities are being relocated to the outskirts of town and out of town.



## 2 What do adequate and satisfactory mean? Who decides?

There is clear evidence that there are dire social consequences of housing policies that force people to live in inadequate cramped accommodation. People who do so are less healthy, less well socially adjusted, less well educated and just plain less happy than their equivalents who live in houses with gardens. Despite being one of the wealthiest countries, we build the smallest houses in Europe. Not because we need to but because it is an unintended consequence of policy decisions made in the past.

2a Adequate and adaptable living space needs to be defined. As a minimum the London Design Guide should be used as a minimum.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:41   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy HO 7 Sub-division of Dwellings ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

1. Development proposals for the sub-division of dwellings to form additional dwellings or housing in multiple occupation in areas excluded from the Green Belt will be permitted where the proposal can demonstrate it meets all of the following criteriaa Care should be exercised in the subdivision of dwelling so as not to lose existing family homes.

h. provide satisfactory access, car parking and secure cycle parking.

As stated elsewhere a qualifier of “adequate car parking” should be added to prevent parking on the highway as a result of the development.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                                |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:42   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy HO 8 Development Involving Residential Gardens ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |

**Status** Draft  
**Submission Type** Web  
**Version** 0.1

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

Policy HO8 may be contrary to Government policy as the identified sites contained within the BLP are not residential gardens and NPPF 48 states that the windfall sites allowance "...should not include residential gardens".

If this policy is to be retained, the policy amendment suggested above for HO3 is further justified so that such development as described in HO8 is not positively sought to avoid the provisions of affordable housing.

In practice it will mean that demolition of homes and piecemeal backland development will not be allowed but considered infill development will be permitted. However reference to the townscape assessment needs to be qualified because it is not always correct. For example the current development at 88 Braywick Road is described as being in a landscape character area of modest semi -detached houses in curvilinear streets which it clearly is not.

---

**Comment by** Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)  
**Comment ID** DBLP  
**Response Date** 13/01/17 11:43  
**Consultation Point** Policy HO 9 Extensions and Outbuildings in Residential Curtilages ([View](#))  
**Status** Draft  
**Submission Type** Web  
**Version** 0.1

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

2. A Borough Wide Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document will illustrate further how this policy should be implemented.

As 1(f) appropriately requires parking provision, HO9 (2) should include reference to the Parking Supplementary Planning Document.

The forthcoming SPD should show enforcement policy, and identify who determines what is acceptable

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)   |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:44                                    |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 8.2 Economic development ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

The preamble nor following policy mentions requirements associated with such development including staff parking, transport links and infrastructure. Whilst it may be the intention to include these matters within supplementary guidance, referencing it should be an important consideration.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)   |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:45                                    |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 8.2 Economic development ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option No has been selected, detailed comments can be added)**

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

1. Intensification - = density how is this reconciled with details of office accommodation extolling the generous space allocations and surrounding space?
2. Proposals should endeavour to improve the education and skills levels of Borough residents and initiatives will encourage the use of local labour, particularly on the development of large and strategic sites. Development proposals that would assist small and start-up businesses will also be supported.

How is educational achievement aims planning policy?

The use of “*will*” above appears to be an error, “*which*” sits more comfortably with the context of the policy.

3. The development of large and small businesses will be supported to encourage local employment opportunities and useful services.

Whilst mentioned in the preamble, medium sized businesses appear to be excluded. It is suggested that the text be amended to “*..businesses from small to large..*”

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)       |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:47  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy ED 2 Employment Sites ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option No has been selected, detailed comments can be added)**

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

Employment site carry an assumption that there will be employees. In Maidenhead and the wider town parking for employees is a problem insufficient parking onsite means overspill onto already congested local roads. We already see that office accommodation on some sites is not easy for landlords to find tenants, and are having to upgrade the parking spaces.

