

ID	Input	MNF Response
1	<p><b>RBWM Planning, see separate document</b>  Topics are listed here, and identifiers added in the related document</p>	Feedback was received by email and sender has been thanked.
1.1	Alignment with Dec 2024 NPPF	All parts now aligned to Dec 2024 NPPF
1.2	Reference to BLP spatial strategy	New paragraphs added at start of section 3 referring to BLP spatial strategy
1.3	Reference to BLP policy QP3a	Now incorporated in DE-1 Policy wording
1.4	Clarification of private rent cost	Now incorporated in HO-1 Reasoned Justification
1.5	Housing mix alignment to BLP and South West Maidenhead SPD	Now incorporated in HO-2 Policy wording
1.6	Town centre boundary	We prefer to retain the Town Centre boundary as proposed in the Reg-14 Neighbourhood Plan, which includes all the BLP-allocated Town Centre residential sites AL1, AL2, AL3, AL4, AL5, AL6, AL7, AL8, AL9, AL10 and AL12. We note that AL11 is an employment site. The policies related to the Town centre boundary include some flexibility.
1.7	Bus stop location and laybys	Policy wording of GA-1 on bus stops should help constructive discussion between developers, bus companies and RBWM at pre-application stage. Requirement for laybys reduced to edge of developments only.
1.8	Parking standards	Town centre parking standards for high rise: flexibility incorporated in GA-2 Policy wording. Retained "Expected" as this word is used in many BLP policies. Acknowledged emerging RBWM Parking SPD in GA-2 Planning Policy Context.

		Added Reference to disabled Parking in tables. Text added in Part 3 Evidence Base, section 1.3.7 to explain Commercial parking standards and use of common parking for retail. Reference to Rooftop parking deleted.
1.9	Public transport interchange	MNF wish to retain this policy, as it will be relevant to any development at BLP site AL7. GA-3 applicability clarified.
1.10	Conservation Area buildings with negative effect	Now incorporated in BH-1 and BH-2 Policy wording
1.11	Policy BH-3 Setting of Heritage Assets	Now incorporated in BH-3 Policy wording
1.12	Policy BH-4 Local List of Non-designated Heritage Assets	Now incorporated in BH-4 Policy wording
1.13	Heritage Assets map and archaeology	
1.14	Green corridors map at Maidenhead golf course	Map 9.1-1 updated as requested
1.15	Policy SS-2 Local Green Spaces alignment to NPPF	Policy SS-2 now has requirement to retain Green Spaces as open. Reference to "other policies" deleted.
1.16	No content on Infrastructure and Developer contributions	Added general statement in 11.1 on Biodiversity gain, improving cycling and walking infrastructure, and implementation of Green and Blue corridors
1.17	Design Code comments	
2		
2.1	<b>GETTING AROUND:</b> Parking is a major issue in Maidenhead. RBWM planning constantly makes exceptions to new apartments in town centre allowing developers to dispense with sufficient parking spaces. It is deemed that these residents do not need cars. Requirements should state that where houses and apartments do not provide car parking spaces as outlined in RBWM parking Strategy document, justification must be made in terms of a survey of residents in the locality in similar accommodation to show what proportion of these residents own cars. Parking on footpaths because roads are not wide enough and no parking spaces	Town centre development has to consider both parking needs and the density requirements set by site allocations in the BLP. Parking requirements take into account relevant census data as described in the Part 3 Evidence Base, section 1.3.

