

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

This document summarises the responses received from the public and from statutory consultees to the pre-submission consultation of the A, S & S Neighbourhood Plan. While every effort has been made to reflect the representations in a full, fair and balanced manner, this document is only intended to provide a summary (the representations are also available in their entirety, referenced by Number). This document also sets out the A, S & S NP's Steering Group's comments to the responses received and any outcomes resulting.

NB. The NPPF is available for download from [NPPF](#), the Borough Local Plan and the RBWM Townscape Assessment are available for download from the RBWM website www.rbwm.gov.uk.

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
1.	SL5 7DY	Kitty Hooey	Thank you for this. Amazing amount of work has been done and I congratulate the Team and Volunteers.			Thank you. No action required.
2.	SL5 7JY	Dr. Joanna Le Metais	General congratulations. Believe sound basis for assessing future planning applications.			Thank you. No action required.
3.	SL5 7AU	Miles Thomson	I congratulate you all on this document which has my unqualified support.			Thank you. No action required.
4.	(Boyer Planning)	Tim Burden	Query Section 9.2 Map 18 should be Map 19; also Map doesn't identify potential SANG area	9.2		Map numbering has changed in Draft Plan. Area for potential SANG at Heatherwood is shown.
5.		Christine Weightman	1. Support all of Plan in principle. And support Ascot scheme. Highlight danger of large amount of building at one time becoming homogenised and dull. Trees and green spaces not the only answer; create variety of styles and sizes. Could plots with services be sold on to smaller builders and to individuals to add to local employment and individuality as is done in Belgium and France?	8.1		Support appreciated, thank you. Comment also noted. While this is something we will do our best to encourage, it will ultimately be market forces that decide.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			2. Lived here for nearly 30 years. High level of older people in area - good close parking facility important	8.1		Agreed and noted.
			3. Pleased there will be mix of residential and business, shops and flats and houses all together. Even better if school and medical centre also close by	8.1		Your comments are noted.
6.	SL5 0UA	Adrian Keal	Request that Gap between Old Sunningdale and Sunningdale be extended to include east up to Broomhall Lane.	NP/EN2		Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.
			See no justification for increasing capacity of railway station car park. Noise and disturbance to residential properties at E end.	NP/SS7		<p>Community consultations repeatedly raised concern about the lack of parking in S'dale overall. And, with forecast growth in population, increased train use is likely, adding pressure to available parking at S'dale station. While we respect the concerns of the local residents directly neighbouring this area, this location does remain an appropriate and sustainable location to provide more parking.</p> <p>The option of double decking the Station car park received overall support in our Options consultation.</p> <p>No change to SS7 proposed.</p>
7.	SL5 0UA	Sue & Mark Klincewicz	Support idea in principle. Request to include field behind Cedar Drive in gap between Old Sunningdale and Sunningdale.	NP/EN2		<p>Support noted, thank you.</p> <p>Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Policy XIP/SS7 re car parking at station: understand it for Waitrose but do not think commuter parking is an issue. Put pressure on Longcross development to provide parking there.	NP/SS7		<p>Community consultations repeatedly raised concern about the lack of parking in S'dale overall. And, with forecast growth in population, increased train use is likely, adding pressure to available parking at S'dale station. Comment re Longcross noted but outside remit of our NP.</p> <p>The option of double decking the Station car park received overall support in our Options consultation.</p> <p>No change to SS7 proposed.</p>
8.	SL5 0UA	Adrian and Grace Keal	<p>Support principles of NP and many of policies but object to two:</p> <p>1. Old Sunningdale to Sunningdale gap should include all of the field to the north of Cedar Drive (map annotation provided)</p>	NP/EN2		<p>Support noted, thank you.</p> <p>Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.</p>
			2. Sunningdale Station and Waitrose Car Parks: no justification for increasing capacity of Station car park - will increase noise and disturbance to adjacent residential properties	NP/SS7		<p>Community consultations repeatedly raised concern about the lack of parking in S'dale overall. And, with forecast growth in population, increased train use is likely, adding pressure to available parking at S'dale station. While we respect the concerns of the local residents directly neighbouring this area, this location does remain an appropriate and sustainable location to provide more parking.</p> <p>The option of double decking the Station car park received overall support in our Options consultation.</p> <p>No change to SS7 proposed.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
9.	SL5 0UA	Helen Knight and Kevin Carter	Support principles of the Plan - except: 1. Old Sunningdale to Sunningdale gap should include all of field to north of Cedar Drive (map included)	NP/EN2		Support noted, thank you. Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.
			2. Sunningdale Station and Waitrose Car Parks no justification for increasing capacity and extra deck will increase noise and disturbance to residents of Cedar Drive. Plus problem of light pollution.	X1P/SS7		Community consultations repeatedly raised concern about the lack of parking in S'dale overall. And, with forecast growth in population, increased train use is likely, adding pressure to available parking at S'dale station. While we respect the concerns of the local residents directly neighbouring this area, this location does remain an appropriate and sustainable location to provide more parking. The option of double decking the Station car park received overall support in our Options consultation. No change to SS7 proposed.
10.	SL5 0UA	Michael Hill	Congratulations on the NP and the work that's been put into it.			Support appreciated, thank you.
			Field bordered by north of Cedar Drive and Broomhall Lane is not included - please confirm this is an oversight	NP/EN2		Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.
			Pleased to see local Hopper bus scheme being suggested. Encourage good co-operation between Surrey and RBWM. Integrate with White Bus schedules	Section 9 Project		Noted.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
11.	SL5 0UB	Jo James	Please amend Gap between Old Sunningdale and Sunningdale to include field to north of Cedar Drive.	NP/EN2		Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.
			Also object to increased parking at Sunningdale station and Waitrose	NP/SS7		Community consultations repeatedly raised concern about the lack of parking in S'dale overall. And, with forecast growth in population, increased train use is likely, adding pressure to available parking at S'dale station. Location is an appropriate and sustainable location to provide more parking and this option received overall support in our Options consultation. No change to SS7 proposed.
12.	SL5 0UA	Eric & Lynn Eastlund	Thank you for your very hard work. But concern re proposed gap between Old Sunningdale and Sunningdale. Please include all of field north of Cedar Drive	NP/EN2		Thank you for your appreciation. Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.
13.	SL5 0UA	Debbie Cook	While being supportive of the NP, propose amendment to the Gap between Old Sunningdale and Sunningdale to include whole field north of Cedar Drive.	NP/EN2		Support noted, thank you. Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.
14.	SL5 0UB	Steve and Rachel Allen	Two objections: Request the Gap between Old Sunningdale and Sunningdale be extended to include all the field north of Cedar Drive.	NP/EN2		Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.
			Object to proposed double decking of Sunningdale Station car park on basis will lead to increased noise and congestion at an already busy and noisy station.	NP/SS7		Community consultations repeatedly raised concern about the lack of parking in S'dale overall. While we respect the concerns of the local residents directly neighbouring this area, this location does remain an appropriate and sustainable location to provide more parking.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
						<p>The option of double decking the Station car park received overall support in our Options consultation.</p> <p>No change to SS7 proposed.</p>
15.	SL5 0UA	Olive Petheram	I support the Plan but object to policy on Gap between Old Sunningdale and Sunningdale - it should include the whole of the field north of Cedar Drive.	NP/EN2		<p>Support noted, thank you.</p> <p>Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.</p>
16.	SL5 0UB	David Martin	Green field behind our apartments (north of Cedar Drive) should remain protected and it is unacceptable that it might be open to development in the future.	NP/EN2		<p>Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.</p>
17.	SL5 0UA	Vera Woods	Strongly object to field to north of my house being included for proposed housing development (field north of Cedar Drive). Whole of this field should be protected.	NP/EN2		<p>Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.</p>
18.	SL5 0UB	Thomas Gray	Register concern re exclusion of field behind Cedar Drive from strategic gap.	NP/EN2		<p>Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.</p>
			Proposal for 2 level car park for Waitrose and Station would only encourage more traffic in Sunningdale which is already at an unacceptable level.	NP/SS7		<p>Community consultations repeatedly raised concern about the lack of parking in S'dale overall and the option of double decking the Station car park received overall support in our Options consultation.</p> <p>While we recognise the concern over encouraging more traffic, no change to SS7 is proposed.</p>
19.	SL5 0UA	Geoffrey Irons	Object to 2 policies: Gap between Old Sunningdale and Sunningdale should include entire field north of Cedar Drive	NP/EN2		<p>Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Increasing capacity of Station Car Park by double decking will add to migration of commuters from other areas and increase noise and disturbance to existing properties. Request deletion	NP/SS7		<p>Community consultations repeatedly raised concern about the lack of parking in S'dale overall. While we respect the concerns of the local residents directly neighbouring this area, this location does remain an appropriate and sustainable location to provide more parking.</p> <p>The option of double decking the Station car park received overall support in our Options consultation.</p> <p>No change to SS7 proposed.</p>
20.	SL5 0LZ	Alan Knuckey	Holy Trinity Church viewed from A30 an iconic view - not clear this is safeguarded	NP/DG4		<p>Holy Trinity Church is designated as a Landmark building and view. The policy seeks to protect these attributes. No change needed.</p>
			Gap should include section along A30 adjacent to former police houses and opposite Redwood Drive. Why does gap between Old S'dale and S'dale station not extend to A30?	NP/EN2		<p>Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.</p> <p>Gap not extended to A30 as there is already development there. Contrary to methodology used for identifying gaps. No change proposed.</p>
			Station car park rarely if ever full and Waitrose car par only full at real peak times of year - schemes to double deck car park would totally disfigure the area	NP/SS7		<p>Community consultations repeatedly raised concern about the lack of parking in S'dale overall. This location is an appropriate and sustainable location to provide more parking.</p> <p>The option of double decking the Station car park received overall support in our Options consultation.</p> <p>No change to SS7 proposed.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Proposals to be selective in deciding some areas of GB can be dispensed with (eg Ascot centre) ill conceived and dangerous as could set precedents.	NP/SS1 and NP/EN1		Noted but there is overall community support for proposed development. This will enable us to better protect other Green Belt areas.
21.	not given	Alan Skipworth	A, S & S NP cc'd on email addressed to Chair of PC and Cllr. Concern that land North of Cedar Drive already earmarked for development and hence reason for not being included within the Gap area. Add this area to the gap.	NP/EN2		Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.
22.	SL5 0UA	Jane and Robert Hay	Support principles of NP and most of the policies but: Deep concern re Gap between Old Sunningdale and Sunningdale and possibility of housing development on field north to Cedar Drive. Whole of field should be in protected area. Any housing here would compromise the infrastructure of the area.	NP/EN2		Support noted, thank you. Gap has been reviewed and amended to include field north of Cedar Drive.
			Re Sunningdale and Waitrose Car Parks, there seems at the moment to be sufficient spaces, the T-junction is an accident black spot. And how can the two parades of shops be "joined"? Always been 2 sides, easily accessed by a short stroll.	NP/SS7 and SS6		Community consultations repeatedly raised concern about the lack of parking in S'dale overall. And, with forecast growth in population, increased train use is likely, adding pressure to available parking at S'dale station. One objective in the Plan is to improve pedestrian links between the two parades of shops. No change to SS7 proposed.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
23.		Cala Homes	Wish to commend NP team in its preparation of this document. For most part it is a comprehensive analysis of the area, with extensive and in-depth assessment of spatial and related issues, with sensible objectives and intelligent proposals to meet these aims.			Thank you for the comments.
			<p>Notable exception is stark absence of any explicit housing target. Nor any strategic requirement derived from a Borough-wide or 'bottom-up' assessment of housing need. It rightly aims to meet new housing demand in a way sympathetic to the area but makes no attempt to quantify that demand. Any evaluation of the Plan's progress in meeting this aim is therefore difficult.</p> <p>Also, no housing capacity figures given for the identified strategic sites so plan provides no clear policy context for housing provision in the area.</p> <p>Accept that emerging Borough plan will address this but in mean time hope the final NP will provide greater clarity with, if only on interim basis, an assessment of housing demand and supply.</p>		NPPF para 184, 185 and 215 general conformity with strategic policies and implementation	<p>Setting a housing target is a matter for RBWM. The new Local Plan currently being developed will determine housing targets based on assessments of housing need.</p> <p>DCLG have confirmed that there is no barrier to NPs coming forward before the Local Planning Authority has produced its LP, nor is it a requirement for NPs to include housing targets if these are not available - provided that discussions have taken place with the Local Planning Authority and every effort has been made to ensure the policies in the NP will not conflict with those being progressed in the Borough LP. Confirmation that these discussions have taken place with RBWM is included in their response to this pre-submission consultation.</p>
			Note that all identified strategic sites all brownfield. While reuse of previously developed land may usually be preferable to release of GB sites, such locations aren't necessarily the most sustainable. Also not entirely clear whether the sites are fully available, viable and capable of accommodating the form of development sought.			<p>Not all the strategic sites are brownfield and some are in GB. An important part of site assessments was the sustainability of their location.</p> <p>Discussions have taken place with site landowners and/or their representatives in relation to their viability and deliverability.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Once comprehensive housing assessment undertaken, if additional land for housing required, we urge you to consider again land off Broomhall Lane, S'dale. Development here would provide range of housing types and a SANG on-site of an appropriate scale and respect the newly identified Old S'dale to S'dale gap providing a permanent defensive boundary to this part of settlement.			Suggestion noted. As a result of responses received in this consultation, the land referred to off Broomhall Lane, including the field north of Cedar Drive, has been reviewed and has now been included within the Old Sunningdale to Sunningdale Gap. It will therefore be subject to our Gaps policy.
24.		Shorts Group Limited	Welcome support for relocation	NP/SS4		Noted.
			Not economically viable to redevelop as employment use, specifically light industrial units. Residential development is only viable alternative use. Promoted to RBWM for 50-70 dwellings	NP/SS4	No evidence provided. NPPF para 89 re development in GB. RBWM Policy E5 re Loss of land in employment areas. Community consultation clearly supports retention of employment sites in the area.	Note that "employment" in the context of our NP is used to indicate any use which provides jobs with the exception of Retail – a definition has now been included in the Plan. Policy SS4 has been amended to set out conditions for any redevelopment of the site.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Not for NP to define what is “very special circumstances”. Circumstances that are “very special” may differ and need not be rare	NP/EN1	<p>NPPF para 81 ref planning positively to enhance beneficial use of GB.</p> <p>NPPF para 88 ref application of “very special circumstances”</p> <p>NPPF para 89 ref inappropriate development in GB</p>	<p>Protection of GB is of great importance to the local community and there is very strong desire to protect it from development (other than as consulted on and designated in Ascot Centre/HS and Ascot Station). Argument re “Very special circumstances” provision noted and policy amended to <i>include</i> clear demonstrable benefits for the community.</p> <p>Clarification included that EN1 applies to “<i>inappropriate</i> development”.</p>
			We own and operate land within the GB so unacceptable for NP to seek to restrict arguments that may be put forward for future use of that land.		<p>NPPF para 17 ref planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings.</p> <p>NPPF para 183 ref Neighbourhood Planning giving communities power to develop vision for their area and deliver sustainable development.</p>	<p>Our NP has carefully considered the implications of a range of developments in our area. This includes the type and the location of this development and its sustainability implications. Our Plan focuses on delivering development at specific locations to maximise infrastructure delivery and to focus development near to public transport hubs, and in turn looks to protect other areas from development that is considered to be harmful to the character, identity and social fabric of our communities.</p> <p>It also looks to ensure that greater protection is provided for our natural environment. Our policies do not restrict, instead they challenge developers to deliver development that responds to its surroundings and is appropriate for our area.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Text on Major Developed Sites in Green Belt incorrect as NPPF does not refer to Major developed Sites in Green Belt and allows for redevelopment of brownfield land in the Green Belt	6.1.1	NPPF paras 89 ref development in GB RBWM Policy GB9	Noted. For purposes of clarity and accuracy, relevant wording in 6.1.1 has been amended.