New development must include a basic level of parking of 5 parking spaces per 1,000 sqft of office space, this space must be within the curtilage of the building or new parking spaces within 4 mins walk of the proposed office.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:48                                  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 9.1 Context ( <a href="#">View</a> )            |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

9.1.4 Further district centres at Ascot and Sunningdale and a number of local centres provide for predominantly convenience based shopping and service needs in other locations across the Borough. A survey of visitors undertaken to support the 2015 Retail and Town Centre Study confirmed that the retail catchment of RBWM extends into neighbouring areas, with residents from settlements outside the Borough including Beaconsfield, Marlow, Staines and Slough, making use of the services on offer in the town centres of Windsor and Maidenhead. The nearby centres of Reading, Bracknell and central London offer the widest range of shops and services in locations that are easily accessible by both road and rail to local residents.

If Bracknell is to be included in this context then for completeness so too should Slough and High Wycombe.

9.1.5 add ' per the AAP aims'

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)   |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:49                                    |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 9.2 Hierarchy of centres ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

**9.2.7** The town centre of Maidenhead has been the subject of a programme of public realm improvements which is ongoing. While the attractiveness of the centre has been hampered in recent years by high vacancy rates, the level of vacancies is now declining. A range of major and multiple retailers are located within the town, focused within the Nicholsons Centre shopping precinct and along the pedestrianised section of the High Street. There is a wide range of land uses within the town centre including a range of offices, hotels, cinema, restaurants and residential developments, which together help to ensure that the centre enjoys high levels of footfall.

The BLP makes no mention of the Chapel Arches and Waterways development, these will both increase visitors to Maidenhead Town centre

The BLP does not appear to offer any positive encouragement for businesses to invest in Maidenhead. Whilst contextually it may be appropriate to acknowledge recent history, NPPF 23 states that *“Planning policies should be positive, promote competitive town centre environments...”* and *“recognise town centres as the heart of their communities and pursue policies to support their viability and vitality”*. If the local plan for the next twenty years does not appear positive about Maidenhead, investment by business may be directed to neighbouring and competing centres for the next twenty years.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)             |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:50  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 9.5 Frontages and diversity of use ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

9.5.5 Specifically the 2009 Waterways Framework SPD

9.5.7 Using upper floors for residential is conditional on the quality and suitability of this accommodation for younger workers without families or those with. Families with children need more internal space than those without.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)     |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:53                                      |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 9.8 Maidenhead town centre ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

9.8.1 Specifically the 2009 Waterways Framework SPD

9.8.2 Forecasts 2,300 additional dwellings presumably 2 and 3 bedroom flats will require at least 4,600 car parking spaces (no mention is made of this)

There no further recovery of existing retail leakage, despite the AAP being aimed to address. exactly this. Adding In aggregate 5,000 m2 = c20% of that planned for The Landing alone ...Why so low?

9.8.3 We support the Integration of the two shopping centres to create a natural flow of shoppers but question the planned capacity of the Broadway car park to facilitate the shopper's arrival.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)             |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:54  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy TR 3 Maidenhead Town Centre ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

No mention is made of the additional requirements for parking in this policy

No evident linkage of the two issues grouped together here. Separate the issues as the considerations are completely different. The waterways policy should be linked to the AAP and 2009 Waterways Framework SPD.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)       |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:55  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy TR 4 District Centres ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

4. The scale of development that will be appropriate in local centres will be smaller than that in district centres, and will be determined by reference to the scale and function of the centre in question. Development proposals should not be of such a scale that they would elevate the centre to a higher level in the retail hierarchy.

TR4(4) appears to be out of context, either "local centres" and "district centres" should be substituted with "district centres" and "town centres" or this paragraph a replacement for TR5(2).

1 Support- provided they have adequate off-road parking and amenity space.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:56                                  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 9.12 Local centres ( <a href="#">View</a> )     |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |



**Version** 0.1

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

3. Support – provided conditions on room space, amenity space and off-road parking can be met.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)    |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:57                                     |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy TR 5 Local Centres ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

6. The local centres identified in Policy TR1 exclude small parades of shops of purely neighbourhood significance.

TR5(6) is not needed as it does not add anything to the policy and is therefore unnecessarily verbose. Its inclusion within the preamble may be acceptable.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)     |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 11:58                                      |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 9.14 Impact and conditions ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |

Version 0.1

If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)

Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added) No

If you disagree, please tell us why?