	are provided is the norm. Even The Loftings, a new development near the railway station has this problem.	
2.2	<b>CLIMATE:</b> One dilemma is that low cost housing has to be low cost at this may mean that the cost of the proposed requirements is unaffordable. Net result, a shortage of low cost housing.	Appendix 5, Evidence base covers the likely cost implications of the net zero policy. There is some tradeoff but we also have to consider the target date of 2050 for net zero carbon emissions.
2.3	<b>BUILT HERITAGE:</b> See general comments	The general comments did not suggest any changes to the built Heritage section.
2.4	<b>BIODIVERSITY:</b> Needs to tie in with Climate change. e.g. Is it possible to have green roofs and solar panels?	It is possible to have green roofs and solar panels, referred to as "biosolar" roofs.
2.5	<b>SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES:</b> Why nothing on West St opportunity area and link to Kidwells Park as in WSOA SPD?	Discussions with RBWM stated that the West St Opportunity Area SPD was prepared before the BLP. Not all the ideas in the SPD were carried forward into the BLP site Proforma for AL5, which specifies "improved connectivity to Kidwells Park to the north". RBWM indicated the new cycle and pedestrian crossing fulfils that role.
2.6	<b>GENERAL COMMENTS:</b> COMMENTS ON DRAFT DESIGN CODE. One of the most significant areas without planning permission or pending planning permission is the West St opportunity area. All that is said about this area CA2 (which actually has an SPD although it is not listed in your documentation) is "The frontages of these areas can be enhanced by the introduction of street trees and furniture where possible;". The area needs much more about connection to Kidwells Park, widening West St (possibly one way), parking, type of development (office/housing), design to reflecting listed building (church). CA2 is totally inadequate. Apart from West St (AL5, AL6, AL2 part), the other significant area without planning permission is AL10/AL12. (Stafferton Way and an existing office block). Only directive I can find in CA14 is "It is important to ensure that local vernacular is taken into consideration by incorporating features that are characteristic of Maidenhead". Does the local vernacular look like Homebase or Lidl? Perhaps Vicus Way car park? Clarify. Ditto West St. Is local vernacular the BT exchange or United Reformed Church? These are the last two significant sites without planning or outline planning	

	permission in central Maidenhead. This is our last chance to influence how Maidenhead town centre looks.	
3		
3.1	<p><b>SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES:</b></p> <p>The Fisheries should be moved to Bray Ward. We are part of Bray Parish (therefore lying outside the remit of the Maidenhead Plan) yet are represented by Oldfield Councillors at RBWM level. Oldfield electorate will grow as the Golf Course is developed. It makes no sense to me that we are Parished in Bray yet represented by Oldfield Cllrs.</p>	The Plan Area is designated by RBWM and based on electoral ward Boundaries. The Neighbourhood Plan does not have power to change representation boundaries.
4		
4.1	<p><b>HOUSING:</b></p> <p>I would like to see plentiful footpaths and cycle/wheelchair/pushchair friendly paths that link to useful places (shops/public transport stops etc) in any new development that is being planned</p>	Wheelchair/pushchair now incorporated in GA-1 Policy wording.
4.2	<p><b>GETTING AROUND;</b> I would like to see plentiful footpaths and cycle/wheelchair/pushchair friendly paths that link to useful places (shops/public transport stops etc) in any new development that is being planned</p>	Wheelchair/pushchair now incorporated in GA-1 Policy wording.
4.3	<p><b>CLIMATE;</b> All new homes should be built to be as eco-friendly as possible, with solar panels/heat pumps/waste water recycling to be installed wherever possible.</p>	Policy CL-1 has a net-zero requirement which could be met by solar panels and heat pumps but also allows other solutions. Appendix 4 of the RBWM Sustainability SPD provides guidance on water efficiency though it is not policy. Building Regulations document H refers to Greywater recovery but is not mandatory.
4.4	<p><b>BUILT HERITAGE;</b></p> <p>Any new developments should be sympathetic to surrounding area, both in style and colour of bricks.</p>	Policy BH-1 requires developments in Conservation Areas to respect the architectural style and materials palette
4.5	<p><b>BIODIVERSITY:</b></p> <p>All new developments should be as sustainable as possible, with as much green planting, trees, open spaces for wildlife, families, permeable paths to minimise risk of flooding</p>	Policy BI-3 covers Biodiversity net gain with preference for on site, and policy BI-4 covers urban greening. Policy BI-2 covers drainage and flooding.