			Vague, uncertain and undefined policy. No housing needs analysis by Borough or NP. Contrary to para 50 NPPF. Developers respond to market demand.	NP/H2	NPPF para 50 ref delivering a wide choice of homes and meeting housing needs.	NPPF para 50 does not require a NP to include a housing needs analysis. Other NPs are going forward without housing numbers. Our housing needs will emerge as progress is made on the emerging BLP but these are not yet known. Housing targets a strategic issue for RBWM.
			Unreasonable interference with the housing market. Flats are part of the housing mix and are important in providing affordable properties. No evidence to support policy	NP/H3	NPPF para 17 ref planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings. NPPF para 183 ref Neighbourhood Planning giving communities power to develop vision for their area and deliver sustainable development.	Evidence has been compiled as part of developing policies; this is available in the Evidence pack that will be submitted alongside the Neighbourhood Plan.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>New housing will be just the same as that which already exists in form, appearance and density. Too restrictive and prescriptive contrary to NPPF. Policy wording could prevent development of windfall sites.</p> <p>Only NPPF plus NP/DG3 is required.</p>	<p>NP/DG1 and NP/DG2</p>	<p>NPPF paras 183-185 ref Neighbourhood Planning and paras 56-61 ref requiring good design.</p> <p>RBWM policies H10 and H11</p>	<p>Disagree. The community's priority, made clear through consultation, is to retain the key aspects that determine the character of our area, hence the focus on Density, Footprint, Separation, Scale and Bulk. Our policies encourage innovative, good design; they do not restrict development but instead challenge developers to deliver development that responds to its surroundings and is appropriate for our area.</p>
			<p>12 months marketing an unreasonable burden on the property owner. Other evidence may be appropriate</p>	<p>NP/E1</p>	<p>NPPF para 22 re avoiding long term protection of sites where no reasonable prospect exists for their use.</p> <p>RBWM Policy E5 ref loss of land in employment areas</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
			<p>Vague requirement of "significant development".</p>	<p>NP/SV1</p>	<p>Expression "significant development" used in NPPF paras 17 and 112</p>	<p>No change proposed to SV1 on these grounds. Policy wording has been amended to aid clarity.</p>
			<p>Object to providing parking for residents, visitors and tradesmen. Meet Borough's standards not additional.</p>	<p>NP/T1</p>	<p>NPPF para 39 ref issues that should be taken into account when setting standards for residential development.</p> <p>NPPF para 10 ref Plans taking local circumstances into</p>	<p>There is serious community concern regarding on-street parking on our narrow congested Victorian roads creating congestion and safety risk and about lack of parking overall.</p> <p>Proposed policy is proportionate having regard to the acknowledged parking problems in our area.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if apply)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
					account RBWM DG1(7) ref parking policy.	
			Clearly concerns about traffic congestion in the area. Unfair to require development in Sunninghill to have additional requirements for traffic management and parking	NP/SV1	NPPF para 10 ref Plans taking local circumstances into account	Development in an area cannot be divorced from consequences on traffic management or other sustainability criteria. Proposed policy is proportionate having regard to the acknowledged traffic problems in S'hill.
25.	SL5 9DH	Natascha Sole	No problem with development on acreage owned by Ascot Car Parks and in favour of Village Square idea. But concern that some of my land will remain GB and hence not provide an income - wish narrow strip to be included.	Appendix Section 8, p16		Proposed strip of land forms a natural boundary and has now been included in the "Ascot Green" area.
			Concern that small biz units will make area around my property very unattractive			Any development will be subject to design considerations in accordance with our policies.
			Concerned I am funding 65% of entire GB strip between Ascot and South Ascot/Sunninghill. NP proposals will mean loss of income from Car Boots leaving little funding for Ascot Wood GB. In return would like an area of land de-gazetted so that I can apply for planning permission to build a house.			Issue of funding for private GB land not a NP matter. Any application on this site will be subject to Neighbourhood Plan and Borough policies.
26.		Paul Butt for Ascot Central Car Parks and the Sole family	ACCP and the Sole family welcome preparation of the Plan and are supporting of its aims for the site in their ownership as part of Ascot rejuvenation. In particular, ACCP keen to provide a physical hub or centre for the community on their site. Some detailed comments:			Offer noted.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			No need for a joint agreement and equalisation; and it can cause delays. Suggested modification to bottom of p. 55: "To achieve this vision, it is important that we adopt a holistic versus a piecemeal approach to development, by promoting close collaboration between landowners and developers".	Bottom p. 55		This wording has been amended.
			Requirement for a single planning application and a Development Brief likely to delay delivery of the heart of Ascot. It is sufficient to say that areas within Strategic Site as a whole could come forward independently provided they do not compromise delivery of the remainder. Suggested modification to NP/SS1.1: "Any development proposals for Ascot Centre and Ascot High Street must show how the key issues and intent for the entire Ascot Rejuvenation area comprising the High Street, South of Ascot High Street ("Ascot Green") and North of Ascot High Street ("Ascot Village") as defined on Map 15 have been addressed, and be accompanied by a Development Brief as set out in Appendix D, and to have actively engaged in consultation with the Parish Council and the community as part of the design process prior to any planning application being submitted."	NP/SS1.1		Policy has been amended.
			As matter of public policy not possible for a LPA to invalidate a planning appn on the NP/SS1.5 ground that phasing had not been agreed by RBWM and the PC. Suggested modification: "PHASING: The Development Brief must include proposals for the phasing of both the development and of all required improvements and amenities, with clear milestones and deliverables."	NP/SS1.5		Policy clause on phasing has been amended.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Concern that lack of SANG will delay delivery. Suggested modification of section 9.2 to be: "Project Heatherwood SANG and other potential SANG sites" so that it includes any other potential SANG sites that come forward as result of consultation.	Section 9.2		Section 9.2 Project has been amended.
			At recent meeting questions raised re whether land would be removed from GB or development would occur within it. Development within GB requires very special circumstances which may create problems if there were separate applications for each site. Removal from GB would make it easier but recognise this has to be done by RBWM in their LP. Greater clarity would be helpful. Suggested modification: The Plan should be clear on which Strategic Sites should be in/out of the GB so that the BLP can consider and progress minor alterations to the GB boundary planned for in the Plan, and that the ACCP and Sole family sites, together with any other parts of the Ascot Centre/High Street Rejuvenation area that lie within the GB should be out. Whether the ACCP and Sole family sites remain in the GB in the Plan and are or are not removed from the GB in the BLP, then the concerns about a planning application requiring majority community support remain.	NP/EN1		Noted. We will work closely with colleagues at RBWM to ensure the appropriate route is taken for the GB boundary review in the emerging BLP. Requirement for majority community support has been removed.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Wording of this policy does not give sufficiently clear understanding of infrastructure requirements necessary, their costing and mechanism through which intended to be funded. Suggested modification to SS1.2: "Any proposal for the redevelopment of Ascot Centre and High Street as shown within the area identified on Map 15 must show how it will either deliver, or contribute towards the delivery of, or not be necessary to deliver or contribute towards the delivery of the following improvements and community amenities..."	NP/SS1.2 and NP/SS1.3		Requirements set out are based on community responses. Some amendments to the wording have been made. The details are expected to be dealt with through the Development Brief.
27.	SL5 9EA	Christian Leigh	Object to proposal relating to Ascot Centre. There is no overwhelming <i>need</i> to make Ascot High Street bigger and more attractive. There's no appraisal in the Plan about potential commercial impact on S'hill and S'dale - no sequential test or full appraisal undertaken. Ascot High Street has become a better and far more attractive local centre over last few years.	Section 8.1/ NP/SS1		Comments noted. Whilst there isn't specific evidence to show the potential impact on the other villages, this is a relatively small scale retail development that is considered to be appropriate for the edge of a district centre location such as this. Feedback from community consultations is that the local community wish to focus development on key locations and there is majority support for the Ascot development.
			Concerned about how very large areas of housing proposed on open and GB land relate to GB policy. Development would conflict with NPPF paras 79-80 hence land would have to be removed from GB. Not convinced there are exceptional circumstances to justify - the statements of intent are merely general aspirations and there's no test to show they cannot be met elsewhere. The exceptional test is difficult to satisfy in the absence of and figures on housing numbers and commercial space proposed for the Ascot Project. My overall objection is to development on this open land	NP/EN1 and NP/SS1	NPPF paras 79-80 and 87-89 ref purpose of GB and exceptions to inappropriate development	We reviewed SHLAA sites and comparing potentially available sites to deliver community aspirations, Ascot Centre presented a unique and sustainable opportunity, being close to both the station and shops and offering a vision for the rejuvenation of Ascot. Decision on whether area is removed from GB is a matter for the Local Authority and will be reviewed by RBWM. We disagree that the proposals will be very

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>without proper justification or quantification when other options for development in the area have not been fully examined - eg. other land that might better suited for housing/commercial and capacity for development on other land - eg. increase density on other allocated sites or on windfall sites.</p> <p>The Ascot proposals will be very harmful to character and openness of area which contains trees with large protection areas, which are fundamental objectives of green belt policy.</p>			<p>harmful to the character and openness of the area.</p> <p>Policy wording has been amended to require design to take into account local characteristics and to include a significant provision for the creation of green spaces.</p>
28.		Ascot Racecourse	The Racecourse welcomes Proposed Plan and is broadly supportive of its proposals. But a number of detailed comments and suggested amends on issues relevant to the Racecourse.			Support is welcomed, thank you.
			Racecourse has historic and symbiotic links with Ascot and is a significant landowner, a major local employer and provides community facilities. Three areas where wish to see more positive planning in support of the Racecourse:			We very much recognise the Racecourse's close links with Ascot and its importance as a landowner and employer. We are also appreciative of the community facilities the Racecourse provides and supports.
			Minor Green Belt Alterations: new Grandstand and surrounding landscaped grounds almost entirely in GB, and any works are deemed 'inappropriate development', making even minor operational enhancements challenging and we wish to have them removed. Recognise this is for RBWM but would like support in NP for doing so, as current Plan does for Ascot Green site. Suggested revision to policy wording: EN1.1 With the exceptions only provided for in specific Strategic Site policies and around the revised Racecourse Boundary defined by Map X the BLP policies will apply to all GB areas".	NP/EN1	RBWM GB policy. NPPF para 83 ref it is the LPA which is responsible for setting GB boundaries	The NP Steering Group supports the Racecourse's request for GB boundaries around the Racecourse to be rationalised and we would like to encourage the Borough to consider doing so.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Future Operational Development: Racecourse will evolve over Plan period and likely to bring forward development proposals incrementally - eg. potential equestrian centre and possible energy centre. We suggest the Plan supports operational development proposals within the Racecourse boundary. Suggest a policy NP/AS1 as follows: "Proposals for operational development at Ascot Racecourse shall be permitted subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) A demonstrable operational benefit to the racecourse (b) Permanent replacement of long-standing temporary buildings on the racecourse sited to ensure that the site is viable (c) Design and access considerations (in accordance with Policy DG2 and DG3 (d) Compliance with all other policies in the Plan and the BLP 	Section 7.1		<p>Both the Equestrian Centre and the Green Energy Centre raised considerable concerns among the local community at consultation and they were not included in the proposed NP.</p> <p>In principle we support future operational development at the Racecourse but in the absence of sufficient information it is not appropriate to include at this time.</p>
			<p>Hotel: Pleased the Plan includes a site for development of a hotel on Racecourse land. We are broadly supportive of identified location but seek more flexibility for any hotel development. Suggest following text included at the end of NP/SS2: "Proposals for the hotel location should reflect the operational requirements of the racecourse, provision for conference activity and connectivity to the High Street in particular compliments the vision for Ascot Centre/High Street Rejuvenation (Policy SS1) and complies with DG2 and DG3"</p>	NP/SS2		<p>Following the extensive consultation that has taken place and the fact that the proposed location of the Hotel was a factor in the community's support for it, it is not appropriate to alter the policy at this time.</p> <p>Connectivity to the High Street is desirable and the policy has been amended to reflect this and to also reflect other issues raised during consultation.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Housing mix and design: Supportive of principle of housing mix but want to ensure principles cannot be undermined in delivery. Restricting flats/apartments contrary to NPPF para 50 unless there is demonstrable oversupply of flats so suggest deletion of NP/H3. Also deletion of NP/DG1 sub-sections 2 to 5 which seek to control the type of dwellings. Also remove reference in NP/H2 to "should be in size and type in keeping with the size and type of dwellings already prevalent in the surrounding area".</p> <p>Only appropriate to restrict new flats and apartments if robust assessment of local needs shows this is necessary.</p>	<p>NP/H3 and NP/DG1 and NP/H2</p>	<p>NPPF para 17 ref planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings.</p> <p>NPPF para 183 ref Neighbourhood Planning giving communities power to develop vision for their area and deliver sustainable development.</p> <p>NPPF para 50 ref delivering a wide choice of homes and meeting housing needs</p> <p>NPPF paras 58, 60 and 61 requiring good design.</p>	<p>Our housing needs will emerge as progress made on the emerging BLP but these not yet known. Policy NP/H2 does not restrict development, instead it challenges developers to deliver development that responds to its surroundings and is appropriate for our area. Wording has been amended to give some flexibility should it be needed to help meet identified housing needs.</p> <p>The intent for policy H3 re flats/apartments is to ensure that such developments don't occur where they would adversely impact the character of the area – natural, built and social. A detailed Streetscape Assessment has been conducted by NP volunteers to add additional local detail to the RBWM Townscape Assessment and streets have been identified where flats/apartments would be appropriate, taking into account location, character of the surrounding neighbourhood, status of on-street parking and the streetscape generally. This piece of work is included in our Evidence Pack and formed an important input into determining appropriate locations for flats/apartments in our area. As a result of reviewing this project, the policy has been amended to include certain additional streets.</p> <p>The policy also actively welcomes flatted development in TA classification zone Post War Residential Flats, when part of a mixed use commercial development (eg. Along a redeveloped Ascot High Street) and some Strategic Sites (eg. at Ascot Station).</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Acknowledge importance of trees to area character but TPO process already provides suitable protection - hence NP/EN3.1 unnecessary or should be adjusted. The caveat 'exceptional circumstances' under which removal is allowed is unduly rigorous.	NP/EN3.1		Your comment is noted. Some amendments have been made to this policy.