9.14.2 Support, need to prioritise healthy town centres over out of town. This should also recognise the changing patterns in retail sales, shoppers' preferences for open car parks at out of town supermarkets and online.

---

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| Comment by         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                        |
| Comment ID         | DBLP   |
| Response Date      | 13/01/17 11:59   |
| Consultation Point | Policy TR 6 Strengthening the Role of Centres ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| Status             | Draft  |
| Submission Type    | Web  |
| Version            | 0.1  |

If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)

Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added) No

If you disagree, please tell us why?

3. Where suitable and viable in-centre sites are not available, edge of centre locations must be considered. If suitable and viable edges of centre sites are not available, out of centre sites should be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference will be given to accessible sites that are well-connected to the centre.

This is confusingly verbose and states the obvious, instead the prioritisation preference of locations (centre, edge, outside) would be more appropriate.

---

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| Comment by    | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| Comment ID    | DBLP  |
| Response Date | 13/01/17 12:00                                  |

**Consultation Point** Policy VT 1 Visitor Development ([View](#))  
**Status** Draft  
**Submission Type** Web  
**Version** 0.1

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

- 2.c This is particularly relevant to Maidenhead
- 3. Changing needs of visitors – we have a growing population of older people provision must be made within the shopping areas to provide generous (more than adequate) seating (benches) and rest areas (loos).
- 6. Development proposals for park and ride facilities located in the Green Belt will need to demonstrate a case of very special circumstances.

To take into consideration the impact, it is suggested that *“and appropriate mitigation measures”* is added to the end of the sentence.

7. We look forward to receiving a copy of this SPD to comment on.

---

**Comment by** Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)  
**Comment ID** DBLP  
**Response Date** 13/01/17 12:01  
**Consultation Point** Policy HE 2 Listed Buildings ([View](#))  
**Status** Draft  
**Submission Type** Web  
**Version** 0.1

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** Other

**Please make any other comments here:**

8. We look forward to receiving a copy of this SPD to comment on.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)        |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 12:02   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy HE 3 Ancient Monuments ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** Other

**Please make any other comments here:**

2 We look forward to receiving a copy of this SPD to comment on.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                   |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 12:04  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 12.2 Sustainable design and construction ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

**12.2.1** The recent Housing Standards Review concluded that government regulations and standards relating to sustainable design and construction should be simplified through Building Regulations. The Deregulation Act 2015 withdrew the ability of local planning authorities to add local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings at higher

levels than Building Regulations. This included the removal of the Code for Sustainable Homes, which set out the government owned standard for sustainable house building. A Written Ministerial Statement confirmed that Local Planning Authorities could not require the Code for Sustainable Homes as a planning condition.

“Local planning authorities have the option to set additional technical requirements exceeding the minimum standards required by Building Regulations in respect of access and water, and an optional nationally described space standard.”\*

**\* Department for Communities and Local Government – Housing: optional technical standards**

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                        |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 12:05   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy NR 3 Managing Flood Risk and Waterways ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

Why are these two issues grouped together here? The Maidenhead waterway is NOT a flood defence scheme and is not funded by the EA, but the consented Phase 1 plans have nevertheless illustrated betterment, not aggravated flood risk.

The Waterways project relies on a flow of water from Cookham, this flow must be considered in other planning submission that may affect this.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)               |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 12:06  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy EP 1 Environmental Protection ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |

Version 0.1

If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)

Do you agree with this content? (Once an option No has been selected, detailed comments can be added)

If you disagree, please tell us why?

2. Development proposals should not significantly and adversely impact the local environment.

The impact on the local environment is important, therefore the classification for impact should take into consideration either qualification not both together. Therefore it is suggested that EP1(2) be amended to "...significantly nor adversely...".

6. Residential amenity may be harmed by reason of noise, smell or other nuisance. Accordingly, care should be taken when siting particular commercial or agricultural proposals such as livestock units, silage storage or slurry pits which should be sited well away from the curtilage of any residential property.

