

Maidenhead Neighbourhood Forum - Regulation 14 consultation comments relevant to Design Code produced by AECOM.

Sources and Reg-14 comment identifier are shown for example as **RBWM 1.17c**

Amendment	Section	Source and ID	Comments
	SE01	RBWM 1.17c	The code is a little confused by points jumping from townscape to signage to shopfront and back to signage again. Town/streetscape should perhaps be separated out from signage and shopfronts. Reference to materials of shopfronts and signage should be included in this section particularly in relation to historic environments and historic buildings alongside traditional shopfront designs/features. Point 3 – This point is too open ended, 'signage should be improved' would provide clear direction of this code. However, how it should be improved needs to be included, i.e. avoiding internally illuminated signage, box fascias, materiality of signage etc. Point 6 – Amend the word 'old' to 'historic' buildings. The listed building and area's historic character and setting should be preserved. Recommended this point is reworded.
X1			<i>Rewrite SE01 to take RBWM comments onboard.</i>
	CA1.01	RBWM 1.17d	Building heights reference would be contrary to Tall buildings SPD in relation to back land sites particularly along the northern edge of this character area. This needs to be rethought.
X2			<i>Neighbourhood Plan policy DE-2 has been rewritten to be fully compatible with RBWM Tall Buildings SPD Chapter 6. All references to building height in all Character Areas need to be updated so they are fully compatible with Neighbourhood Plan policies DE-1 and DE-2.</i>
	CA1.04	RBWM 1.17f	The following sentence needs to be reworded, 'Historic facades should be preserved in every way possible, particularly through avoiding replacement uPVC windows...' The replacement of uPVC windows for more traditional materials is encouraged from a conservation perspective. This sentence reads rather counterintuitive. Reference to a 'uniform colour scheme' – what colours?
X3			<i>Rewrite CA1.04 to clarify "avoiding replacement uPVC windows" and delete text about colour scheme.</i>
	CA2.01	RBWM 1.17g	Rather than describing the rear of High Street and West Street, it would be better to add a figure to illustrate the issue rather than have a vague description in the design code.
	CA2	Respondent #2	Why nothing on West St opportunity area and link to Kidwells Park as in WSOA SPD? 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.
		Respondent #2	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

Amendment	Section	Source and ID	Comments
			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.
X4			Discussions with RBWM stated that the West St Opportunity Area SPD was prepared before the BLP, and now carries low weight. Not all the ideas in the SPD were carried forward into the BLP site Proforma for AL5, and RBWM consider the new cycle and pedestrian crossing provides improved connectivity to Kidwells Park to the north. With this in mind reconsider CA2.xx to take RBWM comments into account and what Design Code points can usefully be made about this area and also BLP allocations AL10/AL12. Retain Figure 50 to illustrate.
	CA4.03	RBWM 1.17i	This is a normal planning assessment approach. I think this should be removed, as codes like this are causing repetition and making the document look hefty and difficult to peruse.
X5			Remove CA4.03 (it is covered by BLP policy QP3 1b) and renumber codes.
	CA4.05	RBWM 1.17j	Any backland development would inevitably alter street pattern and density to some degree, so should all backland development be avoided? BWDG principle covers this so as CA4.03 perhaps remove to avoid repetition.
X6			In CA4.05, Delete "Backland development which alters the street pattern, density and existing amenity space should be avoided". It is covered by SPD Borough Wide Design Guide principle 6.11.
	CA5.03	RBWM 1.17k	There is backland development in this character area (rear of 80 Portlock Road, rear of 17 Wellington Road, rear of Belmont Crescent and Spencers Road). Noted that this may not mean it is an established character, but there is backland development in this character area. Noted the use of the word "should" in this instance, and not "must" be avoided.
X7			Rewrite CA5.03 to state "Cul-de-sac and backland development is generally not characteristic of the area and should be avoided".
	CA6 Furze Platt (and codes from CA6.02-CA.04)	RBWM 1.17m	This section is written very well. Although this statement - Building heights should be no more than 2.5 storeys, and building typologies should reflect the immediate surrounding properties, is used in several codes (can we have something generic for this statement?) furthermore, code like CA6.04 are good but too lengthy, can we make this type of codes in points?
X8			Suggest to split CA6.04 into several smaller codes.
	CA6.05	RBWM 1.17n	'palette' of what? Materials? Colours? etc.
X9			Replace "palette" with "materials" in CA6.05.
	CA8.02	RBWM 1.17p	It is important to note that it applies to non-important or of poor appearance terraces. High quality patterns should be preserved.
X10			Amend CA8.02 as per RBWM comment.
	CA8.07	RBWM 1.17r	"In the case of building extensions, the original building should remain the dominant element of the property regardless of the scale or number of extensions. The newly built extension (here I'd change to extension when combined) should not overwhelm the building from any given viewpoint; and"