29.	SL5 7DY	Andy Hohne	Your planning policy has many seriously flawed and conflicting claims, aims and conclusions. As an Ascot resident so focus on Ascot:			Comment noted.
			Ascot High Street is busy and thriving place and does not need rejuvenating. Number of shops right for population. Community wants to retain character of area and leafy nature. Ascot proposal entirely conflicts with these wishes.	NP/SS1		Your view is noted, however over repeated consultations community feedback has been in favour of rejuvenating Ascot centre and the High Street. Retention of the green and leafy appearance is part of the policy.
			Absolutely disagree green field sites should be built on. Restrict development to the large brown field sites in the area. High density building can only increase traffic congestion	NP/EN1 and NP/SS1	NPPF paras 79-80 and 87-89 ref purpose of GB and exceptions to inappropriate development	While the community agrees with you about wishing to protect the GB, in Ascot it is considered that the important benefits outweigh the negatives. Part of the requirements on any development is that traffic issues are addressed with improvements to road infrastructure. Not proposing high density at this location. By focusing development on fewer sites, there is a better opportunity to improve infrastructure.
			Question outdated notion Ascot needs and can support community centre and small cinema	NP/SS1	NPPF para 17 ref planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings.	The idea of a community centre that is capable of being used as both a community hall and an arts space or small cinema arose directly out of the public meetings and was endorsed in subsequent consultation.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
					NPPF para 183 ref Neighbourhood Planning giving communities power to develop vision for their area and deliver sustainable development	
30.	SL5 7HF	John Bayliss	1. Support good development on south side of High Street provided any Commercial Units are tasteful and lettable	NP/SS1		The requirement for a Development Brief will provide an opportunity for local residents to be consulted and to influence design. Any development will be keen to ensure commercial success.
			2. Village Square scheme ill thought out and shows complete naivety. It will become a "meeting place" for many "undesirables" who frequent Ascot for drinking sessions.	NP/SS1		Your view is noted but there is no evidence to indicate that Ascot will attract "undesirables". Well-designed, overlooked spaces with active frontages can deter anti- social behaviour.
			3. Concern about development on Car Park 5 which contains some of finest trees in the immediate location - a superb selection of some 70 or so trees, many in excess of 150-200 years old. The whole should be placed under an immediate TPO.	NP/SS1		Our Ascot Centre policy expressly provides for retention of "important mature trees". Any development would also have to be in accordance with our Tree policy EN3.
			Proposals beyond the frontage to the High Street will create insurmountable problems in immediate and extended future and destroy important central green oasis	NP/SS1		Unclear what type of problems are being referred to here. With respect to destruction of important central green oasis, our Ascot Centre policy expressly provides for the retention of important mature trees and the creation of green spaces.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
31.	SL5 7HL	Alison and Frank Zecca	Supportive in general of initiatives proposed. Would have liked more prior consultation.			Comments noted and thank you for your support. We conducted a number of consultations including the Vision consultation which went to all households in the area.
			Concerns regarding development of Car Park 6 in Ascot Village plans. Would like smaller number of houses to maintain more open feel with the beautiful old trees.	NP/SS1		Comment noted. Our Ascot Centre policy expressly provides for retention of important mature trees and for the creation of green spaces. And the Development Brief will provide an opportunity for local residents to be consulted and to influence design.
			Ask that we and local council continue to make sure everyone's views are heard.			Comment noted.
32.	Re SL5 7DY	Paul Butt Planning for Altitude Real Estate	Comments made on behalf of Altitude Real Estate LLP who have an option with the freehold owner to purchase site of Oakfield Farm, which includes existing waste transfer station and an area to north either side of access road fronting onto Wells Lane. Pre-application advice has been sought from RBWM for a residential redevelopment of waste transfer station and a change of use of land to the south to recreational public open space, potentially a SANG. Site lies in GB.		NPPF paras 79-80 and 87-89 ref purpose of GB and exceptions to inappropriate development	Information noted. Redevelopment on this site to residential would be inappropriate development in GB. This area also forms part of our strategic gap between Ascot and Sunninghill to which our policy NP/EN2 relates.
			Altitude welcomes preparation of the Plan and is wholly supporting of its aims. . In particular, keen to facilitate Ascot Centre rejuvenation. Detailed comments:			Thank you for your support.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>1. Provision of a SANG quality public open space could be brought forward in a timely fashion thereby removing any uncertainty or delay in realising Ascot Centre project. Suggest amending section 9.2 Project to become "Project Heatherwood SANG and other potential SANG sites", adding "other landowners" to text in coloured box and adding "Other potential SANG sites that have come forward include the wood to the south of the waste transfer station in Wells Lane".</p>	Project 9.2		Project in Section 9.2 has been expanded to include alternative potential SANG sites.
			<p>2. Potential provision of recreational public open space (whether or not to SANG quality standard). Note potential to create link between Wells Lane and one of the NP primary green corridors. Suggest modification of EN2 to read "A planning application for inappropriate development in the GB in Gaps between Villages, as defined by Map 6, shall only be permitted in very special circumstances where:</p> <p>(a) the very special circumstances are for the benefit of the community AND</p> <p>(b) it is accompanied by a statement of Community Consultation as set out in Appendix E...."</p>	NP/EN2 and NP/EN6		<p>Welcome the possibility of additional recreational public open space and enhancement of our green corridors.</p> <p>Wording of EN2 has been amended to aid clarity.</p>
			<p>3. NP/EN1 Green Belt policy will apply as Altitude site is not a Strategic Site in the Plan. Suggest modification of EN1 to delete requirement for "majority community support".</p>	NP/EN1		Policy has been amended to no longer include reference to majority community support.
33.	Ascot	Sue Rensch	In general plans very good especially for Ascot.			Thank you for your support.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			But object to building houses in GB. Considerable building in New Road, North Ascot and Bracknell Forest Council has given permission for more houses in GB including The Rough which is ancient woodland. And infrastructure cannot cope even at present. What measure do you have to intervene to stop further building?			This NP only covers Sunninghill & Ascot and Sunningdale parishes and can have no influence over Bracknell Forest areas. NP cannot stop all building but can help encourage investment in infrastructure.
34.	SL5 7ET	Woolf Bond for Index House	Owned site is 0.47ha and is PDL in GB. A 3-storey building currently in office use and accessed from St. George's Lane. Site now benefits from NPPF para 89. Accordingly, subject to appropriate redesign that responds to site's GB location, redevelopment for alternative commercial or residential use would be acceptable.		NPPF para 89 ref partial or limited infilling or redevelopment of PDLs	Comments noted.
			In sequential terms site is more logical release than the land to the north. Mature tree buffer on southern side results in a stronger visual and physical relationship with existing open land to the north (towards Ascot High St) than to waste facility in the south. Site could add to scale of proposed allocation at Ascot Green and deliver much needed economic or residential development, in accordance with core land-use principles including: "to encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided it is not of high environmental value".	NP/SS1	Amendment to Permitted Development Rights May 2013 to convert offices to residential NPPF para 111 ref re-use of previously developed land	The area to the north of Index House is part of an area that represents a significant opportunity to enhance our High Street. The NP is not able to release Green Belt; that is a matter for the LPA. Whilst it is recognised that Index House can relate well to the wider opportunity it could be redeveloped or converted under existing policy in the NPPF.
			Propose site is excluded from its present GB designation and allocated for residential or commercial development either as a stand-alone allocation or as part of the Ascot Green scheme.	NP/SS1.	NPPF para 83 ref it is the LPA which is responsible for setting GB boundaries	Your comment is noted.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
35.	SL5 7HH	Laura & Pete Browitt	Wholeheartedly support the efforts to develop the Ascot HS area. As always though, the devil is in the detail and we have concerns as set out below:			Thank you for your support.
			Hotel: plans lack the detail to make any serious comments but proximity to our home gives us concerns: Find logic of planned location difficult to understand. Racecourse have large areas of land which would be more appropriate. More sense to have at Heatherwood end of HS away from proximity to home owners and without need to bring additional traffic into main shopping area. Adding traffic to already congested HS cannot support local economy, the council's environmental policies nor the well being of central Ascot residents. No details given re how hotel will be accessed. Access for staff and service vehicles? Parking? Noise and disturbance to local residents from lighting, physical size disturbing our outlook and additional traffic. Proposed building will take footprint of current well used service area – where will this be pushed out to? How will access to our homes we currently enjoy potentially change?	NP/SS2		<p>Your concerns are noted.</p> <p>One of the benefits of a hotel is the economic benefits it can bring, so its location close to the High Street is appropriate. Close proximity to the Grandstand and main Racecourse concourse also appealing for potential visitors and conference delegates.</p> <p>Full details will emerge as part of the planning process. And any development proposal will be subject to Design and Access considerations and to adequate parking being provided for staff, residents and visitors.</p> <p>The policy has been amended to better reflect concerns over impacts on neighbouring properties.</p>
			“Green” energy centre: understand your committee do not feel this is an issue based on previous feedback, cannot understand this. While main body of the plan fails to mention this building, the appendix very clearly brings it within scope of the “plan”. Building any type of power supplying building in this location makes no sense; building on this specific area, within yards of our home, when so much land is available that can be more easily accessed with much less	NP/SS1 and Appendix B		Previous consultation feedback showed concern over a potential Green Energy Centre and, in the absence of more information, it was not included in the Plan policies. We recognise however that references made to it in the Prince's Report in Appendix B may have created uncertainty; we have therefore removed this report from the NP and are including it only as part of our Evidence Base.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>impact on residents?</p> <p>We understand that TPOs are in place on the numerous trees outside our home. How can these be so easily overturned.</p>			<p>With respect to trees, our policy NP/SS1 includes a requirement to retain important mature trees.</p>
			<p>Transparency: we seriously question the transparency your committee claim: Including the Energy centre merely in the Appendix with no mention in the main body is clearly questionable. The hotel being claimed to be accepted by local residents is hard to comprehend. We have discussed this with many residents of central Ascot and nobody can confirm their acceptance. How many of these so called residents actually live within the boundaries of the affected areas? We live within 10 yards of the racecourse yet none of the “volunteers” managed to contact us for our views.</p>			<p>The Energy Centre being in the Appendix was addressed above – it was not included in the Plan policies.</p> <p>With regard to consultation, we conducted three major general consultations prior to this one and, for Ascot specifically, we held two public meetings which were widely publicised.</p> <p>Details of the consultation process is set out in the Statement of Consultation.</p>
36.	SL5 7HH	Theresa Doherty	<p>Read proposals with interest and overall supportive of initiatives outlined which are aimed at rejuvenation of Ascot Centre/HS ie. “Ascot Village” concept providing the necessary changes in current infrastructure developed sufficiently to support the proposals. However, wish to express personal concerns re certain aspects of NP and PF report: Consultation: As a resident of Course Side Rd I was not engaged in the consultation process by any of the volunteers even though my house is on direct route of proposed Racecourse developments.</p>	NP/SS1 and Appendix B		<p>Thank you for your comments and support.</p> <p>With regard to consultation, we conducted three major general consultations prior to this one and, for Ascot specifically, we held two public meetings which were widely publicised.</p> <p>Details of the consultation process is set out in the Statement of Consultation.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Ascot hotel: distinct lack of detail re this development – eg. size of hotel, no reference to access or where the necessary changes to existing infrastructure will be. Neither parking nor delivery arrangements have been identified. Concern that existing parking arrangements outside my house will still stand; will there still be vehicle and foot access to Course Rd via Bank Place; will local residents still have access to Ascot Heath via underpass tunnel; will bollards remain in place? Safeguards re minimising noise, light, waste management and general pollution level?	NP/SS2		Full details will emerge as part of the planning process. And any development proposal will be subject to Design and Access considerations and to adequate parking being provided for staff, residents and visitors. The policy has been amended to better reflect concerns over impacts on neighbouring properties.
			Although not included in the NP, the PF report clearly identifies two further areas of potential development very close to my property: Equestrian Centre and Green Energy Centre. Major concerns regarding the latter. According to the maps, it would have detrimental impact on my lifestyle and home. There is insufficient detail re size, siting and infrastructure required. Impact of such development would be considerable and I wish to register my personal objection to any Green Energy Centre.	Appendix B		Previous consultation feedback showed concern over a potential Green Energy Centre and, in the absence of more information, it was not included in the Plan policies. We recognise however that references made to it in the Prince's Report in Appendix B may have created uncertainty; we have therefore removed this report from the NP and are including it only as part of our Evidence Base.
37.	SL5 7HH	Pamela & Anthony Bunn	Supportive in general toward improvement of Ascot Centre/HS together with Community Centre and construction of proposed Ascot Village concept.	NP/SS1		Thank you for your support.
			Our concerns are mainly the planned development of a Hotel. There are no details regarding size and necessary changes to our existing infrastructure and potential impact it will have on our property:	NP/SS2		Full details will emerge as part of the planning process. Any development proposal will be subject to Design and Access considerations and to adequate parking being provided for staff, residents and

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - where will access be for visitors, where will a CP be sited - proposed height and position of hotel/lighting concerns - waste management and environmental impact - will access for Course Side Rd residents through Bank Place be maintained and will we retain right to continue parking opposite our homes - will access to Ascot Heath be maintained via underpass - 			<p>visitors.</p> <p>The policy has been amended to better reflect concerns over impacts on neighbouring properties.</p>
			<p>Also concerned re Green Energy Centre:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - negative impact on view from front of our houses - why can't this be positioned at Heatherwood end of Racecourse - Up to 6 years ago we had a massive brick wall a few feet away; when it was removed on rebuilding of Racecourse we were assured of brilliant outlook we would hav - Trees protected by TPOs 			<p>Previous consultation feedback showed concern over a potential Green Energy Centre and, in the absence of more information, it was not included in the Plan policies. We recognise however that references made to it in the Prince's Report in Appendix B may have created uncertainty; we have therefore removed this report from the NP and are including it only as part of our Evidence Base.</p> <p>With respect to trees, our policy NP/SS1 includes a requirement to retain important mature trees.</p>
38.	SL5 7HQ	Tim Hallett	<p>Studied proposals with interest and generally supportive of initiatives to improve local area particularly re regeneration of Ascot Centre/HS and Ascot Station, together with Community Centre, public open space and construction of Ascot Village concept.</p>	NP/SS1		<p>Thank you for your comments and support.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Some concerns on certain points: Plans to develop Hotel lack any detail re size and necessary changes to existing infrastructure. Concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plan fails to accept that traffic congestion in Ascot HS already critical. Will access for deliveries and guests be from HS? How will it impinge on access to Course Side Rd and traffic island at Station Rd - Proximity to our homes and impact of proposed height and position, light spillage and invasion of privacy - Will residents continue to have right to park in Course Side Rd and will existing bollards be maintained - Waste management and environmental impact - Will access to Ascot Heath via underpass be maintained 	NP/SS2		<p>One of the benefits of a hotel is the economic benefits it can bring, so its location close to the High Street is appropriate. Close proximity to the Grandstand and main Racecourse concourse also appealing for potential visitors and conference delegates.</p> <p>Full details will emerge as part of the planning process. And any development proposal will be subject to Design and Access considerations and to adequate parking being provided for staff, residents and visitors.</p> <p>The policy has been amended to better reflect concerns over impacts on neighbouring properties.</p>
			<p>Concern that not one of the residents in Course Side Rd has been consulted even though we will be directly affected.</p>			<p>With regard to consultation, we conducted three major general consultations prior to this one and, for Ascot specifically, we held two public meetings which were widely publicised.</p> <p>Details of the consultation process is set out in the Statement of Consultation.</p>
			<p>Strongly oppose PF plan for a Green Energy site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trees in area protected by TPO - Concern detrimental impact on our property values - Size and height of energy centre and potential 24 hour operation - Noise, light and odour pollution - Why not site at Heatherwood end 			<p>Previous consultation feedback showed concern over a potential Green Energy Centre and, in the absence of more information, it was not included in the Plan policies. We recognise however that references made to it in the Prince's Report in Appendix B may have created uncertainty; we have therefore removed this report from the NP and are including it only as part of our</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
						Evidence Base.