As presented EP1(6) may introduce an element of ambiguity due to the acceptability inference of the wording "*may be harmed*". Consideration should be given to amending the first sentence to:

*"6. Residential amenity should not be harmed by reason of noise, smell or other nuisance. ..."*

---

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| Comment by         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)    |
| Comment ID         | DBLP   |
| Response Date      | 13/01/17 12:07                                     |
| Consultation Point | Policy EP 2 Air Pollution ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| Status             | Draft  |
| Submission Type    | Web  |
| Version            | 0.1  |

If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)

Do you agree with this content? (Once an option No has been selected, detailed comments can be added)

If you disagree, please tell us why?

2. Development proposals will be supported where significant increases in air pollution can be mitigated, thus reducing the likelihood of health problems for residents.

It is suggested that the draft wording may inadvertently send the wrong message, that significantly increasing air pollution is acceptable if it can be mitigated. In fact Monitoring Indicator 9 has a stronger wording than the policy it is monitoring. An amendment is suggested:

*“2. Development proposals which may result in significant increases in air pollution must contain appropriate mitigation measures, thus reducing the likelihood of health problems for residents.”*

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 12:08                                  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy EP 4 Noise ( <a href="#">View</a> )      |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

3. Development proposals in areas significantly affected by aircraft, road or rail noise will be supported if the applicant can demonstrate via a noise impact assessment, effective mitigation measures.

It is an accepted principle that noise can significantly affect the residential amenities of local residents, therefore it is right that applicable policies should place a duty of care on developers. To provide reassurance of this duty to inhabitants a slight change in emphasis within EP4(3) is suggested:

*“3. Development proposals in areas significantly affected by aircraft, road or rail noise will require the applicant to demonstrate, via a noise impact assessment, effective mitigation measures.”*

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)         |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 12:09  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 14.4 Habitats and designations ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)

Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added) No

If you disagree, please tell us why?

14.4.2 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) are designated by Natural England as the very best wildlife and geological sites in the country. They support plants and animals that find it more difficult to survive in the wider countryside. Eleven such sites have been designated in the Borough, as follows:

.....

h. Great Thrift Wood, Woodlands Park

Great Thrift Wood is located in Cox Green not Woodlands Park.

---

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| Comment by         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                                  |
| Comment ID         | DBLP   |
| Response Date      | 13/01/17 12:10   |
| Consultation Point | Policy NE 2 Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| Status             | Draft  |
| Submission Type    | Web  |
| Version            | 0.1  |

If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)

Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added) Yes

If you agree, please tell us why?

8. Support in principle, but what ratios will apply to Maidenhead developments? If so how?

---

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Comment by         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| Comment ID         | DBLP  |
| Response Date      | 13/01/17 12:11                                  |
| Consultation Point | Policy NE 4 Open Space ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| Status             | Draft   |



**Submission Type** Web

**Version** 0.1

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

8. Land at Ockwells, Maidenhead is allocated on the Policies Map to provide Open Space to meet the needs of new development within the town centre.

“Land at Ockwells” is an incorrect description, it should be amended to “Ockwells Park & Nature Reserve, Cox Green. As the pro-formas for sites within the town centre require open space provision within the development, Ockwells Park & Nature Reserve is not a substitute for the requirement. Therefore the following amendment would correctly reflect the provision:

*“The expansion of Ockwells Park & Nature Reserve, Cox Green as identified on the Policies Map provides Open Space towards the needs of new development within the town centre.”*

With this designation the Integrated Transport Plan, Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Cycling Strategy should take into consideration the transportation needs of residents, including those from new town centre developments, to and from this Open Space provision. Such an omission runs contrary to the operational functioning of the designation.

---

**Comment by** Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)

**Comment ID** DBLP

**Response Date** 13/01/17 12:15

**Consultation Point** 14.14 Local Green Space ([View](#))

**Status** Draft

**Submission Type** Web

**Version** 0.1

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

Using the criteria detailed in 14.14.2, it is suggested that Ockwells Park & Nature Reserve should be designated a Local Green Space due to recreational value, richness of its wildlife and community value as a facility used by the wider community.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)    |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 12:17                                     |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 15.3 Community facilities ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

In the MLP there just one mention of increase in education capacity. The development on Maidenhead Golf Course.