5		
5.1	<p><b>DESIGN :</b> I fully support the design suggestions in the NPF, and believe the control of high buildings, and the look and feel of the new housing should be in keeping with the character of the town - not new innovative designs, but reflecting the character of the place over 50k people already live.</p>	Thank you for support.
5.2	<p><b>HOUSING</b> I support this section - we need provision for families with the appropriate infrastructure created - eg schools. we don't want to become a commuter town with a flat population, but a vibrant community town.</p>	Thank you for support. School places are handled by a separate process within RBWM, and the siting and creation of schools is covered by the BLP site allocations.
5.3	<p><b>GETTING AROUND:</b> Public transport is limited and its chicken and egg, as without the demand then the supply will be limited. For walking and cycling I would like to see a section on safety for women. Better lit public pathways to carparks and cycle paths - maybe CTV in town centre areas such as underpasses. Women will drive to stay safe.</p>	Policy GA-1 has been updated to include safety considerations, and text updated in Reasoned justification sections 6.1, 9.1 and objective in 10.2.
5.4	<p><b>CLIMATE:</b> Flooding is clearly getting worse, and I don't know if the Drain system suggested will be sufficient. If it is only proposed for new developments then the older parts of Maidenhead will suffer instead?</p>	Policy BI-2 Sustainable Drainage covers new developments, and Thames Water have requested planning conditions where off-site upgrades are required, to avoid overloading the existing system.
5.5	<p><b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b> We have a beautiful part of the country to live, and I believe this plan, carefully and with passion and commitment created for the future generations is a must to protect this town from ruthless developers.</p>	Thank you for support.
6		
6.1	<p><b>GETTING AROUND:</b> There needs to be better connectedness with Braywick Leisure Centre by public transport. Currently it takes 2 buses and 45 mins to get there from Furze Platt (longer if the buses don't connect). It's really only a facility for people well enough off to own a car as it currently is, and virtually impossible to get to if elderly and no longer able to drive. The infrequent bus stops at Braywick cemetery leaving an impossible walk unless you are fit, so no good if you have limited mobility and just want a swim to keep active. I think the aim for connectedness is a good one, but I feel it should include this vital amenity to make it accessible for those without a car, not just those with their own private transport.</p>	A valid point and a negative consequence of the decision to move the Leisure Centre to Braywick. The Neighbourhood Plan does not however have power to specify bus routes or frequencies.
7		

7.1	<p><b>GENERAL COMMENTS;</b></p> <p>Personally, I am comfortable with very tall buildings in the town centre and around the station. We need far more housing - including flats. Well-designed tall blocks can look beautiful, and can be very efficient ways of providing housing. They can also add attractive new spaces to the public realm. What is missing here, or at least under-stated, is consideration of community assets such as community halls and parks. For a fast-expanding town, where is the next Oaken Grove park? Developers will provide pocket parks. Only RBWM can provide proper recreational areas. The same is true of community halls of which there are very few in the town. Faith communities have their community spaces but if we want a flourishing vibrant community of all faiths and none - with a myriad youth groups, drama societies, toddler playgroups, societies and clubs - then we need to provide quality community spaces for them. And that falls to the council because developers will not be interested.</p>	<p>MNF looked into this but it was not possible to write a proportionate policy applicable to any development. Our understanding is also that only RBWM can provide recreational areas and community halls. BLP Appendix C site proformas require: A new civic and social space at AL4 (York Road), a small community centre at AL9 (St Cloud Way), a central green area, new publicly accessible spaces and community facilities at AL13 (SW Maidenhead), on-site public open space at AL25 and AL28 (Spencer's Farm).</p>
8		
8.1	<p><b>GETTING AROUND:</b></p> <p>It is good to encourage walking and cycling routes. However, there has been a habit of installing (or leaving) direction signposts, lighting poles etc in the middle of a pathway. This sometimes forces pedestrians to one side and potentially into a road, if in a groups. Betting joined up thinking needed.</p> <p>It is naive to think that town-centre plat dweller do not want or need a car. Most will probably not be working to the east or west of Maidenhead and using a rail service. What about north-south trips? People will still want a car for leisure use.</p> <p>Car-use and parking is often discussed in terms of alternatives such as walking or cycling. These options are increasing not an option for the elderly and/or mobility impaired folk. This concern should be foremost when considering local transport needs.</p>	<p>Town centre development has to consider both parking needs and the density requirements set by site allocations in the BLP. Parking requirements take into account relevant census data as described in the Part 3 Evidence Base, section 1.3. Agree that many north-south trips are hard or not possible by rail. Bus services provide an alternative but with significant restrictions.</p>
9		
9.1	<p><b>DESIGN:</b></p> <p>One minor amendment: Objective: To retain the appearance and features of the existing Avenues, Streets and Roads in the plan area and encourage good, compatible design. Retaining the setting and aspect enjoyed by neighbouring properties is a material consideration.</p>	<p>Now incorporated in section 4.2 Objective</p>
9.2	<p><b>BUILT HERITAGE:</b></p> <p>Would like to see a commitment to maintaining/updating the List included in the policy.</p>	<p>Maidenhead Neighbourhood Forum is only designated for a</p>