39.	SL5 7HH	Kathleen & Neil Richardson	Our family has lived in Course Side Rd for over 60 years and has keen interest to improve local area. Have read NP with interest and generally support initiatives to improve local area particularly re sustained redevelopment of Ascot Centre/HS and Ascot Station.			Thank you for your comments and support.
			<p>Some concerns on certain points: Plans to develop Hotel lack any detail re size and necessary changes to existing infrastructure. Concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic congestion in Ascot HS already major issue. Will access for deliveries and guests be from HS? How will it impinge on access to Course Side Rd and traffic island at Station Rd - Will access to Course Side Rd be maintained through Bank Place - Where will hotel CP be sited. Will residents continue to have right to park in Course Side Rd and will existing bollards be maintained - Risk of significant noise and light pollution from CP plus waste management and environmental impact - Will access to Ascot Heath via underpass be maintained 	NP/SS2		<p>One of the benefits of a hotel is the economic benefits it can bring, so its location close to the High Street is appropriate. Close proximity to the Grandstand and main Racecourse concourse also appealing for potential visitors and conference delegates.</p> <p>Full details will emerge as part of the planning process. And any development proposal will be subject to Design and Access considerations and to adequate parking being provided for staff, residents and visitors.</p> <p>The policy has been amended to better reflect concerns over impacts on neighbouring properties.</p>
			Concern that not one of the residents in Course Rd has been consulted even though we will be directly affected.			With regard to consultation, we conducted three major general consultations prior to this one and, for Ascot specifically, we held two public meetings which were widely publicised.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
						Details of the consultation process is set out in the Statement of Consultation.
			<p>Strongly against PF plan for a Green Energy site hidden in the Appendices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trees in area protected by TPO - Size and height of energy centre, will it have a CP and potential 24 hour operation - Noise and light pollution - Negative impact on view from front of our houses 	Appendix B		Previous consultation feedback showed concern over a potential Green Energy Centre and, in the absence of more information, it was not included in the Plan policies. We recognise however that references made to it in the Prince's Report in Appendix B may have created uncertainty; we have therefore removed this report from the NP and are including it only as part of our Evidence Base.
40.	SL5 7EY SL5 7EX SL5 7HL SL5 7QP SL5 9NJ	Pegasus for 12 local Ascot residents (10 Ascot, 1 C/side, 1 S'hill)	Response considers Ascot plans only as it represents residents in local vicinity who know area best. In support of proposal, residents welcome opportunity to guide location of future developments in the plan neighbourhoods. Draft NP is comprehensive, detailed and technical. Appreciate time invested and detail offered. However, specific concerns regarding matters excluded or unsupported within draft NP set out below:			Comments noted.
			Ascot Racecourse – raceday implications for Ascot residents: residents proud of world class racing delivered by racecourse and wish it to remain competitive against competition. Given its significance plan has notable lack of reference to how development proposals on racecourse land – hotel and Ascot Village – will affect local residents. References in PF report to a Green Energy Centre and Equestrian Centre also factors.	NP/SS2 and NP/SS1 and Appendix B and Section 3.1	RBWM LP para 7.3.1 identifying Racecourse as one of existing main employers in area.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Both the Equestrian Centre and the Green Energy Centre raised concerns among the local community at consultation and were therefore not included in the proposed NP in the absence of more information.</p> <p>We recognise however that references made to them in the Prince's Report in Appendix B may have created uncertainty; we have therefore removed this report from the NP and are including it only as part of our</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Raceday traffic and parking have been successfully improved and managed over last decade with resulting effect on residents being positive. Highway projects within NP should provide realistic mitigation management plans for racecourse operations or risk of return to former chaotic situation for residents and visitors ceasing to support racecourse in favour of other racecourses.</p> <p>Reminder to NP SG that some local businesses earn 45% of annual revenues during Royal Ascot, allowing them to be successful businesses for residents to enjoy rest of year.</p> <p>Note none of SG are Ascot residents. Request full consideration given to operation and management of racedays and associated impacts on Ascot residents. Matters to be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access and service road congestion during build and preparation periods incl for HGV deliveries - Easy parking for racegoers cars and coaches or coach drivers will not come to Ascot - Parking and People Management for the 700+ extra employees at Royal Ascot and hundreds on other racedays <p>Above specifically applies to Ascot village development as combined concern of losing considerable parking area alongside numbers of new residential properties. Not clear how racecourse will provide alternative safe access and movement of people.</p>			<p>Evidence Base.</p> <p>Policy SS1 includes requirements relating to road infrastructure improvements and sufficient parking capacity. The detail will emerge through the Development Brief process.</p> <p>Ascot Racecourse are broadly supportive of the plans and aware of the operational issues that will evolve from them.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Recommend an alternative people flow plan is publicised to show Ascot Village can be successfully assimilated into locality.			
			<p>Implications of proposed residential development: NP cannot promote less development than is set out in LP but RBWM housing figures not listed anywhere. For clarity, reference SHLAA and how A, S & S will contribute to meeting development allocation. Note NPPF refs. Concern text in 5.3.2 advises “inclusion of sites in the plan does not necessarily mean they will be developed” – what is point of inclusion if no realistic prospect of development.</p> <p>Concern that based on PF report c. 90+ houses would fit in Ascot Village. No regard taken to style of housing adjoining the green on opposite side to create balanced visual integration. The green adjoins Winkfield Rd houses, not Course Rd. Also not clear how parking needs for Ascot Village been considered and proposals considered to result in an undersupply of parking space provision.</p>	Section 4 and Section 5.2.1 and Section 5.3.2 And Appendix B And NP/SS1	SHLAA and NPPF para 47 ref 5 year housing land supply and 6-15 year developable sites	<p>All your comments are noted.</p> <p>Setting housing targets is a matter for RBWM. The new Local Plan currently being developed will determine housing targets based on assessments of housing need. We have been liaising very closely with RBWM and they are fully aware of what is included in our NP and supportive of it.</p> <p>The wording of 5.3.2 has been amended to aid clarity.</p> <p>Provision of sufficient parking is included in the policy as a requirement.</p>
			Ascot Green proposals would equate to over 75 dwellings. Transparency required to give clarification to local community. Also request when Heatherwood consultation provides housing provision calculations, these are added to assess overall impacts on local area and greater certainty as to how Local and national targets will be met.			Your comments are noted.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Highways, traffic & parking & people flows: NP identifies existing traffic and parking strains on Ascot especially on race days. But proposals do not include evidence base or collaboration with RBWM to demonstrate that these will not be made worse by new development or how they may be improved. Indication of mitigation transport projects with associated funds would be of benefit including evidence of a switch to train usage which will not suit all.</p>	<p>NP/SS1 and NP/SS2</p>	<p>NPPF Section 4</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Policy includes requirements relating to road infrastructure improvements. The detail will emerge through the Development Brief process.</p>
			<p>RBWM has own parking standards. NP recognises higher than average car ownership in area so suggest that provisions for increased parking standards are incorporated. Consideration also should be given to overall NP area development effects.</p> <p>PF report includes relocation of Petrol Station to Winkfield Rd roundabout. No detailed justification given nor realistic traffic flow implications. Not considered that proposed site is suitable given existing traffic flows, close proximity to school, a residential area and Shorts Recycling.</p>	<p>NP/DG3.3</p>		<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>PF Report is presenting a vision. The detail will emerge through the Development Brief process.</p>
			<p>PF report also recommends a proposed Community Energy Centre as it states there is a power problem for businesses around the HS. Any such proposal likely to have significant impact on local residents.</p>	<p>Appendix B</p>		<p>Previous consultation feedback showed concern over a potential Green Energy Centre and, in the absence of more information, it was not included in the Plan policies. We recognise however that references made to it in the Prince's Report in Appendix B may have created uncertainty; we have therefore removed this report from the NP and are including it only as part of our Evidence Base.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Amenity: matters of noise, disturbance and vibration not commonly material considerations taken into account by Local Authority in assessing proposed development. Request such considerations specifically referred to within this policy.</p> <p>Local residents also wish to see TPOs upheld on Ascot Village and Ascot Green.</p>	<p>NP/DG2.2 and NP/SS1</p>		<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Policy SS1 includes requirements to retain important mature trees.</p>
			<p>Proposed expansion of Ascot HS: Retail expansion of HS positive aspiration but at odds with level of protection NP places on individual villages (Section 5.1). Proposed expansion of HS more akin to an Urban Town Centre than a local village hub. Concern no evidence that HS's expansion idesirable or viable. No reference to such a review by RBWM or NP SG; no reference to how Ascot fits with retail provisions of larger nearby town centres eg Windsor Bracknell and Camberley. Recent retail arrivals not NP's sought after "small independent shops" but retail and chain café stores incl Subway, Boots, Costa, Starbucks and Tesco. While community may raise disappointment to this, it's clear that they are used or they would not remain in business. Whilst small independents may be desirable, how does NP intend to buck trend and encourage them and is it even feasible to do? Concern that future development may result in significant additional housing with no major funding for improving the HS, retail or amenities.</p>	<p>NP/SS1 and Section 5.1</p>		<p>Comments and concerns noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. Whilst there isn't specific evidence to show the potential impact on the other villages, this is a relatively small scale retail development that is considered to be appropriate for the edge of a district centre location such as this. No objections from retailers in either Sunninghill or Sunningdale to the Ascot Centre proposal.</p> <p>Feedback from community consultations is that the local community wish to focus development on key locations and there is majority support for the Ascot development.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Reference to 'small cinema' and/or 'arts centre'. But no mention whether any interest from potential operator. Given presence of local theatres and cinemas in Windsor, Camberley, Reading, Woking and Bracknell, serious concern that an additional facility will not be used.	NP/SS1		Context is space that acts as a community hall that can be used as a small cinema and/or arts centre. This was as a result of suggestions made by the local community in consultation.
			<p>While it's accepted that commercial units may benefit from increased spending capacity of a larger local population, this doesn't directly correlate to success of a local centre. New urban extensions of many hundreds of homes will often only sustain one or two new retail units and in Ascot, already established that considerable income to local bars, restaurants and cafes comes from visitors/racegoers. Nothing to suggest this would change.</p> <p>NP makes no mention to fact that with Tesco's arrival on HS, their pension fund became a main landlord and has since sold the parade on. This contrasts with NP ambitions of a vibrant village of small independents and demonstrates commercial reality where Big Businesses guide HS evolution and potentially lock out smaller businesses through high property rents.</p> <p>NP policy E3.1 at odds with RBWM policy ASC1 in indicating that introduction of non-retail uses will be allowed subject to max of 30% of length of current frontages. Also doesn't reflect NP's intentions in para 6.4.3 on retaining retail.</p>	Section 8.1 and NP/SS1 And NP/E3.1	<p>RBWM LP policy ASC1 ref not permitting loss of existing A1 retail use in HS unless it can be shown that vitality and viability of centre will not be harmed.</p> <p>Amendments to Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 1995 to allow more flexible changes of use of commercial units under permitted development.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>RBWM is fully aware of our proposed policy E3.1 and happy that it is in conformity with the BLP and their thinking in relation to their emerging LP.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Proposals for urban growth of HS will require investment and ongoing support and maintenance of policing, street cleaning services etc. Not clear in NP how this will be funded. Nor how issues such as noise and anti-social behaviour will be mitigated, with expansion of evening hours operations such as restaurants and bars.</p> <p>Safety and amenity of existing Ascot residents paramount; other villages won't experience this degree of impact and Ascot will require additional response in a Policing Plan. DG2.2 covers amenity effects of new residential dwellings but no similar policy to consider amenity effects of commercial proposals and this should be amended.</p>			<p>Comments noted.</p>
			<p>Local Schooling: Increase in residential development results in a direct impact upon school resources in the locality. Project identified for School imperative. Should also take account secondary and special education needs places. Charters not even mentioned yet new family size properties will give rise to children of secondary school age.</p> <p>NP should make reference to Council's Planning Obligations and Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (2005) and forthcoming CIL schedule for how developer funds will be pooled to resource the Project. Also valuable to outline what enhancement projects developer funds would contribute to local schools. If existing schools don't have the capacity to expand, consideration will need to be given to new schools. Residents specifically</p>	<p>Section 9.4</p>		<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is a Borough responsibility to ensure there are sufficient school places. As it is a matter of concern among local residents, we have defined a Project to work with RBWM to identify a suitable location for a new school.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			concerned re Cheapside school which is the main destination for local primary school children.			
			Neighbourhood Plan process: In interests of transparency request all comments published online. To date, residents aware of numerous occasions when have contacted SG with comments with no acknowledgment of receipt or response. Nor considered acceptable or considerate of the wider ranging perspectives of Ascot residents regarding NP consultation process.			Comments noted. All comments and our responses will be published on our website.
			Evidence base detailed in section 1.2 refers to 550 respondents or 7% and much mention made throughout to “overwhelming support” or support levels at “93%” or above. Highly misleading: not 93% of Ascot population – it is 93% of 550 respondents. Not considered to be sufficiently representative of whole NP area. Concern is raised about true level of commitment and support for some of the new proposed facilities as number of respondents relatively low in contrast with local population size.	Section 1.2 and Section 7.1		Comments noted. These response rates are considered high by the standards of those normally received in response to the Borough’s planning consultations. All consultations have been widely publicised. Full details of the consultation process is set out in the Statement of Consultation.
41.		Ascot Residents	Collective of local groups keeping residents advised of inappropriate planning appns and other local issues. Group has followed development of NP and taken active part.			Noted.