All existing Primary and Secondary schools need to be assessed for future capacity and where possible enlargement. This will then indicate where new capacity is needed. Consideration should be given to establishing a school to the East of Maidenhead, which would reduce cross-town school commuting. When considering school expansion adequate area for drop off and pick up must be allocated.

An increase in population means that GPs, pharmacies and dentists capacity must increase proportionately. Some surgeries may have spare capacity to expand, but it may be necessary to build new ones. There will need to be provision within the golf club development.

Small shopping parades near new developments are necessary. There is little space to expand existing parades. Local shops help reduce vehicle usage.

A fully integrated cycleway needs to be planned with adequate secure parking.

If the Magnet Leisure centre is to be relocated to Braywick there must be a safe route available for children visiting the centre from the north and west of it. This relocation will also mean that more commuter car parking will be lost.

To ease the parking problems of Maidenhead adequate parking space per new dwelling bedroom count must be enforced and any new development must cater for visitors and service providers.

A larger population will require more recreational facilities, which use halls. We have over 20 at present, but they are kept quite full. Extra more modern facilities are going to be needed.

---

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>    | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| <b>Comment ID</b>    | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b> | 13/01/17 12:17                                  |

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 15.7 Sustainable transport ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

The Southern bypass should be made dual carriageway so that it complements the Northern bypass. This would relieve the one-way system particularly of HGVs.

Turning the station forecourt into the transport hub is a move in the right direction, but it will come at the cost of losing more parking spaces.

The arrival of Crossrail is welcomed, but suitable parking needs to be provided as there is insufficient for the current commuters. We must also ensure that peak hour fast services to London are maintained.

To improve traffic flow more use of junction filters and roundabouts that can handle greater volumes without adversely slowing traffic should be considered.

Maidenhead residence are only to familiar with congestion when the M4 is closed no contingency plans currently are in evidence to mitigate these events, Also the BLP gives no mention of them with the advent of the M4 super highway this should be addressed.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)    |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 12:19                                     |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 15.9 Local Transport Plan ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

Developments should seek to improve pedestrian and cyclist accessibility by ensuring that an adequate and definable segregation between pedestrians and cyclists exist to avoid potential conflicts between the two user groups. Examples include dedicated cycle routes; physical separation; line marking and associated signage on 'shared' routes; as well as pedestrian only (cyclists dismount) designated routes.

A hierarchical approach could be implemented of pedestrians first followed by cyclists, the presumption would be that pedestrians have priority over provided routes excepted in dedicated and defined cycle routes.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)            |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 12:20   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy IF 3 Sustainable Transport ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

All day parking by commuters in residential areas close to the station and town centre has to be more tightly controlled. More affordable parking for commuters needs to be provided. Maidenhead needs to be able to cope with increased volumes through Crossrail and the expanding population. Improved bus services should also help alleviate the use of private cars.

Car parking for town centre visitors will need to increase and new office developments should not be permitted to buy into shopper's car parking spaces, but provide adequate parking within their developments.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)            |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 12:20   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy IF 3 Sustainable Transport ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

All day parking by commuters in residential areas close to the station and town centre has to be more tightly controlled. More affordable parking for commuters needs to be provided. Maidenhead needs to be able to cope with increased volumes through Crossrail and the expanding population. Improved bus services should also help alleviate the use of private cars.

Car parking for town centre visitors will need to increase and new office developments should not be permitted to buy into shopper's car parking spaces, but provide adequate parking within their developments.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)        |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 12:21   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 15.11 Developer contributions ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

15.11.4 All' must include the town centre, where much of the development that drives infrastructure need is targeted. Not clear how the justification used at inspection for a Nil CIL rate in town centre can be reversed to support a positive CIL rate now..?

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                                 |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 12:22  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | Policy IF 4 Infrastructure and Developer Contributions ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |

|                        |       |
|------------------------|-------|
| <b>Status</b>          | Draft |
| <b>Submission Type</b> | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>         | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

The delivery of infrastructure, whilst necessary, can heavily impact upon existing residents during construction. Therefore it is suggested that IF4 is expanded to include the appropriate planning and phasing of required infrastructure works to minimise the disruption to the local community insofar as is possible.