		period of 5 years, expiring at the end of 2027. Any updates to the Local List of Non-designated Heritage Assets would be the responsibility of RBWM Planning.
9.3	<p><b>GENERAL COMMENTS:</b></p> <p>MNF volunteers are to be applauded for this draft MNP. A much-needed, new perspective on how to improve our home town when planning future development, from a resident's point of view.</p> <p>As an ex-chair of Maidenhead Civic Society (MCS) many of the issues are familiar and, in particular, I welcome the proposals for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Liveable buildings space standards</li> <li>- Affordable Housing AND suitable mix</li> <li>- Self-contained parking</li> <li>- Public Transport Interchange at station (originally in MCS Strategic Review 2004)</li> <li>- Urban Greening</li> <li>- Heritage Assets</li> </ul> <p>AECOM too have done a great job on the Design Guidance and Codes. The Checklist at the end is excellent and will be invaluable.</p> <p>I have made just a couple of suggestions above. But overall, guys, it's an exceptional achievement</p>	Thank you for support.
10	<p><b>LICHFIELDS FEEDBACK: SITE SPECIFIC, SEE SEPARATE DOCUMENT</b></p> <p>Topics are listed here, and identifiers added in the related document</p>	Have Been Thanked for their response
10.1	Tone of Plan	The plan is intended to positively direct development rather than to hinder it, and the tone aims to reflect this.
10.2	Status of Regulation 14 draft	The Reg-14 draft is not final, and the Reg-14 consultation process followed applicable legal requirements. The plan policies relate to issues identified in the Neighbourhood Area.
10.3	Scope of policy	Neighbourhood Plans are able to make new policy which is tested through the examination process, as set out in Part 5 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The Basic Conditions statement will demonstrate regard to

		National policies and to the RBWM BLP.
10.4	Design approach for Sierra House	The general observations in section 3 do not preclude a contemporary approach. Maidenhead Town Centre Conservation Area appraisal recognises St Mary's walk as a negative Area and from the immediate environs a modern design approach can be justified.
10.5	Streetscape and Biodiversity Net gain	The link between natural styles of streetscape and Biodiversity net gain is an observation from community input. It does not restrict design, and policies BI-3 and BI-4 allow a wide range of options.
10.6	Building height and SPD	BLP policy QP3a uses the word maximum rather than recommended, and refers to the Building height and Tall Buildings SPD. In the SPD Principle 6.2, the Maidenhead Landmark sites are specified as "No more than.." or "up to..". BLP policy QP3a and the SPD were informed by the Tall Buildings Technical and Baseline Study and the Tall Buildings Strategy, both updated in 2022. The SPD aligns with the BLP, and the Neighbourhood plan aligns with the SPD.
10.7	Maturity of Design Code	The Design code details referred to are minor compared to updates which will legitimately follow the outcome of responses made at Regulation 14 consultation.



10.8	Parking and cycle storage standards	Reference to connectivity to the nearest train station is already included in policy GA-1. Policy GA-2 Cycle storage requirements are derived in the Evidence Base part 3, now added in the Reasoned Justification.
10.9	Operational carbon emissions	Thank you for support.
10.10	Policy BH-1 Buildings in Conservation Areas	Wording of policy BH-1 second bullet has been updated. Reasoned Justification updated to recognise development proposals should enhance or preserve a Conservation Area as a whole.
10.11	Policy BH-3 Setting of Heritage Assets	Policy BH-3 does not assume that “setting is its own heritage asset”. NPPF paragraphs and BLP policy HE-1 are non-specific, hence the points in BH-3.
10.12	Local list of Non-designated Heritage Assets	Heritage England Advice Note 7 has been followed, and shows commonly used selection criteria. Location-specific criteria are an option but not mandated. The heritage list contains both the criteria used and a summary of the list creation process, and the introduction updated. Advice Note 7 paragraph 13 advises Neighbourhood Plans to have a relevant policy such as BH-4.
10.13	Biodiversity Net Gain	Wording of policy BI-3 Reasoned Justification updated to clarify, thanks for input.
10.14	Policy BI-4 Urban Greening	Wording of policy BI-4 updated to clarify.
10.15	Infrastructure and Developer Contributions	Added general statement in 11.1 on Biodiversity