			General feedback very positive but one major concern:			Noted.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Concern is sheer scale of proposed “rejuvenation” of Ascot Centre. Support principle of new development in Ascot to enhance HS and provide community facilities. And recognise residential part of this. But area proposed for development south of HS (Ascot Green) simply too much. It will overwhelm current centre and its infrastructure and proposals in danger of <i>urbanising</i> the village feel, which majority like and wish to retain.</p> <p>Seriously request re-think of area being proposed for Ascot Green to focus on section of HS that runs from Station Hill roundabout to end of Hermitage Parade. This will still be very significant development, especially if Ascot Village also goes ahead.</p>			<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Policy wording has been amended to require design to include a significant provision for the creation of green spaces and for the phasing of the development to ensure that any cumulative impacts of development can be dealt with.</p>
42.	SL5 7LE	Anne Ayres	Comprehensive and well considered plan; fully endorse. Vibrant hub in Ascot centre attractive; hotel advantageous.	NP/SS1 and NP/SS2		Thank you for your comments and your support.
			In favour of deterring more luxury flats except in the few places identified.	NP/H3		Your comment is noted.
43.	SL5 7LD	Roger and Suzanne Bailey	Excellent piece of work and congratulations. Support limited and appropriate development of compatible design and density.			Your support is appreciated, thank you.
			1. Support and expect RBWM to pursue all violations of TPOs through legal system	NP/EN3		Noted and we will pass this to RBWM.
			2. Garden grabbing/back land development needs to be defined and curtailed more rigorously	NP/EN4	NP para 53	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Policy has been reworded to aid clarity. There is no basis however for justifying more rigorous curtailment.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			3. Plan not definitive enough in preventing flats/apartments, an urban feature for which there is little <i>local</i> demand	NP/H3		The NP is in favour of sustainable development and that includes flats where appropriate and sustainable. The policy is aimed at delivering this.
			4. Consider Ascot centre to be from A329/Station Hill to A329/A330 and regeneration should be focussed on this zone. Broadly supportive but plans too ambitious - proposed level of new dwellings would create too many extra vehicle movements. Support more limited development c. 50% of what proposed and an ideally sized hotel	8.1		Your comments are noted.
			5. Re traffic and parking: A ban on conversion of garages and parking spaces to accommodation. Racecourse hotel plan should include pedestrian and horse tunnels. Note impact of Longcross MOD site development on traffic in our area. Plan for compulsory use cycle path between Windsor and Ascot so cyclists prohibited from using Sheet Street Road. Restrictions on Legoland which causes regular chaos.		Sheet Street and Legoland are outside our NP area.	Your various comments noted. Garage and parking spaces ban on conversions not within the remit of this NP. Racecourse hotel policy has been amended to include requirement to retain underpass for access to the Heath. Sheet Street and Legoland outside our NP area.
44.	SL5 9HN	Malcolm Thurling	Wish to obtain hard copy of the plan			Explained cost prohibited free printed copies. Pointed in direction of libraries or parish offices - or available online.
45.	SL5 8PG	David Chapman	In general it's a sensible proposal for development of Ascot Centre, Sunningdale and Sunninghill and congrats to SG and TG. But Plan doesn't adequately address needs of entire area, specifically North Ascot. Need to have improved links to newly developed Ascot centre by footpaths, cycle routes and road - current proposals lack real commitment and energy	NP/SS1.2 and NP/T2		NP policies include reference to cycle routes to link North Ascot with Ascot (and to and between all the villages). Ascot Centre policies include a requirement for improving road infrastructure and pedestrian walkways.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Village Square: plan for buildings around overdevelopment. Buildings should have gaps between and heights limited to one storey; important to see trees beyond	NP/SS1		The requirement for a Development Brief will provide an opportunity for local residents to be consulted and to influence design.
			High Street: removing central median pedestrian refuge would be detrimental to pedestrian experience. Urge new building is set back from the road and areas of sites bordering the road are used to improve pedestrian, cycle and vehicle movements	NP/SS1		The requirement for a Development Brief will provide an opportunity for local residents to be consulted and to influence design.
			Concerned that secondary green corridor recommended for my garden. Not been consulted and not sure what consequences would be. Concern developers will use green corridors as excuse for removing vegetation elsewhere	NP/EN6		<p>The intent of the Green Corridors policy is to protect green corridors from adverse impact arising from development. Where arguments in favour of development are strong the NP requires appropriate mitigation measures to be put in place or compensation provided.</p> <p>It does not negate any other policies that would influence whether or not developers may remove vegetation.</p>
			Pedestrian and cycle ways through racecourse/heath not appropriate as private land and access could be refused. Also threat of dogs. Need alternative routes. Must not lose racecourse mile straight underpass.	NP/SS2 and NP/T2		<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Ascot hotel policy has been amended to include requirement to retain underpass for access to the Heath.</p> <p>Policy on cycle routes has been amended although still includes route through the racecourse.</p>
			Hotel plans must not alter view of grandstand set among trees as seen from heath.	NP/SS2		This view is one of our designated Landmark Views and is subject to our policy NP/DG4
			Heatherwood site pedestrian and cycle ways: add link to North Ascot	NP/SS5.4c		Your comment is noted.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
46.	Not given	Richard Haworth	<p>A lot of hard work gone into plan but by amateurs with no training in town planning or experience in taking objective overview. Summary of concerns:</p> <p>Assuming the allocation of lots of land in Ascot will let S’hill and S’dale off hook is naïve. Permission will be granted if no good planning reason why not.</p>			Comments noted.
			<p>Number of houses to be accommodated not known, but level of development in Ascot HS will completely change it. NP proposing far too much development for Ascot area especially with impact of other major local developments and the DERA and Bracknell town centre developments.</p> <p>If it must be housing it should be affordable, so why so much land for detached housing?</p> <p>Very sceptical that the more attractive elements of PF plan will ever be implemented.</p>	NP/SS1		<p>Your concerns are noted.</p> <p>Our policies call for a mix of housing types and sizes.</p> <p>Ascot Centre policy includes a number of requirements which must be delivered as part of the overall rejuvenation plan.</p>
			Plan emphasis too much on housing and not on key issues of parking in Sunningdale.	Sunningdale		Both policies NP/SS6 and SS7 relate to the provision of additional car parking in Sunningdale.
			Not convinced that NP strategy will allow refusal of planning apps on Sunnings gardens and backland.	NP/EN4		<p>Policy provides parameters for what development is appropriate for gardens in our NP area.</p> <p>Policy wording has been amended to aid clarity.</p>
			Once GB status removed from High Street field, it will be a developers’ bonanza, notwithstanding promised development briefs. Not in favour of removing GB designation.			Ascot Centre policies set out the requirements for redevelopment in this area.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			More needed about helping Sunninghill, South Ascot and Sunningdale to thrive with more parking, including affordable parking for local people using stations.			Parking is addressed through our policy NP/T1 and a number of strategic site policies.
47.	Not given	Anne Yarwood	Rest of so-called 'proposals' relate to sites which come forward anyway, with or without the NP			Development will take place with or without a NP, subject to national guidelines and Borough policies. The policies in the NP will become part of the Development Plan for the area and will influence the type of development that is in keeping with the character of our area and where it should go.
			Housing: support emphasis on "mixed" developments to include housing that "our children can afford". Welcome consensus against mansions and large flats. Welcome DG5.			Thank you for your support.
			Retail: sustaining and developing local High Streets welcomed Trees: Agree RBWM should be far more proactive on TPO enforcement Biodiversity: welcome EN5 and praise such long term thinking, particularly support green corridors Support T2 Cycle routes Ascot High Street proposals: support all aspects			Thank you for your support.
			Projects: Support Bus, Biodiversity and School. Oppose Heatherwood SANG: do not wish to see any sale or housebuilding plans progressed until future service provision at hospital has been settled.			Thank you for your support. The suggested area for SANG at Heatherwood is GB. Whilst the NP fully supports the community's desire to retain a hospital on the Heatherwood site, this site is a Major Developed Site in GB and NP policies cannot stop it from being redeveloped. Our Heatherwood policy will enable us to

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
						influence the type and nature of any development that may occur, based on community feedback received through consultation.
48.		Steve Kay (S'hill Saints Sports Club)	Support relocation of St. Michael's school to gasholder site but concern that it could jeopardise use of the field by junior football club.	NP/SS8		Your comment is noted and will be passed on.
49.		Planning Perspectives for National Grid	We ask that Map 22 is updated (title plan provided)	NP/SS8		Suggestion is noted. New map shows site for redevelopment.
			Disappointing that the intro text makes no reference to fact site is in a sustainable and accessible location. Just off the High Street, well placed for future residents to walk to local schools, health centres and employment opportunities in Sunninghill town centre. Statement that site is not near a station and bus services are very limited is misleading, as site is within 2 km of Ascot Station, considered by Institute of Highways and Transportation as being acceptable walking distance for commuting.	NP/SS8		Comments noted. Text states site is in central Sunninghill. Bus services are very limited and the site is approximately 30 minutes walk from Ascot station which is further than most of our other strategic sites.
			Introductory text also refers to community feedback suggesting a strong desire to limit amount of inappropriate flatted development. We raised concerns re this in Jan 2013, that the option for flats on this site has never been put to residents objectively and now policy only refers to housing. Disappointing as site is relatively self-contained and could provide a range of dwelling types without impacting on character or amenity of existing residential area.	NP/SS8 and NP/SS8.2(a)		Comment noted. Policy has been amended to allow the possibility of some flatted development subject to other policy conditions being met. In view of the consistent feedback from community consultations against too much flatted development, there is still a strong

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Request SS8.2(a) amended to include “a mix of houses and flats”.			preference for houses over flats on this site.
			Text refers to two small wooded areas which should be substantially retained. It is unsound to restrict development potential by stating extent of tree coverage in policy formation rather than through an arboricultural assessment at the time of a planning appn.	NP/SS8	NPPF para 17 ref planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings. NPPF para 183 ref Neighbourhood Planning giving communities power to develop vision for their area and deliver sustainable development	It is not a requirement in the Policy that these wooded areas should be retained; it is presented as a suggestion. The areas would still be subject to our Tree policy EN3 (to which some amendments have been made) and other policies.
			Our considered opinion is that Development Brief is not necessary and development proposals on this site can be dealt with through a planning appn. Request this requirement is deleted.	NP/SS8.1	NPPF para 17 ref planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings. NPPF para 183 ref Neighbourhood Planning giving communities power to develop vision for their area and deliver sustainable development	Disagree. The requirement for a Development Brief provides a clear framework and a mechanic to facilitate an informed and effective consultation with the local community early in the planning process.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
					NPPF paras 66, 188 – 191 early engagement and working closely with those affected.	
			Wording of introduction too prescriptive. Request word “requirements” replaced with “objectives”.	NP/SS8.2		Your view is noted.
			<p>Current wording unsound: a plan should be consistent with national policy – ref NPPF para 32.</p> <p>Request policy reworded to refer to “severe” impact.</p>	NP/SS8.2(c)	NPPF para 32 ref Transport Statement or Transport Assessment for developments that generate significant amounts of movement	Development in an area cannot be divorced from consequences on traffic management or other sustainability criteria. Proposed policy is proportionate having regard to the existing traffic congestion in S’hill.
			<p>No proportionate evidence been submitted why a single access through Bridge Rd should not be permitted hence this approach cannot be justified. Appendix 2 is Technical note which finds that access to site for up to 100 units can be achieved through Bridge Rd with a package of off-site highway works. So dual access will only be required if site developed with more than 100 units.</p> <p>Request policy re-worded: “... traffic movement resulting from this development will not be severe on overall levels of congestion in Sunninghill High Street and the surrounding area. A single vehicle access only to the site via Bridge Road is acceptable, provided this is justified in the independent traffic assessment.”</p>	NP/SS8.2(c)	NPPF 17 and 183	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Issues of access will be addressed through the Development Brief process.</p> <p>Note that there has been a second traffic report submitted in response to this consultation which sets out a case for access solely through Cavendish Meads.</p> <p>RBWM Highways Services have stated a preference for the development to be served through Cavendish Meads.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Cavendish Meads is in private ownership and pedestrian and cycle ways from there to S’hill High St may not be possible. Intention to allow for cycle/pedestrian connections up to boundary of site with Cavendish Meads.</p> <p>Request policy amended to delete reference “from Cavendish Meads through the site to Sunninghill High St”.</p>	NP/SS8.2(e)	NPPF 29 -30 sustainable transport	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that this cannot necessarily be delivered entirely on your land, it is considered to be an essential part of this policy. Any application should not limit the delivery of this in any way. No change proposed to the policy.</p>
			<p>In particular circumstances of this site, we consider it reasonable to provide 10% of total area as open green space rather than the 15% specified. Request policy amended.</p>	NP/SS8.2(f)		<p>Particular circumstances not set out.</p> <p>There is an identified lack of open green space in this part of our NP area which it is important to address. No change to the policy.</p>
			<p>Request policy amended to refer to “parking relating to the development”.</p>	NP/SS8.2(d)		<p>Policy has been amended.</p>
			<p>Request policy deleted.</p>	NP/SS8.3		<p>Policy <i>supports</i> the option, should it be put forward, it does not mandate it.</p> <p>Policy retained.</p>
			<p>Policy is unsound. To ensure it is consistent with national policy it should be re-worded to state “... result in severe cumulative traffic impacts in Sunninghill High Street...”</p>	NP/SV1	Localism Act and NP (General) Regs	<p>We disagree policy is unsound.</p> <p>Development in an area cannot be divorced from consequences on traffic management or other sustainability criteria. Proposed policy is proportionate having regard to the existing traffic congestion in S’hill.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Policy is unsound. Development Brief not considered necessary for sites already covered under strategic site policies in the emerging plan. Further restrictions or requirements set out in a Development Brief may be too burdensome, especially where an end developer for a site is unknown. In any event, planning apps required to be consulted on widely with local communities so not necessary to include requirement for Development Brief.</p> <p>Request policy is removed.</p>	NP/H1	<p>Localism Act and NP (General) Regs</p> <p>NPPF 17 and 183</p> <p>NPPF paras 66, 188 – 191 early engagement and working closely with those affected</p>	<p>We disagree policy is unsound.</p> <p>The requirement for a Development Brief will provide an opportunity for local residents to be consulted and to influence design.</p>
			<p>Policy unsound. Worded to restrict development proposals for new flats in certain areas. Too restrictive. Instead policy should be encouraging new flats in areas where such development is sustainable and in keeping with the area.</p>	NP/H3	<p>Localism Act and NP (General) Regs</p> <p>NPPF 17, 50 and 183</p>	<p>We disagree policy is unsound.</p> <p>The intent of policy H3 re flats/apartments is to ensure that flatted development only occurs in sustainable locations and where they will not adversely impact the character of the area – natural, built and social.</p>
50.		Paul Dickinson for Wates	<p>Support allocation of site for residential development and use of Cavendish Meads for access. Wates owns land at Cavendish Meads which would provide suitable and safe access to site instead of Bridge Rd which is very constrained and we consider unsuitable. We consider it important that the NP considers and sets out clear guidance on access requirements appropriate.</p>	NP/SS8	NPPF para 157 ref local plans should allocate sites to promote development	Comments are noted.