3. if Maidenhead Town Centre development contributions are zero how is this relevant 4. Where necessary priority needs to be given to infrastructure provision over affordable housing, or ALL development (affordable or market) will fail. Land values ultimately flex to reflect the permitted uses AND the cost of development including the burden of required infrastructure contributions.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                          |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 12:23   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | 15.15 Water supply and sewerage infrastructure<br><a href="#">(View)</a> |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

IF6 will, probably, be viewed against larger development proposals as the impact of small applications such as extensions may not be considered, in isolation, as providing an impact. However, the cumulative effect of small/minor proposals can be equivalent to major development. It is common for local communities to raise genuine concerns about the impact of proposals on this infrastructure as problems experienced with the current provision in a locality sometimes do not appear to carry sufficient material weight when determining an application. Therefore, consideration should be given to the expansion

of this policy to state its principles will be applied to all application that use the water and sewage infrastructure.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)      |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 13:19                                       |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA6: Maidenhead Golf Course ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

HA6 - Maidenhead Golf Course : Although providing green space "lungs" for Maidenhead, it is in private / restricted use. The central location is advantageous is providing a large amount of mixed housing (2000 units) plus education, health and community facilities.

The Golf Course should not be taken for housing and should be protected as local green space. Increasing public access to this site would reduce the shortfall of open and green space in Maidenhead and provide easily accessible open space to meet the requirements of the town centre developments.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                           |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 13:21  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA7: Land south of Harvest Hill Road, Maidenhead ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

HA7 - Land South of Harvest Hill Road and Kimbers Lane : A sloping site close to the A308M and A404M this has 350 units proposed - issues of traffic noise and air quality.

Harvest Hill Road will require upgrading and widening

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                    |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 13:22   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA8: Land south of Manor Lane, Maidenhead ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

HA8 - Land South of Manor Lane ( and North of Kimbers Lane : Situated to the north of HA7 this site has proposals for 180 units. Also sloping and close to A404M.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                    |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 13:24   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA8: Land south of Manor Lane, Maidenhead ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**



HA8 - Land South of Manor Lane ( and North of Kimbers Lane : Situated to the north of HA7 this site has proposals for 180 units. Also sloping and close to A404M.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)  |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 13:25   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA9: Land south of the A308(M), west of Ascot Road and north of the M4 (Known as the Triangle Site) ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

HA9 - The Triangle site ( between A308 / A308M / M4 ) : This site is prone to flooding in the western section and is proposed for 180 residential units. In spite of short term non availability because it is required by Highways Agency for "Smart Motorway" works - we continue to believe that this location is more suitable for Commercial/Light Industrial development, rather than residential. Poor air quality and traffic noise are negatives for residential. The out of town location and proximity to motorways are positives for large vehicles and commercial. Many businesses will need to relocate from Boyn Valley Road, Reform Road etc, and this represents an opportunity to keep large vehicles away from the Town Centre.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)   |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 13:26  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA19: Land east of Whitebrook Park, Lower Cookham Road, Maidenhead ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

HA19 - Land East of Whitebrook Park, Lower Cookham Road : This site had been previously identified through the MNP exercise. Although on the flood plain, it is a discreet, largely invisible area of Green Belt previously Islet Park playing field. 75 residential units are proposed, with access from Islet Park Drive. We would propose that this newly created access is shared with the pending application site of the former Stiefel Labs situated to the west. The Stiefel Labs proposal has substandard access arrangements from Lower Cookham Road through the car park of the main Whitebrook Park (Hitachi) offices

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)  |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 13:27   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA20: Land east of Woodlands Park Avenue and north of Woodlands Business Park, Maidenhead ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** Other

**Please make any other comments here:**

HA20 - Land east of Woodlands Park Avenue and north of Woodlands Business Park : The only issue with this site is the proximity and setting of Lillibrooke Manor. 300 residential units are proposed with strategic open space to preserve the aspect of the manor. NB Cox Green Parish.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)   |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 13:29  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA21: Land known as Spencer's Farm, north of Lutman Lane, Maidenhead ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