		gain, improving cycling and walking infrastructure, and implementation of Green and Blue corridors
10.16	Role of Design Code	The role of the design code is specified in bullet point 2 of policy DE-2.
10.17	Building heights in Design Code	
11		
11.1	<p><b>HOUSING:</b></p> <p>On page 24 above policy HO-1 it references the relevant NPPF policies as 63-66, but should this be widened to include 73-76 (particularly 73(b) and 76(a)) references to the December 2024 NPPF? Alternatively, should paragraph numbers be left out if the NPPF is likely to change again in the next year or to?</p> <p>There is no mention of the final bullet point of HO-1 on community-led housing in the reasoned justification section, suggest adding the section below at the end.</p> <p>In view of the latest version of NPPF, suggest adding an extra bullet point to the end of policy HO-1: In line with policy HO2 4 &amp; 5 of the BLP and 73b of the NPPF (December 2024), opportunities will be sought to identify and support smaller sites to come forward for community-led development for housing and self-build and custom build housing.</p> <p>Suggested addition to the end of the reasoned justification section:</p> <p><b>COMMUNITY LAND TRUST DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER COMMUNITY LED SCHEMES, SELF-BUILD HOUSING AND CUSTOM BUILD HOUSING</b></p> <p>Community Land Trust development is a type of community-led housing, an umbrella term encompassing several not-for-profit models of housing delivery. Studies show it has positive impacts on health and wellbeing, and possibly on health inequalities as well, due to psychosocial housing factors which are known to be beneficial for health, including social contact, affordability, employment potential, safety, and environmental sustainability.</p> <p>In addition, community-led housing is generally a more acceptable form of development to the wider community.</p> <p>Community-led, self-build and custom build housing are considered to be more appropriate for smaller sites in an urban area such as the Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan area as rural exception sites are less likely to be relevant. Moreover, little of any of these categories of housing have been built within RBWM in the past.</p>	<p>Added reference to NPPF paragraph 73. Paragraph 76 relates to rural exception sites which would only apply to Green Belt in the plan area.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate sites, so while it would support the use of smaller sites for affordable housing, it is not seeking opportunities to identify them.</p> <p>Added the proposed text to policy HO-1 Reasoned Justification.</p>

11.2	<p><b>GENERAL COMMENTS:</b>  Appreciate the amount of work in producing this draft plan. Apologies that I have not been able to respond sooner, Its been a particularly busy couple of months.</p>	Thank you for support.
12		
12.1	<p><b>BUILT HERITAGE:</b>  Please see separate email. As the owner of 66 Rutland Road I would like to object to the local heritage designation. Please take this email as supplementary to my online response.  Mine is the end terrace on the right as you look at it, and has no front garden (it is all driveway), hence the reference to long front gardens strikes me as unjustified.  Secondly, there is no reference to the extent of modifications. A whole new house was added to the terrace in the 1990s, and all bar two chimneys have been taken down. The porches are also, of course, relatively recent additions. I'm not sure about the bay windows (the brickwork suggests some work, and bay windows would feel like a luxury for simple farm workers cottages). In terms of the cottages being 'small', they are simply two up two down, as so many were.</p> <p>The description refers to construction being early 19<sup>th</sup> Century, possibly 1830s, but I was told ~1865 by my neighbour, who has lived there for ~30 years and has an interest in the history of the terrace. I have searched the available historic maps, and there is nothing to suggest that the terrace is early 19<sup>th</sup> Century.</p> <p>I suspect the terrace would only have stood 'alone', closely associated with the farm opposite, for perhaps 30 years. However, this was in the context of the settlement adjacent to the west shown on early maps as Vine Hill (1837 map), Punt Hill and Boyne Hill. Also, I suspect this was in the context of the whole western sector of Maidenhead having been earmarked for development following the Church (which I think well-precedes the terrace).</p> <p>The whole area does have a strong sense of time depth, but I don't think the terrace stands out, simply as it pre-dates Rutland Road by a few decades. I suggest an area designation over the entire area between Lower Boyn Hill Road Westborough Road. There is much historic interest over-and-above the oldest built form, i.e. from the late Victorian (inc. the Star public house, which I note is missing from your list) through the early 20<sup>th</sup> century (e.g. the Mission Room), through the 1960s development and reconfiguration through to the Spice Girls! The area lends itself to a targeted write-up of its history, and I would happy to commit to writing that. I have a great interest in the historic environment, and my professional background is that I have 18 years' experience assessing local and neighbourhood plans under ~10 sustainability headings, one of which is the historic environment. I also spent two years over the lock-down period mapping every single pre WW1 house in Maidenhead in a GIS (happy to share).</p>	66 Rutland Road removed from NDHA.