			<p>A number of concerns about this policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fails to explain which dual accesses being considered. In our view both Bridge Rd and Charters Lane severely constrained in highway and environmental terms - 	NP/SS8.2(c)		Your comments are noted.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No detailed assessment of highway implications of dual vehicle accesses on S’hill HS and local roads - No detailed assessment of amenity implications of dual access on other residential properties and environment - Dual access policy appears to be based on community feedback to past consultations but flawed as did not include option for access through only Cavendish Meads - 			
			<p>Highway Authority has confirmed access through Cavendish Meads is their strong preference.</p>	<p>NP/SS8.2(c)</p>		<p>RBWM Highways Services have stated a preference for the development to be served through Cavendish Meads.</p>
			<p>Have met with NP Transport TG and shared work done by Highway Consultants – report supplied. Report demonstrates how safe vehicular access can be achieved through Cavendish Meads to ensure site can deliver housing within Plan period. Report also assessed Bridge Rd and identified technical and physical constraints indicating it’s not suitable to deal with a material increase in traffic and no realistic scope for improvements.</p> <p>We consider final version of NP should identify Cavendish Meads as the appropriate access to serve future development of the site.</p>	<p>NP/SS8.2(c)</p>		<p>Thank you for the report and your comments are noted.</p> <p>Note that a second traffic report has been submitted in response to this consultation which sets out sets out a case for access through Bridge Road.</p>
51.		<p>Gerald Eve for Cabinet Office ref Sunningdale Park</p>	<p>We consider wording of EN1.2 should be altered to read: “A planning application for development in GB <u>outside Major Developed Areas</u> under the “very special circumstances”...”</p>	<p>NP/EN1.2</p>		<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>EN1.2 has been amended.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			We consider an error may have been made with ref to the MDS area shown on Map 23. Map in RBWM's Adopted Plan includes Pepys building and tennis courts.	NP/SS9.1 Map 23		Map has been amended to reflect current extent of the MDS.
			In table below Map 4 would like site allocation to be for "Employment with housing" (not "limited housing" as at present). Also in SS9.1 would like sentence "primarily the site remains in employment use" removed, especially as contradicted by SS9.2	NP/SS9.1 and Map 4 Strategic Sites		Text in Table changed to: "Employment plus potentially housing" Policy SS9 has been re-drafted.
			<p>We propose wording in both policies altered to provide alternative option to marketing of viability assessment; policy currently offers no flexibility. Also, if site has to be marketed for 12 months could lead to dis-benefits to community including risk of illegal occupation and vandalism.</p> <p>Suggest amend E1.1 to read: "Proposals for the redevelopment or change of use of an existing employment use will only be permitted if the applicant demonstrates that all possible appropriate alternative employment options (including occupation by micro or small businesses) have been considered through a detailed viability assessment."</p> <p>Also consider SS9.2 should read: "In the event that, having considered all possible appropriate through a detailed viability assessment is undertaken to determine whether the site can remain in employment use, an application for a change of use for part or all of the site for use as residential may be considered provided:..."</p> <p>Sub-para (b): replace "significant" with "appropriate" community benefits.</p>	NP/E1.1 and NP/SS9.2	NPPF para 160 Local Authorities should "work closely with the business community to understand their changing needs and identify and address barriers to investment, including a lack of housing, infrastructure or viability"	Your comments are noted. Policy SS9 has been amended.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Wholly appropriate to have Development Brief but opposed to way in which it should be set out – currently too prescriptive. Prefer to see contents as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary Introduction and Objectives Site Information Policy Context Development Principles Design Principles Sustainability Implementation and Monitoring <p>Also, timing and phasing should be indicative.</p>	NP/SS9.2(a) and Appendix D	<p>NPPF 17 and 183</p> <p>NPPF paras 66, 188 – 191 early engagement and working closely with those affected</p>	<p>The requirements on a Development Brief is that they should include all relevant information needed to facilitate an informed and effective consultation with the local community. For this to be meaningful there has to be sufficient detail for the development proposals to be understood and envisioned by the local community. The requirements listed in Appendix D (now Appendix C) deliver this.</p> <p>Point with regard to timing and phasing is noted and wording has been amended to reflect this.</p>
52.	SL5 0AP	Mike Bateman	<p>Plan echoes many fears and ideas of local residents.</p> <p>Larch Avenue should be totally residential. Remove hotel and conference facilities and replace by houses appropriate to the street. Do not want school or any educational or commercial enterprise.</p>	NP/SS9	<p>NPPF 18, 22 and 89 – economic growth, avoiding long term protection of sites and exceptions to inappropriate development in green belt.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p> <p>The policy wording has been redrafted but the preference still remains for it to include uses that provide jobs.</p>
53.	SL5 7PY	Savills for ICL Silwood	<p>Register appreciation for time NP members have afforded during background stages of evidence gathering. Since then, ICL's plans have progressed further.</p>			<p>Thank you.</p>
			<p>Suggest additional wording as on p. 10: “To support the retention and enhancement of an internationally renowned research and higher education presence at Silwood Park, and the development of the economic role which this plays in the local area”</p>	Main Aims p.10		<p>Your comment is noted.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Suggest additional bullet point at bottom of p.11: "Support the retention and enhancement of research excellence and higher education at Imperial College London's Silwood Park Campus, including associated development required to enable it to become a centre of international importance."	Section 5.1		Your comment is noted.
			Current designation for Silwood Park a misrepresentation of key aims and operations for the site and suggest it is amended to "Education, research, associated employment and Residential"	Section 5.3.2		Your comment is noted but we disagree that there was a misrepresentation. Text has been amended to read: "Education, research, other associated employment and associated residential."
			<p>Changes and aspirations for Silwood Park Campus fully endorsed by ICL. However, formally note that an appropriate quantum of residential development will be required on this site to enable this wider academic vision to be realised, some of which is likely to be outside the MDS boundary. Request revised wording to NP/SS10 as follows:</p> <p>Proposals for residential development at Silwood Park will be the subject of a Masterplanning process. Previously developed sites within the MDS Boundary which are not required for wider educational and research use will be the focus of such residential development and only after these areas have been reviewed will enabling development on GB land be considered.</p> <p>NP/SS10.1 Development proposals to redevelop all or part of the existing MDS at Silwood Park as shown on Map 24 shall be permitted subject to considerations of traffic impact and design. Proposals that retain its current use as an</p>	NP/SS10	NPPF paras 79-80 and 87-89 ref purpose of GB and exceptions to inappropriate development	Your comments are noted. Whilst we support ICL's aspirations for Silwood, there is strong community desire to protect GB, particularly where undeveloped. Policy SS10 has been amended.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			education, training and research facility will be favoured.			
			SS10.2 Proposals to provide on site accommodation on Silwood Campus for students and staff shall be permitted subject to considerations of traffic impact and design	NP/SS10.2	NPPF paras 79-80 and 87-89 ref purpose of GB and exceptions to inappropriate development	Your comment is noted.
54.	SL5 7PU	Sean Scott-Hayward	Think it's a really first class job and achieved a sound result. Much depends on how sensibly Plan will be interpreted. Problem with much development is the removal of so much of the vegetation and tree cover, particularly along road frontage.			Thank you for your comments and support.
			Silwood Park Business Park being re-designated for academic/research puzzling as original planning concept was to make it a technology transfer centre for use by businesses associated with academia.	NP/SS10		Comment noted.
			Not much reference to safe pedestrian pavements between settlements. Many pavements are narrow and traffic passes quite closely; note specially narrow section from Sunninghill roundabout past Victory Field.			Comment noted. We have included the need to improve pedestrian routes where possible.
			Thanks to everyone who gave their time so selflessly to product such a professional document on behalf of the community.			Thank you.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
55.	SL5 0BX	Fraye Farrow	Bearing in mind local community concern that development is harming area character, putting social fabric at risk and putting pressure on infrastructure through increased traffic and parking demand all of which will impact on village viability, we have following points:			Comment noted
			GP surgeries are Not adequately equipped; appointments have to be made 2 weeks in advance	5.3.6		The level of service in GP surgeries is a matter for the surgeries themselves and is outside the scope of a NP.
			Other than Project, how are you addressing need for more school places	5.3.6		Provision of school places is a matter for the Borough. As it is a matter of concern among local residents, we have defined a Project to work with RBWM to identify a suitable location for a new primary school.
			Building flats in place of one house increases traffic tenfold. Why flats at Broomhall but not 500m away at Station? Development will cause enormous disruption to surrounding neighbourhood and roads. Why more housing in Sunningdale when 2,500 homes being developed at DERA 2 minutes away by train/7 minutes by car?	6.2.3/ 7.2/ 8.6		Your comments are noted. Our policies were developed based on feedback from public consultations. DERA is a site outside our boundaries and neither we nor the Borough have an influence on what takes place there other than to make representations.
			Several retail units empty (Sunningdale). What is being done to assist/redevelop existing businesses? Local Cllr says a Tesco store will be built at Broomhall. Is this true? If so, why not in Plan? Is proposed retail development to benefit Sunningdale or DERA development?	4/ 5.1/ 5.3.1	NPPF para 23 ref guidance to ensuring vitality of town centres	The NP Steering Group is not aware of any agreement for a Tesco store to be built at Broomhall. Policy SS6 sets out to deliver an enhanced retail offering for Sunningdale.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Transport: Have you consulted SW Trains? Service already at capacity and more residential will impact on struggling commuter service. If more train services, there will be increased congestion on A30 due to level crossing, which will negatively impact working days of commuters. Junction of Broomhall Lane and A30 always busy specially at rush hour. Increased retail and residential will compound this. Where is proposed access to car park - A30 or Broomhall Lane?</p>	8.5		<p>Your comments are noted. Traffic congestion is an issue in Sunningdale and our policy SS6 includes a requirement for road improvements.</p> <p>Upgrading train capacity is a matter for the franchisee, currently SW Trains and is outside the scope of a NP.</p> <p>The requirement for a Development Brief will provide an opportunity for local residents to be consulted and to influence design.</p>
56.	Not given	Mary Simpson	<p>Congratulations to the team on proposed plan. Very few comments to make and feel it reflects very well the views of the Community.</p>			<p>Thank you for your comments, appreciated.</p>
			<p>Ascot is a unique town and if it has to be redeveloped let it be done in a style fitting its prominence and not made into a carbon copy of the disastrous planning which has been allowed in many of our market towns.</p>	NP/SS1		<p>Your comments are noted.</p>
			<p>St. Michael's School is included as a landmark building and view and it should not be moved to the Gasholder site. If it's moved what will be done with the site – a new use may create even greater traffic pressure in S'hill. And are additional school places for pupils outside our area? A second primary school should be built instead on land offered by the Racecourse</p>	NP/SS8		<p>St. Michael's School building is listed as one of our Landmarks and is protected by our policy DG4, even if it were no longer a school.</p> <p>It is a Borough responsibility to ensure there are sufficient school places. As it is a matter of concern among local residents, we have defined a Project (section 9.4) to work with RBWM to identify a suitable location for a new primary school.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Borough have applied for Judicial Review of NHS's decision to close Heatherwood. If this succeeds and the whole site is retained as a hospital where will proposed housing be re-sited to?	NP/SS5		Even if Heatherwood is retained (which we hope is the case), our understanding is that it is unlikely the whole site will be required and that therefore the rest of the area will still be proposed by the NHS for development.
			Plan refers to our narrow roads and their use by HGVs. Why cannot weight restrictions be imposed?			Weight restrictions are not part of the scope of a NP which is mainly related to spatial issues.
			What are the Strategic Housing Numbers required by the Borough from our NP and, more important, who are they intended to house? Compared with Windsor and Maidenhead, for our size we have the largest developed area. Their residents should be housed in their own areas.			Your comments are noted. Setting a housing target is a matter for RBWM. The new Local Plan is currently being developed and this will determine housing targets for the Borough based on assessments of housing need.
57.	SL5 0BX	Paul McDonald	Concerned that development on these sites will not take into consideration statements in the Borough LP and will exacerbate no 8: 1. LPs are required to include policies in respect of conservation and the natural beauty and amenity of the land. 2. The improvement of the physical environment. 3. The management of traffic. 4. The protection and enhancement of the environment. 5. Encourages the alternative use of transport. 6. Reinforces the importance of the Green Belt - particularly at the urban fringe. 7. Policies for development need to be co-ordinated with policies and programmes for transport infrastructure (not just parking) and management of the transport system. 8. The many problems encountered in the Borough with growth on damage to the urban	SS6 and SS7	NPPF 17 and 183-185	Your concerns are noted. We have worked closely with RBWM and they are fully aware of the contents of our NP and comfortable that it is in conformity with the strategic elements of the BLP and their thinking in relation to the emerging LP.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			and rural environment and the inability of services to keep pace with development.			
			Surgery in S'dale requires booking several weeks in advance	Section 5.3.6		The level of service in GP surgeries is a matter for the surgeries themselves and is outside the scope of a NP.
			How does proposed development address problem with lack of primary school places?			It is a Borough responsibility to ensure there are sufficient school places. As it is a matter of concern among local residents, we have defined a Project to work with RBWM to identify a suitable location for a new primary school.
			More flatted development has knock on effect on traffic. Fail to see how flatted development in Broomhall Centre is appropriate whereas it will be refused at Station Car Park.	Sections 6.2.3, 7.2 and 8.6		Community feedback was strongly against more flats at Station Car Park but accepting of residential development being included in the Broomhall Centre scheme.
			Fail to see how increasing parking at Waitrose or Broomhall will reduce traffic. What consideration has been given to impact of DERA? Consideration of DERA on S'dale roads? Increased parking will impact on traffic flow.	5.3.1 and Transport		Your concerns are noted. Both our policies SS6 and SS7 include a requirements to take traffic considerations into account.
			Do not object to redevelopment of car park but changing residential and GB land to other use should be rejected. Ancient hedgerow to East boundary of Broomhall Lane should be maintained. Any consideration given to including the 2 office blocks into development scheme? Encroaching into GB sets dangerous precedent.	NP/SS6	NPPF paras 79-80 and 87-89 ref purpose of GB and exceptions to inappropriate development	The area designated as Broomhall Centre does not include any land that is in Green Belt. The owners of the office blocks are currently not interested in being included in the scheme.
			Until train capacity is upgraded there should be no more residential development in S'dale.			Upgrading train capacity is a matter for the franchisee, currently SW Trains and is outside the scope of a NP.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
58.	SL5 8PF	Catharine Paige	Support intention and content of proposed NP and have following comments:			Thank you for your support – appreciated.