HA21 - Land known as Spencers Farm, north of Lutman Lane : This is a prime and strategic Green Belt buffer location between North Maidenhead and Cookham. The eastern section is prone to flooding and access is difficult. 300 residential units and a secondary school are still proposed. We are not in favour - but might have to concede western half of site only.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)  |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 13:29   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA22: Land north of Breadcroft Lane and south of the railway line, Maidenhead ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

HA22 - Land north of Breadcroft Lane : Situated in a triangle between Breadcroft Lane, Cannon Lane and GWR this site is proposed for 100 units. NB Cox Green Parish.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)      |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 13:31                                       |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | E Site Allocation Proformas ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1  |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option No has been selected, detailed comments can be added)**

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

**GREEN BELT NOT WITHIN BLP:**

There are other areas of Green Belt identified for analysis in the Jan 2014 Preferred Options Consultation that are omitted from the BLP. If they have been omitted after due consideration the BLP should explain their exclusion:

Area West of Sheephouse Road : This small area between Summerleaze Road and Fullers Yard could be developed for residential use. The properties on the east side of Sheephouse were built on "green belt" in the 1960s.

Strip of land west of Cannon Lane : This is part of the larger Claires Court Campus / Berkeley Homes site which has generated such opposition. It is noted that this proposal is omitted from the BLP discussion. If it is not going to proceed, then the previous strip - one house deep along Cannon Lane should be reinstated for consideration. NB Cox Green Parish.

Area west of A404M : This is also within Cox Green Parish - and BLP should make reference to this exclusion.

Area south of Stafferton Way, Braywick : This includes the Park and Ride area to the north now under construction by Redrow Homes, plus the Civic Amenity Site, Veolia Works and water works. Again the omission from BLP should be explained.

**OTHER SITES INCLUDED IN BLP :**

The following sites fall within the designated Town Centre :

HA1 Railway Station, HA3 St Cloud Way (Magnet), HA4 West Street, HA5 York Road.

**SITES WHICH HAVE PREVIOUSLY BEEN IDENTIFIED BUT ARE NOT IN THE BLP :**

The following were in the Jan 2014 Preferred Options document but are now missing. Some cross reference is necessary to plot changes over time.

Land east of Oldfield Road : Previously identified for 30 dwellings. A current application is in the pipeline for an excessive 67 flats.

Belmont Place, Belmont Road : Identified for 18 low rise flats ( 12 maisonettes preferred ) but not included in BLP.

DTC Research, Belmont Road : Only half of originally proposed site now understood to be available. Proposed 123 mixed dwellings therefore reduced to 60 - but not in BLP.

Eastern Part of Whitebrook Park, Lower Cookham Road : This is the site of the unoccupied Stiefel Labs. Identified for 36 dwellings in Preferred Options document - planning application for similar in pipeline. Access could be improved through development of HA19 see above. Not featured in BLP.

Maidenhead Lawn Tennis Club, All saints Road : Identified for 32 mixed dwellings, but excluded from BLP.

**ADDITIONAL POTENTIAL SITES :**

The following potential sites have also been identified as part of the MNP process :

Land between St Marks Hospital and Cemetery - size not established but potential for 25 homes.

137 Boyn Valley Road - smaller but similar to Middlehurst ans currently occupied by commercial business.

Small triangle of Green Belt land - between Ockwells Road and Thurlby Way - approx 10 dwellings.

Land south of Cox Green - and north of Ockwells Road. This land is not Green Belt but is protected by covenant to preserve the setting of Ockwells Manor. However, the Manor is obscured by vegetation even in winter. Consideration should be given to developing the northern and eastern side along Shoppenhangers Road and Cox Green Road. This would still leave substantial open space to the south and west of the site - along Ockwells Road.

**SITES ALREADY COMPLETED, UNDER CONSTRUCTION OR GRANTED PERMISSION :**

For the sake of completeness the following sites from the Jan 2014 consultation are recorded here :

Berkshire House, Queen Street.

150 Bath Road.

33 /35 Lower Cookham Road (Velmead Works).