	In summary, I do not feel that the designation is justified, but if it must be designated please check and amend the description.	
13		
13.1	<p><b>HOUSING:</b></p> <p>I agree with the proposed policy on Community led development, and suggest it needs strengthening and some additional justification. For example taking elements of East Cambridgeshire District Council Policy on Community led development on Rural Exception sites (which has been successful in enabling community led development on the edge of villages which wouldn't otherwise have been allowed) adapted for the urban setting of Maidenhead Neighbourhood Area....</p> <p>Based on the East Cambridgeshire policy it could read similarly as follows...</p> <p>"Community Led development may include affordable housing, but also small business units, renewable energy generation, community halls, open spaces, and other appropriate uses.</p> <p>Any non-housing elements of such schemes will be assessed against other local and Neighbourhood Plan policies.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Community led schemes with affordable housing may be considered outside normal development envelopes as an exception to normal policies of control where</li> <li>2. The site is well related to a settlement/suburb which offers a range of facilities and services, and there is good accessibility on foot/cycle to those facilities</li> <li>3. No significant harm would be caused to the character or setting of the settlement and surrounding countryside</li> <li>4. The scale of the scheme is appropriate to the location and level of identified affordable housing need</li> <li>5. The scheme incorporates a range of dwelling sizes, types and tenures appropriate to local need</li> <li>6. Community led schemes should i) be initiated by and led by a legitimate local community group (such as a CLT but there may be other appropriate forms) and ii) the scheme should have general community support and iii) with evidence of meaningful public engagement.</li> <li>7. It can be demonstrated that the scheme will be well managed and financially viable over the long term and that any benefits can be retained by the local community in perpetuity.</li> <li>8. The scheme accords with all other policies in the Borough Local and Neighbourhood Plan</li> </ol>	<p>It is not clear how well policies for rural exception sites translate to the urban area covered by the Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan, or how forms of development other than affordable housing would be supported by NPPF policy.</p> <p>Policy HO-1 wording refers to "Community Land Trust development and other community led schemes" so does give some flexibility. On balance MNF prefers the detail to be at the discretion of the Local Planning Authority if an application is made.</p>
14	<p><b>COOKHAM PARISH COUNCIL – SEE SEPARATE DOCUMENT</b></p> <p>Topics are listed here, and identifiers added in the related document</p>	Have Been Thanked for their response
14.1	Building height	Policy DE-1 aligns with the Building height SPD and BLP allocated sites. A Neighbourhood Plan

		cannot contradict the BLP or propose less development, so we cannot discourage or restrict further.
14.2	Design codes	
14.3	Affordable housing	MNF view is that adding detailed requirements on positioning would be subjective and impractical to enforce.
14.4	Family housing	Access to amenity space is covered in policy DE-3
14.5	Sustainable drainage	Policy BI-2 wording follows Cookham policy C-EN3b. Common practice for SuDS basins is to provide signage
14.6	Waterway corridor	Thank you for support.
14.7	Support for plan	Thank you for support. MNF has carefully considered the wording in each policy.
14.8	Walking and cycling routes	Map 6.1-1 now includes the 3 routes mentioned. The Neighbourhood Plan does not however have power to specify bus routes or frequencies.
14.9	Parking and cycle storage standards	The use of “minimum” and “maximum” parking standards has been long debated with neither being found satisfactory so we have used “expected”. MNF believes rules on tandem parking would be too detailed for policy.
14.10	Local heritage listing	Thank you for support.
15		
15.1	<b>BUILT HERITAGE:</b> This is a welcome step to maintain some of the buildings (of various architectural styles and merit), which are not listed but which provide interest in the community and are well worth listing	Thank you for support.
16		
16.1	<b>GENERAL:</b> Very supportive of this endeavour generally, and of the detailed content	Paper copies of feedback were received. Sender has been thanked