			Should apply not only to new dwellings but to extensions and replacement dwellings. Need to ensure housing is built in strategic areas identified and not through windfall sites replacing smaller houses with much larger ones which reduces garden sizes, animal habitats and the much appreciated green and leafy surroundings.	NP/EN4		Your comments are noted. The Gardens policy has been amended for better clarity. Including extensions would be unduly onerous and many in fact no longer require planning permission.
			Biodiversity: Preamble words good but the policies only aim to try to mitigate any harmful effects of development and not to enhance biodiversity and habitats.	NP/EN5	NPPF Section 11	EN5 has been amended to reflect comments received from Natural England and BBOWT.
			How do we avoid developers splitting appns so that each are under the 0.4 ha/10 dwellings?	NP/H1		A threshold has been set because it is not realistic to insist on a Development Brief for all planning applications.
			What about the town houses that are being crammed in – eg. Sovereign Mews and Beechcroft Close – these developments can be as tall and densely packs as apartments. Hopefully DG1 will cover this.	NP/H3 and NP/DG1		Your comments are noted.
			Also about density of housing v gardens – need to ensure gardens are large enough and the house does not take up too much of the plot. DG2 addresses this.	NP/DG1.3 and NP/DG2		Your comments are noted.
			Heatherwood site must protect and provide public access to prehistoric round barrow. Excavations in 1973 dated it to c. 1800BC.	NP/SS5		Policy SS5 has been amended to include this.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Cycle route down St. George's Lane not safe while Shorts still there due to lorries.	NP/T2		The options for cycle routes have been amended.
			Magnolia House could move to opposite side of Station Rd into Sunningdale Park where the "stables" were. Alternatively into S'dale but not to Lynwood – too close to another GP surgery.	NP/SS9		Your points are noted.
			There should be requirement to enhance public access to open spaces whenever possible – eg. S'dale Park (government owned). If it became privately owned need to increase access to parkland and lose access	NP/SS9		Your comment is noted. The S'dale Park policy has been amended.
			Silwood Park – opportunity for public footpath/access?	NP/SS10		Your comment is noted. Silwood Park policy has been amended.
			There should be a requirement for developments to always provide access through sites to link area better for pedestrians.	Transport		NP/DG3.1 has been amended to refer to safe access for pedestrians.
59.	SL5 0AJ	BEN Lynwood	I think there is much to commend in the plan and we are grateful for the acknowledgment of contribution that new BEN Lynwood village will make to the wider community. Our planning consultant, John Sneddon of Tetlow King, has a couple of concerns, which I endorse:			Thank you for your comments. No response received from Tetlow King.
			The whole of Lynwood site falls within GB and there is already a requirement for us to make a case for 'very special circumstances' for any planning proposal – as was the case for Lynwood village currently under development. See no reason for additional protection for remainder of the site. Do not believe that highlighted land north of railway provides an	NP/EN2 map 6(e)	NPPF paras 17, 109 and 183	The policy on gaps between the villages and the extent of each gap have been extensively consulted on and there is very strong support for them. This includes the land you refer to.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			effective gap between Sunninghill and Sunningdale. Land is bordered by railway on one side and houses in Park Crescent on the other. Highlighted land to south of railway may well form an effective gap but not true north of the line.			
			Also concerned re requirement for majority community support for any planning submission as this seems a wholly unreasonable and unrealistic test that could undermine any proposal that could on balance be in the interests of the community.	NP/EN1 and NP/EN2 and Appendix E		The requirement for majority community support has been removed.
60.		S'dale PC	<p>The PC made following comments at its planning meeting on 23 July: NP as presented is excellent and displays commendable amount of hard work and dedication.</p> <p>Concern over lack of definition on what is meant by sustainability is a weakness that needs to be addressed. Council offers a definition with Venn diagram.</p>			The concept of sustainability underpins the entire NPPF and the NP. Not appropriate to have a specific NP definition.
			<p>Doctor's surgery at Lynwood: Sustainability of health care for S'dale community requires improvements to Primary Health Provision. Magnolia House surgery has strong backing from its patients to move to a purpose built surgery on Lynwood site where they have been offered land, thus making it a viable financial proposition. Proposed draft plans being prepared will include the landscaping of the field so as not to lose sense of green space.</p> <p>Council has argued there was a stronger case for allowing development of doctor's surgery rather</p>		NPPF paras 17, 109 and 183	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The NP SG supports SPC's desire to assist Magnolia House Surgery to relocate. However, the site mentioned falls within an identified gap between villages and it is therefore considered that more appropriate sites are available.</p> <p>The policy on gaps between the villages and the extent of each gap have been extensively consulted on and there is very</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			than leaving scrub land as a “gap” between village and that exceptional circumstances can be argued for extending development in GB on this site.			strong support for them.
61.	not given	J Croxton	Re Sunningdale drainage situation dire; difficult to see a doctor; trains already jam-packed; traffic too dense. Sunningdale is a village and hasn't got infrastructure to cope with all this development. Totally against.	NP/SS6 and NP/SS7		<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Development will take place with or without a NP, subject to national guidelines and Borough policies. If the NP is voted for, the NP policies will become part of the Development Plan for the area and will influence the type of development that takes place and where it should go.</p> <p>Traffic considerations are requirements of both SS6 and SS7.</p> <p>Upgrading train capacity is a matter for the franchisee, currently SW Trains, and outside the scope of a NP.</p> <p>The level of service in GP surgeries is a matter for the surgeries themselves and is outside the scope of a NP.</p>
62.	SL5 0LD	Roger Mills	Pleased to support direction of the NP. Specially to see it considers need for improving facilities alongside growth and a medical facility for Sunningdale.	NP/SS6		Thank you for your support.
			Concerned proposals should not be taken as set in stone; future planning apps should take account of local needs and the Community. Proposal to maintain separateness of villages should not limit possible future developments which would be of community benefit.	NP/EN2		Your comment is noted.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
63.	SL5 ODG	M & J Rimell	Opposed to any form of large anchor store such as a supermarket on S'dale Broomhall Centre	NP/SS6		Your comment is noted.
			Opposed to any standalone flats/apartments being included in the plan. No objection to flats above retail outlets.	NP/SS6 and NP/H3	<p>NPPF para 17 ref planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings.</p> <p>NPPF para 183 ref Neighbourhood Planning giving communities power to develop vision for their area and deliver sustainable development.</p> <p>NPPF para 50 ref delivering a wide choice of homes and meeting housing needs</p> <p>NPPF paras 58, 60 and 61 requiring good design.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p> <p>Our policy H3 identifies locations at which flats are considered appropriate and sustainable.</p> <p>Policy H3 has been amended.</p>
			Medical centre if included should be either in addition to Magnolia House or much larger	NP/SS6		Your comment is noted.
			Parking a concern; if extra capacity to be accommodated, it would reduce retail and small business space and even more if public open space and medical centre included	NP/SS6		<p>Your comment is noted.</p> <p>The requirement for a Development Brief will provide an opportunity for local residents to be consulted and to influence design.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Hope buffer strip of land to rear of properties in Broomhall Lane, now wooded area good for flora/fauna, will remain	NP/SS6		Comment is noted.
64.	SL5 0BX	Marcel Tay	Concern residents in affected areas not given opportunity to comment.			<p>Details of the consultation process is set out in the Statement of Consultation.</p> <p>During the NP's development we have made serious efforts to keep people informed.</p>
			Firmly opposed to any plan to increase residential properties until infrastructure, specially road and train services can cope with increased demand			<p>Your comment is noted.</p> <p>Our policies include requirements for infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>Upgrading train capacity is a matter for the franchisee, currently SW Trains, and is outside the scope of a NP.</p>
			Opposed to development on any GB. Re Sunningdale Broomhall Centre, any development should only include RBWM car park and not surrounding GB.	NP/SS6		None of the land included in Broomhall Centre proposal is in Green Belt.
			Agree there is lack of parking around Chobham Rd and supportive of additional but restricted by time limits for use by shoppers and visitors and not commuters	NP/SS6		Comment is noted.
			Firmly oppose additional car parking at station which would encourage commuters from surrounding areas. Trains already overcrowded.	NP/SS7		<p>The option of double decking the Station car park received overall support in our Options consultation.</p> <p>Train overcrowding a matter for the rail franchisee, currently SW Trains, and not part of the scope of the NP.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
65.	SL5 0BX	Ian Luxton	I agree with SS6.1 and SS6.5. With respect to SS6.2 would wish to see access to be only from the A30 as Broomhall Lane is unable to cope with current traffic levels	NP/SS6.2		<p>The requirement for a Development Brief will provide an opportunity for local residents to be consulted and to influence the design of any development, including the issue of access.</p> <p>Traffic considerations are a requirement of the scheme.</p>
			Wish to restrict height of any development to fit with current surrounding dwellings so limited to 2 storeys. Perimeter should be landscaped to shield it from view, especially northeastern flank that is currently mature trees. These trees should be retained as a condition of any development and policy wording should include this. 500 sq m restriction is too large as allows major supermarket. Further supermarket will attract increased traffic from non-residents.	NP/SS6.3		<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>The requirement for a Development Brief will provide an opportunity for local residents to be consulted and to influence such issues.</p> <p>The protection of trees is addressed through our Tree policy EN3.</p>
			Include that Proposal designs must include consideration of traffic and pedestrian movement both within the development site and over the areas adjacent to the site and an impact assessment on traffic flow on the A30 considering both general traffic movement levels and peak period levels	SS6.4		SS6.2 includes a requirement to take into account potential increases in traffic.
66.	Not given	Richard Hearn	Thanks for preparing NP. Comment about parking: concerned that lack of parking leading to decline of shops and restaurants in Sunningdale. Proposals for more parking in Broomhall Centre and double decking Station and Waitrose car parks should give substantial improvement in long term. However car parking needs improving now and consider many of the present on street parking restrictions should be lifted until sufficient	Parking and NP/SS6 and NP/SS7		Thank you for your comments which have been noted.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			on street parking is available.			
67.		Daniel Watney LLP for Hawks Meadow Properties	Representations focus on NP consultation process and lack of credible and robust evidence. Also lack of recognition of NPPF with regard to town centre retail policies and Development Plan Document Tests of Soundness as per NPPF para 182.	Section 8.5 NP/SS6		Your comments are noted. Evidence has been compiled as part of developing policies, this is available in the evidence pack that will be submitted alongside the Neighbourhood Plan.
			Site 1.69 ha (map provided)	NP/SS6		NP has letter on record from one of the landowners within the site area that they do not wish to promote their site for development (New and Old Boundary House). Map in NP therefore excludes this land. Area being promoted for development is as in the proposed Plan.
			Hawks Meadow in collaboration with St. John's College, are promoting the development of the Broomhall Site.	NP/SS6	St. John's is only one of the landowners of the promoted area.	Comment noted.
			Consultation process was biased and insufficiently robust and did not allow community to comment on development of Sunningdale's retail centre. Questions re supermarket worded to highlight perceived negatives. Some consultation questions were "leading questions". Resultant evidence base therefore lacks all credibility. We suggest consultation process is undertaken again.	NP/SS6		Your comments are noted. We disagree that the Options consultation process or any other consultation process were biased. Details of the consultation process are set out in the Statement of Consultation. The Options consultation is only one part of our evidence base.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			NP incorrectly defines Sunningdale as a village centre and attempts to prevent categorisation within NPPF as a Town Centre. Misleading to residents.	NP/SS6	NPPF Section 2 ref promoting the vitality of town centres	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>We disagree that referring to S'dale as a village is misleading. S'dale according to the 2011 Census has 2,135 households and its residents think of it and refer to it as a village.</p> <p>Its official designation is that of a District Centre within the retail hierarchy of City/Town/District/Local centres. It is recognised that the term "town centre" is also used to describe any centre within this hierarchy.</p>
			Plan errs in ruling out provision of a supermarket in this location as this is in direct conflict with NPPF policies on Town Centre uses, which cover District centres. Sunningdale is a key district centre requiring a competitive retail presence. Broomhall Centre is clearly being promoted for a supermarket, which aligns with uses appropriate to town centres, is available and deliverable. Supermarket required to ensure the vitality of Sunningdale.	NP/SS6	<p>NPPF para 23 ref guidance to ensuring vitality of town centres</p> <p>NPPF paras 17 and 183 Neighbourhood Planning giving communities power to develop vision for their area and deliver sustainable development</p> <p>NPPF para 184 – right types of development in a local area</p> <p>LP saved policy S1</p> <p>RBWM Executive Summary of Windsor and Maidenhead Retail Capacity</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. We disagree that the policy is in direct conflict with the NPPF or that a supermarket is <i>required</i> to ensure the vitality of S'dale.</p> <p>It is noted that a supermarket is an appropriate town centre use. Sunningdale is a small centre of 2,135 households and its current retail offering reflects this. Our policy intent is to deliver more retail that will complement the existing retailers in the centre. It does not preclude a supermarket but instead looks to manage the size of units being delivered.</p> <p>LP policy S1 says "new retail development will be permitted where this would enhance the attractiveness and viability of existing centres, <i>provided that the proposal is of a scale commensurate with the size, character and role of the centre</i>, can be integrated into the existing shopping centre</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
					Update 2009 RBWM Retail Health Check 2011	area.....”
			NP does not meet the Test of Soundness as required by NPPF para 182. Nor does it support the key economic and social strands for sustainable development in the NPPF.	NP/SS6	NPPF para 182 Localism Act NP(General) Regs	We disagree. When considering the content of a Neighbourhood Plan an independent examiner’s role is limited to testing whether or not a draft NP meets the basic conditions, and other matters set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The independent examiner is not testing the soundness of a NP or examining other material considerations.
			Requirement for a Development Brief introduces an inappropriate additional level of control.	NP/SS6	NPPF para 17 and 183 ref planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings. NPPF paras 66, 188 – 191 early engagement and working closely with those affected.	The NPPF supports the principle of early engagement of the community in planning applications and their involvement in planning decisions. The requirement for a Development Brief provides an opportunity for local residents to be consulted and to influence design at an early stage in the process.
			Sunningdale Broomhall Centre provides an excellent opportunity for a mixed-use redevelopment enhancing Sunningdale. It is inappropriate to rule out a supermarket in this location, which will contribute to the retail vitality of the area and provide a competitive retail environment	NP/SS6	NPPF para 17 ref planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings.	Your comments are noted. Our policy does not preclude a supermarket but instead looks to manage the size of units being delivered.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
					NPPF para 23 – diverse retail offer reflecting the individuality of town centres.	
68.		Savills for St. John's College Cambridge	St. John's joint landowner of S'dale Broomhall Centre site. Supports principle of a NP and in particular that this site has been shown capable of accommodating both residential and retail uses. Keen to see a final form of NP adopted ASAP to provide framework for development in S'dale and avoid unsolicited planning apps for random sites.	NP/SS6		Your comments and support noted.