Shoppenhangers Manor, Manor Lane.

Woolley Hall and Grange.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton) |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 13:33                                  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA2: Reform Road ( <a href="#">View</a> )       |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

HA2 - Reform Road : Originally proposed with a modest 100 dwellings on a mixed housing and employment site, the BLP has increased to 150 units, plus a primary school and retained employment units.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                          |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 13:34   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA12: Boyn Valley Industrial Estate, Maidenhead ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |

**Version** 0.1

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

HA12 - Boyn Valley Industrial Estate : This site has been extended eastwards and more than doubled in land area. 58 dwellings were proposed on the original area in a mix of maisonettes and low rise flats. More intense development is now proposed generating a total of 300 units.

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                           |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 13:35  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA13: Exclusive House, Oldfield Road, Maidenhead ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

HA13 - Exclusive House, Oldfield Road : Originally proposed for 24 low rise flats this site is now vacant, and identified for 30 dwellings in the BLP.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                              |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 13:36   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA14: Land south of Ray Mill Road East , Maidenhead ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web  |

**Version** 0.1

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** Other

**Please make any other comments here:**

HA14 - Land south of Ray Mill Road East (Deerswood Meadow) :Originally proposed for 87 dwellings over the whole site, the BLP now proposes 60 residential units, with the eastern third (liable to flood) retained as open space.

Loss of green space

---

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                                 |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP  |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 13:37  |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA15: Middlehurst, 90-103 Boyn Valley Road, Maidenhead ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft   |
| <b>Submission Type</b>    | Web   |
| <b>Version</b>            | 0.1   |

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

HA15 - Middlehurst, Boyn Valley Road : Originally proposed for 15 maisonettes, permission has been granted for 45 flats over 4 to 5 storeys.

---

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment by</b>         | Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)                              |
| <b>Comment ID</b>         | DBLP   |
| <b>Response Date</b>      | 13/01/17 13:38   |
| <b>Consultation Point</b> | HA16: Osbornes Garage, 55 St Marks Road, Maidenhead ( <a href="#">View</a> ) |
| <b>Status</b>             | Draft  |

**Submission Type** Web  
**Version** 0.1

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** No

**If you disagree, please tell us why?**

HA 16 - Osbornes Garage, St Marks Road : This is a newly identified site within the BLP. It is identified for 20 residential units.

Too intensive

---

**Comment by** Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)  
**Comment ID** DBLP  
**Response Date** 13/01/17 13:40  
**Consultation Point** HA24: Summerleaze, Summerleaze Road, Maidenhead ([View](#))  
**Status** Draft  
**Submission Type** Web  
**Version** 0.1

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** Other

**Please make any other comments here:**

HA24 - Summerleaze Works : This site has been enlarged northwards by approx. 150%. The original proposal of 40 mixed dwellings has been modestly increased to 80 units.

---

**Comment by** Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)  
**Comment ID** DBLP  
**Response Date** 13/01/17 14:18  
**Consultation Point** About You ([View](#))  
**Status** Draft



**Submission Type** Web

**Version** 0.1

**Age group**

**Which of the following age categories do you fall into?** 55-64

**Housing**

**Are you?** Other

**Belief**

**How would you describe your religion or belief?** Prefer not to say

**Yourself**

**Which of the following options best describes yourself?** Prefer not to say

**Physical disability**

**Do you have any physical disability, mental health condition or illness lasting or expected to last 12 months or more?** Prefer not to say

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

---

**Comment by** Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Roger Panton)

**Comment ID** DBLP

**Response Date** 13/01/17 14:24

**Consultation Point** Foreword ([View](#))

**Status** Draft

**Submission Type** Web

**Version** 0.1

**If yes, what is the nature of your physical disability mental health condition or illness. (Please tick all that apply)**

**Do you agree with this content? (Once an option has been selected, detailed comments can be added)** Other

**Please make any other comments here:**

This response is submitted by me on behalf to the Maidenhead and Cox Green Neighbourhood plan. The comments include remarks made during extensive consultation process in the Town Centre event during 2016 and numerous public meetings.

Any problems contact Roger Panton or via the MNP website