17		Paper copies of feedback were received. Sender has been thanked
17.1	<p><b>DESIGN:</b></p> <p>There are some roads which are simply not wide enough or appropriate for cycle routes. If cycle routes are proposed in residential areas, then there should be extensive consultation with the residents. People should be encouraged to walk and jog in safety and with space that is adequate on pavements. There is an overemphasis for cycle routes and cyclists throughout this neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>Agree that each route needs to be considered if and when implemented. Pages 24-25 of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan cover these points. Policy GA-1 aims to give equal importance to both cycling and walking.</p>
17.2	<p><b>GETTING ABOUT:</b></p> <p>Policy GA - cycling, walking, bus routes. There should be more than 500 metres between bus stops, maybe 800m or 1000m. 500m is really too close between stops. People don't catch buses because of a lack of bus stops, but because it is prohibitively expensive to use any bus journey in Maidenhead. IT is about costs not access. People old and young should be encouraged to walk to a bus stop. 500m is guidance used in London and other cities; it is not appropriate for Maidenhead. Thorough this consultation there is an over-emphasis on cycling and cycle routes. It's actually recommended by the NHS and social prescribers that people should be encouraged to walk for wellbeing and to tackle obesity. Cycling routes are, and will be exploited by electric bikes and electric scooters, making pavements more dangerous for pedestrians. The voice of avoiding pedestrians is missing from this.</p>	<p>Policy GA-1 does not specify the distance between bus stops, rather that within a development no-one should have to walk further than 500m to access a stop. Policing the usage of cycle routes is outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan. Policy GA-1 aims to give equal importance to both cycling and walking.</p>
17.3	<p><b>BIODIVERSITY:</b></p> <p>Green corridors should take into account the safety of women and minors. Shrubs, trees and hedges can provide opportunity to sexual attacks and flashers as they provide spaces for the perpetrators to hide.</p>	<p>Policy GA-1 has been updated to include safety considerations, and text updated in Reasoned justification sections 6.1, 9.1 and objective in 10.2.</p>
17.4	<p><b>SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES:</b></p> <p>There should be spaces which are just left as simply green, with no recreational or sports venues, no surfaced tracks. Green space is vital for mental health and wellbeing. Space where people can simply walk and enjoy nature, with NO park swings or additional recreational features. It's unclear if you are proposing to create recreations/sports usage on existing green spaces eg the town Moor, which is a lovely open green space, vital to the local community for their wellbeing.</p>	<p>Policy SS-2 has been updated not to support development at Town Moor, Guard's Club Island, Maidenhead Thicket, Braywick Nature Reserve, The Gullet, Deerswood Meadow, Battlemead Common and North Town Moor.</p>
18	<p><b>NATURAL ENGLAND:</b></p> <p><i>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan</i></p>	<p>Email feedback - have been thanked for their response</p>

19	<p><b>NATIONAL HIGHWAYS</b></p> <p><i>We will therefore be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, in this case our interest is in the A404(M), A308(M) and M4.</i></p> <p><i>We reviewed this consultation and have ‘ No Comments’.</i></p>	Email feedback - have been thanked for their response
20	<p><b>THAMES WATER - SEE SEPARATE DOCUMENT</b></p> <p>Topics are listed here:</p>	Email feedback - have been thanked for their response
20.1	<p>Request to insert text: <i>“Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades.”</i></p> <p><i>“The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste water company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development.”</i></p>	BLP policy IF7 sections 3, 4 and 5 already cover these requirements
20.2	<p>Request to insert text: <i>“When considering sensitive development, such as residential uses, close to the Sewage Treatment Works, a technical assessment should be undertaken by the developer or by the Council. The technical assessment should be undertaken in consultation with Thames Water. The technical assessment should confirm that either: (a) there is no adverse amenity impact on future occupiers of the proposed development or; (b) the development can be conditioned and mitigated to ensure that any potential for adverse amenity impact is avoided”</i></p>	BLP policy EP1 sections 1 and 2 already cover these requirements
20.3	<p>Request to insert text: <i>“Development must be designed to be water efficient and reduce water consumption. Refurbishments and other non-domestic development will be expected to meet BREEAM water-efficiency credits. Residential development must not exceed a maximum water use of 105 litres per head per day (excluding the allowance of up to 5 litres for external water consumption) using the ‘Fittings Approach’ in Table 2.2 of Part G of Building Regulations. Planning conditions will be applied to new residential development to ensure that the water efficiency standards are met.”</i></p>	Requirement Box 5 of the RBWM Sustainability SPD covers this requirement, and Appendix 4 provides guidance on water efficiency.
20.4	<p>Request to insert text: <i>“It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding”</i></p>	Policy BI-2 already specifies adequate water drainage infrastructure to serve the development, without surcharge of foul drainage.
21	<p><b>HISTORIC ENGLAND</b></p>	