Amendment	Section	Source and ID	Comments
X11			<i>Delete redundant "and" in CA8.07.</i>
	CA9.10	RBWM 1.17t	Biodiversity aspect should be moved from here to previous paragraph - to avoid mixing of impacts
X12			<i>Move text "...as well as new plantings to improve biodiversity" from CA9.10 to CA9.9.</i>
	CA9.13	RBWM 1.17u	"Whilst it is not expected that all trees be retained on development sites (as trees can grow with defects that make their retention undesirable)," - this part is unnecessary.
X13			<i>Delete text "Whilst it is not expected that all trees be retained on development sites (as trees can grow with defects that make their retention undesirable)" from CA9.13. Consider moving text "any new development should put great thought into tree retention and planting as part of proposals" into CA9.12, then deleting CA9.13 and renumbering CA9.14 to CA9.18.</i>
	CA10.04	RBWM 1.17v	I think it's important to highlight that it can only be accepted if it's in keeping with wide urban grain.
X14			<i>Amend CA10.04 to read "This could be resolved by proposing appropriate massing that is sensitive to the surrounding properties and in keeping with the wide urban grain".</i>
	CA11.05	RBWM 1.17w	This looks like it is providing guidance on flood risk design. Rather than suggest flood risk approaches it is considered better to simply refer to the latest EA guidance.
X15			<i>Delete CA11.05 (key points covered by BLP policy NR1)</i>
X16			<i>In CA12, Add new code stating "Building heights should be no more than 2.5 storeys, and the roofline should be consistent with the neighbouring properties" (Inconsistent to have this missing from Oaken Grove Character Area)</i>
	Figures 128 to 131	RBWM 1.17x	It would be useful to know where these examples are. It's unclear if these are new development examples from within the borough.
X17			<i>Replace Figs 130 and 131 with examples from within CA14.</i>
	Figure 134	RBWM 1.17y	This does not appear to be an image of an industrial development.
X18			<i>Change the caption of Fig 134 to "Commercial developments"</i>
	Figure 138	RBWM 1.17z	Is this a map of industrial character areas? This does not align with the industrial areas identified under Policy ED2 of the Borough Local Plan. The map also appears to indicate that the sewage treatment works is an industrial character area.
X19			<i>Take all industrial areas identified in BLP policy ED2 (approx. 12 within Neighbourhood Plan Area) out of the AECOM Character Areas, and label them all as "15". It is likely that almost all maps of Character Areas would need to be updated.</i>
	CA15.04	RBWM 1.17aa	"A common material palette should be adopted and used throughout the area to provide a unified image of the industrial area." We would disagree with this, as industrial areas should be creatively enhanced from visual perspective, instead of unified monotony - and contrary to previous and further paragraphs "Forces for change" on page 98. Stafferton Way is referred to as a successful precedent, but it has not been explained why it is successful.
X20			<i>Delete CA15.04, as there are many Industrial/Office areas with separate styles. Renumber CA15.05 to CA15.10.</i>

Amendment	Section	Source and ID	Comments
X21		Cookham PC 14.2	In CA9 Figure 99 the 1 st bullet states “Existing properties should be buffered with rich vegetation to mitigate any visual impact towards the open countryside”. Please change to “ New Development should be buffered with..”. New development should have this requirement as intended by CA9.xx, CA9.yy. For Existing properties, such planting would not require planning permission and the Neighbourhood Plan cannot itself require improvements to existing properties.
X22		MNF	Section 4 on Character Area appraisal, Guidance and Codes is wrongly titled Section “03”, correct to Section 04
X23		MNF	Town Centre boundary is unchanged, so CA1 and CA2 boundaries remain as they are.
X24		MNF	Introduction to CA9 refers to “The scheduled monument 'Robin Hood's Arbour', Maidenhead Thicket, Cookham is located within the character area”. Although this is the name used by Historic England, please delete “Cookham” as Maidenhead Thicket is not regarded as being part of Cookham, and falls outside the area of the adjacent Cookham Neighbourhood Plan.
X25		MNF	In Figure 23, Maidenhead Green and Blue Infrastructure, remove Maidenhead Golf Course from the map and the key as the site is allocated for development in the BLP. Replace with Green corridors which will remain (information can be supplied)
X26		MNF	In Figure 38, Check whether the both areas labelled “15” south of the railway line are Industrial, or whether one is “recent development”
X27		MNF, RBWM 1.17b/d/h	Neighbourhood Plan policy DE-2 has been rewritten to be fully compatible with RBWM Tall Buildings SPD Chapter 6. All references to building height in all Character Areas need to be updated so they are fully compatible with Neighbourhood Plan policies DE-1 and DE-2.

Maidenhead Neighbourhood Forum

Ian Rose/Andy Woodcock

21 March 2025