	<p><i>We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan and are see that the historic environment of your parish features through this draft. Although your neighbourhood area does contain a number of designated heritage assets, at this point we don't consider there is a need for Historic England to be involved in the detailed development of the strategy for your area...</i></p>	<p>Email feedback, have been thanked for their response</p>
22	<p><b>MAIDENHEAD UNITED FOOTBALL CLUB:</b></p> <p>I understand that a further consultation is being undertaken in regard to the draft Maidenhead Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Following on from our correspondence in August and the meeting I had with Mick Jarvis, I am emailing to request that Maidenhead United's York Road Ground is removed from the plan a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>As discussed, when I met with Mick, we have a range of concerns related to the proposed inclusion of our York Road Ground within the plan as non-designated heritage asset. The club is already suffering the consequences of unjustified political interference with our plans to sustain the football club and meet the various needs we have for significantly improved stadium and community facilities, and we would hope the MNF does not want to add to the challenges the club now faces by creating further limitations on our ability to achieve this.</p> <p>Unfortunately, York Road is no longer fit for purpose as a spectator stadium or a community sports facility which continues to create significant challenges for the club. This is for a variety of reasons including the age of the facilities at the ground which require many millions of pounds of investment to bring them up to modern stadium standards, alongside wider limitations we have no control over or ability to address regarding spectator and vehicular access, car parking and the unsuitability of the York Road for any significant community use, all of which will compounded by the wider development of adjacent sites.</p> <p>These challenges have increased over the last 10 years because of the club's growth across all we do, whether it be the for our men's and women's adult teams and the number spectators which come and watch them play at York Road, our wider community football and wellbeing programmes. Sadly, we have reached a place where there are insufficient facilities available within Maidenhead to meet the demand we have for activity. For the club to continue to thrive and grow we still have to resolve and overcome the challenges we have with facilities and we are concerned that the designation of York Road with significantly impact and limit the options available to the club moving forward, threatening the long-term sustainability, viability and future of Maidenhead United Football Club overall, which I would hope is not an outcome MNF would want to contribute to.</p>	<p>York Road Football Ground removed from NDHA.</p> <p>This site is recognised by a Commemorative plaque as recorded in the RBWM list of local history and heritage "Monuments" section.</p>



	<p>It is also important to point out that the argument put forward within the appendix referring to the ground is inaccurate, suggesting that a planning application for the development of the ground has been recently rejected due to substantial public opposition. This is simply untrue as there has been no planning application submitted for the development of York Road, but this does clearly indicate the source of the suggested listing has no understanding of the challenges the club faces nor the good we do for the community and challenges we are facing in terms of maintaining and growing our provision due to the lack of appropriate facilities.</p> <p>Mick previously confirmed that the Maidenhead Neighbourhood Forum has already agreed to all similar removal requests from owners of other properties recommended for inclusion as non-designated heritage assets, so I would be grateful if you can confirm your agreement to the removal of our York Road ground as a Non Designated Heritage Asset within the plan.</p>	
23		Feedback was received by email, sender has been thanked
23.1	<p>Dear Andrew, from a scan through it looks like it sets a much higher bar for carbon emissions than the current BLP (where quantifiable targets are absent) and has the evidence in the Bioregional Report that it can do so. That's great. The policy itself is quite wordy and I would suggest that the use of clearer headings and measures would be of benefit. I.e. Don't hide the onsite net zero in the middle of a paragraph.</p> <p>But sustainability isn't a prominent 'golden thread' throughout the document. The vision is not particularly visionary. To restore and rebalance our relationship with nature, we need to design a future where buildings consume more carbon than they generate, where infrastructure increases biodiversity, where urban planning restores natural ecosystems, and so forth. At the very least the NP should address and clearly signpost the measures which contribute to mitigation and resilience. Some will be covered to some degree by the Sustainability SPD, but how Maidenhead wants this guidance to be interpreted for Maidenhead is what I think the NP is able to cover e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- identifying and designating existing green spaces where they have not been done so yet, and green corridors that shouldn't be disrupted (like sight lines of St Paul's)</li> <li>- identifying where renewable energy generation could be sited e.g. solar canopies over existing ground level car parks) and encourage community ownership.</li> <li>- emergency preparedness measures particularly with the river nearby.</li> </ul> <p>It also needs a good proof read with full stops missing and repeated words.</p>	<p>Sustainability features in policies GA-1, CL-1, BI-1, BI-2, BI-3, BI-4, SS-1, SS-2 and in the Design Code. Specifically, policy CL-1 requires new buildings to be net zero carbon, BI-3 covers Biodiversity net gain, and BI-2 aims for more natural drainage. Policy SS-2 has been updated to protect Local Green Spaces identified for their wildlife and habitat value. Policy BI-1 identifies green corridors and requires connectivity and through movement of species. BLP policy NR1 already covers flood risk management measures and evacuation plans.</p> <p>The Foreword has been updated to recognise the increased importance of sustainability.</p>

24		
24.1	As part of your neighbourhood plan have you included the new Brill Close flood alleviation scheme set to start soon in Desborough park?	Thanks for the information. The Neighbourhood Plan doesn't list specific schemes, and as this scheme has already been agreed by RBWM it will be compliant with policy. Feedback received by email