			Principle of an Anchor Store: Anchor store entirely appropriate for a town centre location and accords with NPPF	NP/SS6.3	<p>NPPF para 23 ref guidance to ensuring vitality of town centres</p> <p>NPPF paras 17 and 183 Neighbourhood Planning giving communities power to develop vision for their area and deliver sustainable development</p> <p>NPPF para 184 – right types of development in a local area</p> <p>LP saved policy S1</p> <p>RBWM Executive Summary of Windsor and Maidenhead Retail Capacity</p>	<p>It is noted that a supermarket is an appropriate town centre use. Sunningdale is a small centre of 2,135 households and its current retail offering reflects this. Our policy intent is to deliver more retail that will complement the existing retailers in the centre. It does not preclude a supermarket but instead looks to manage the size of units being delivered.</p> <p>LP policy S1 says “new retail development will be permitted where this would enhance the attractiveness and viability of existing centres, provided that the proposal is of a scale commensurate with the size, character and role of the centre, can be integrated into the existing shopping centre area.....”</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
					Update 2009 RBWM Retail Health Check 2011	
			<p>Concern that precluding a new large anchor store has potential to affect viability and deliverability of the site by being overly prescriptive and not providing sufficient flexibility to react to market conditions over plan period.</p> <p>Inclusion of an anchor store would serve to increase footfall in S'dale town centre, enhance vitality and viability and promote competition.</p> <p>Suggest SS6.3 modified to remove sentence: "Proposals which include an 'anchor' store, defined as a store having floorspace of more than 500 square metres will be refused".</p>	NP/SS6.3	<p>NPPF para 23 ref guidance to ensuring vitality of town centres</p> <p>NPPF paras 17 and 183 Neighbourhood Planning giving communities power to develop vision for their area and deliver sustainable development</p> <p>NPPF para 184 – right types of development in a local area</p> <p>NPPF para 173 ref deliverability of Plans</p>	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Our policy intent is to deliver a mixed development of retail and residential with parking and community amenities. We disagree that it does not allow sufficient flexibility to react to market conditions.</p> <p>Our policy seeks to manage the size of units being delivered so as to ensure they complement the existing retail offering in S'dale centre.</p>
			<p>Test of Soundness: NPPF requires plans to be sound. Consultation with respect of S'dale Broomhall Centre was flawed and included leading questions. Suggest public are re-consulted</p>	NP/SS6	NPPF para 182	<p>When considering the content of a Neighbourhood Plan an independent examiner's role is limited to testing whether or not a draft NP meets the basic conditions, and other matters set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The independent examiner is not testing the soundness of a NP or examining other material considerations.</p> <p>We disagree that the Options consultation process or any other consultation process</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
						were biased. Details of the consultation process are set out in the Statement of Consultation.
			St John's also own land in S'dale which form Broomhall Farm and Broomhall Paddocks – land which falls within a designated Gap. Keen to engage with community to discuss potential for future development of these sites, specifically to meet future housing or employment needs.	NP/EN2		Your comment is noted.
			Aware of need to find suitable SANGs, especially within S'dale. College in principle able to provide land potentially suitable for SANG, subject to meeting objectives of the College and any associated development partners.	Project 9.2		Your comment is noted.
69.		Barton Willmore for Waitrose	Waitrose supports allocation of Sunningdale Broomhall Centre for a mixed use development as per draft NP	NP/SS6		Your comment and support is noted.
			Specifically support intention that any proposals for an anchor store are refused supported by findings from Retail Capacity Update 2009 and Retail Health Check 2011. Policy should remain worded as it is.	NP/SS6	NPPF para 23 ref guidance to ensuring vitality of town centres NPPF paras 17 and 183 Neighbourhood Planning giving communities power to develop vision for their area and deliver sustainable development NPPF para 184 – right types of development in a local area	Comment is noted.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
					LP saved policy S1 Executive Summary of Windsor and Maidenhead Retail Capacity Update 2009 Retail Health Check 2011	
70.	SL5 0BX	Woolf Bond for I&H Brown and Breckenridge Estates	Owners of 8 & 10 Sheridan Grange which form large detached dwellings with southern boundary adjoining proposed mixed use development at S'dale Broomhall. Do not wish to object outright to policy but do seek amends to ensure that any development reflects need to protect character, setting and residential amenities of adjacent properties.	NP/SS6		Comment is noted.
			Properties fall into RBWM TA 'Executive Residential Estates' classification and we support the principles which this states are to be taken into account in development design process and public realm improvement projects. Specifically wish to see the following applied to any development on this site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respecting prevailing 2-storey scale of Sheridan Grange - Preserving residential amenities of SG - Retain existing important trees on SG boundary and within allocated site - Retain verdant street scene along eastern side of Broomhall Lane Wensleydale House and majority of site land are classified as 'Late 20 th Century Suburbs' but it's considered this relates largely to estate development on western side of Broomhall Lane.	NP/SS6	RBWM Townscape Assessment	Support for principle of Townscape Assessment is noted. The requirement for a Development Brief will provide an opportunity for local residents to be consulted and to influence design. Other relevant policies in our NP will also apply.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Given entire site is to be redeveloped, more crucial future scheme relates to TA assessment for residential estates to north and Victorian village of central S'dale.			
			Support requirement for holistic approach to any planning appn as only way site can deliver the mix of uses appropriate and the benefit to village as a whole. Agree Development Brief would assist process.	NP/SS6.1		Support for Development Brief noted. Some amendments have been made to policy SS6.1
			Support need to secure safe access from London Rd and suggest a 2 nd bullet added: "The sole vehicular access to be secured direct from London Road". Also open field on NE side should be maintained in an open character to secure appropriate settlement edge and ensure scheme relates to existing paddock land to E. Suggest current 3 rd bullet has words added: "to be provided on the far northeastern side of the site"	NP/SS6.2		Comments noted. The requirement for a Development Brief will provide an opportunity for local residents to be consulted and to influence issues including those of access and character.
			Support need for strong and detailed design response. Propose SS6.4 amended to read: "Quality of design is a key consideration for this development. The following requirements will be taken into account in determining any future scheme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of open space on the site's northeastern side - Protection and reinforcement as necessary of a strong defensible boundary on the site's northern side 	NP/SS6.4		The required elements for a Development Brief include design considerations. Trees are subject to our tree policy EN3. Other relevant policies in our NP will also apply.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any proposal must respect neighbouring residential amenities including strong principal elevations where facing development located off site - Retain existing valued trees <p>Proposals of poor design will be refused”.</p>			
			Support requirement for development brief.	NP/SS6.5 Phasing		Your comment is noted.
71.		Woolf Bond for various clients incl Kebbell Homes, Millgate Homes, Bewley Homes and Lightwater Management	<p>Do not believe the NP meets the Basic Conditions Test. Object to principle of producing a NP in advance of an adopted up to date strategic LP.</p> <p>Request these representations are forwarded to the Inspector and request opportunity to speak at the Examination in Public Hearing.</p> <p>For a number of reasons, NP threatens the achievement of NPPF requirements by making detailed land use and policy decisions without an overarching strategic planning framework.</p>		NPPF para 184, 185 and 215 general conformity with strategic policies and implementation	<p>We disagree.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans when brought into force become part of the Development Plan for the neighbourhood area. DCLG have confirmed that they can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its Local Plan. Other NPs have passed examination in advance of an up to date LP.</p> <p>A draft NP must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in force if it is to meet the basic conditions. A draft NP is not tested against the policies in an emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>We have liaised closely with RBWM so that they are fully aware of the policies being put forward in our NP and they have confirmed that they are comfortable these are in line with their thinking on their emerging Local Plan.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Policy states that ‘very special circumstances’ must be for benefit of the community and have majority community support. While Localism Act places importance on community involvement, very special circumstances can represent any number of issues including strategic or even national priorities.</p> <p>Propose EN1.2 is omitted leaving definition of ‘very special circumstances’ open to individual cases and on their own merits.</p>	NP/EN1.2	<p>NPPF Section 9 ref benefits of protecting GB and para 88 defines ‘very special circumstances’</p> <p>NPPF para 89 ref effective use of land that has been previously developed</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Policy EN1 has been amended to aid clarity.</p>
			<p>Policy covers both GB and non-GB areas. Same argument as above re NP redefining ‘very special circumstances’ and requiring majority community support – especially as applied to land that is not GB.</p> <p>Further object to this policy in absence of draft strategic LP as being restrictive and unnecessary, and fails to contribute towards sustainable development.</p> <p>Propose EN2 is omitted.</p>	NP/EN2	NPPF paras 17, 109 and 183	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Policy EN2 has been amended to aid clarity.</p> <p>There is very strong support from the community to protect the separation between the villages.</p>
			<p>Policy is over prescriptive and fails to account for public condition of a tree that may eg be a danger to highway or public safety. Effectively generates a TPO over entire plan area such that it imposes constraint on development irrespective of arboricultural quality. Also devalues presence of existing TPO.</p> <p>NP cannot introduce such a policy without support from an overarching Borough wide LP. Without this, policy should be deleted.</p>	NP/EN3.1	<p>NPPF para 118</p> <p>RBWM strategic policies include a policy to minimise the potential adverse effects on the natural and built environment,</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Some amendments have been made to policy EN3.1</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Local Planning authorities should only request supporting info that is relevant, necessary and material to appn in question. Requirement for a tree survey and tree protection plan will in many cases add nothing to determination of a scheme but cost developers money.</p> <p>Propose EN3.2 be moved to supporting text and validation requirements to remain subject to Borough's discretion.</p>	NP/EN3.2	NPPF para 193 ref validation requirements should be proportionate	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Trees are a very important characteristic of our area.</p> <p>Some amendments have been made to policy EN3.2</p>
			<p>Similarly to EN2, policy threatens to artificially constrain strategic LP process and could threaten delivery of NPPF requirements such as need for LPAs to meet 'full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing'. In absence of strategic LP, policy is unnecessary and restrictive and does not contribute towards sustainable development. Accordingly appns should be determined on case by case basis having regards to NPPF core planning principles only.</p> <p>Propose EN4 should be omitted</p>	NP/EN4	<p>NPPF para 53 ref resisting development on gardens</p> <p>NPPF paras 57 and 118 – design and biodiversity.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Gardens are an important feature of our landscape and important to protect from inappropriate development – NPPF para 53.</p> <p>Some amendments have been made to policy EN4 to aid clarity.</p>
			<p>No reference in NPPF or Localism Act to thresholds or specific requirements. Hence any specific requirement for pre-app consultation is inconsistent with national policy.</p> <p>Propose H1 is omitted or moved to supporting text.</p>	NP/H1	<p>NPPF para 17 ref planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings.</p> <p>NPPF para 183 ref Neighbourhood Planning giving communities power to develop vision for their area and deliver</p>	<p>Comment noted. We disagree with your analysis of NPPF or Localism Act.</p> <p>The requirement for a Development Brief will provide an opportunity for local residents to be consulted and to influence important issues at an early stage in the planning process.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
					<p>sustainable development</p> <p>NPPF para 188 ref early engagement</p>	
			<p>Accept that appns for flatted development not appropriate in all cases but such schemes do offer opportunity to increase supply of homes and deliver much smaller sized residential locations that can still not harm character of area. Also Borough has been subject to long running housing land supply deficits. It is realistic option that strategic LP will need to plan for flatted developemnt to meet NPPF requirements.</p> <p>Policy also suggests development only sustainable if located in specific locations; we contend this is restrictive and fails to account of the 3 aspects of sustainable development and that area is relatively sustainable given its reasonable local service offer and railway services.</p> <p>Policy suggests new flats permitted only along section of A30 and TA flat zones. These locations have been subject to residential redevelopment over last 30 years and additional development here is practically impossible. So policy effectively generates a blanket ban on flatted development across plan area.</p>	NP/H3	<p>NPPF Section 6 ref LPAs need to meet objectively assessed needs for housing</p> <p>NPPF para 17 ref planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings.</p> <p>NPPF para 183 ref Neighbourhood Planning giving communities power to develop vision for their area and deliver sustainable development.</p> <p>RBWM Townscape Assessment</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>RBWM has not had a long running housing land supply deficit as per annual monitoring reports and recent inspector decision notices.</p> <p>The intent of policy H3 is to ensure that flatted developments only occur in sustainable locations and where they will not adversely impact the character of the area – natural, built and social. A detailed Streetscape Assessment has been conducted by NP volunteers to add additional local detail to the RBWM Townscape Assessment and streets have been identified where flats/apartments would be appropriate, taking into account location, character of the surrounding neighbourhood, status of on-street parking and the streetscape generally. This piece of work is included in our Evidence Base and formed an important input into determining appropriate locations for flats/apartments in our area.</p> <p>The policy also actively welcomes flatted development in TA classification zone Post War Residential Flats, when part of a mixed use commercial development and in a number of our Strategic Sites.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if apply)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Unnecessarily restrictive. Existing site and built footprint are a material consideration but in some circumstances a greater level of development may be appropriate and offer wider benefits.</p> <p>Propose H3 omitted.</p>	NP/H3.3	<p>NPPF para 60 ref not stifling innovation, originality or initiative and seeking to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Should there be a need to depart from this policy it will be down to the applicant to demonstrate why this is appropriate and necessary.</p>
			<p>Not the purpose of this document to comprise a development plan document and any intention for this would need to be brought forward by the Borough. Strict compliance as suggested fails to take NPPF para 60 into account.</p> <p>DG1.2, DG1.3 and DG1.4 are overly prescriptive, especially the need to apply policy even in zones where other dwelling types may also exist. . Planning inspectorate have determined that apartment and semi-detached schemes are acceptable in ‘villas in a woodland setting’.</p> <p>Propose DG1 omitted.</p>	NP/DG1	<p>NPPF para 58 re plans responding to local character etc while not discouraging appropriate innovation.</p> <p>NPPF para 60 ref not stifling innovation, originality or initiative and seeking to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness</p> <p>Also NPPF paras 61, 64 and 66 ref design</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The community’s priority, made clear through consultation feedback, is to retain the key aspects that determine the character of our area. Our policies encourage innovative, good design; they do not restrict development but instead challenge developers to deliver development that responds to its surroundings and is appropriate for our area.</p>
			<p>Policy jeopardises NPPF’s requirement to boost housing supply for Borough to meet market needs for housing. Further, policy contradicts NPPF para 58’s requirement for design innovation and is therefore overtly prescriptive.</p> <p>Propose DG2 omitted.</p>	NP/DG2	<p>NPPF para 58 re plans responding to local character etc while not discouraging appropriate innovation.</p> <p>NPPF para 60 ref not stifling innovation, originality or initiative and seeking to promote or reinforce</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The community’s priority, made clear through consultation feedback, is to retain the key aspects that determine the character of our area. Our policies encourage innovative, good design; they do not restrict development but instead challenge developers to deliver development that responds to its surroundings and is appropriate for our area.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
					local distinctiveness Also NPPF paras 61, 64 and 66 ref design	
			Policy contradicts NPPF para 58 re design innovation and is therefore overly prescriptive in terms of parking layouts. Object and propose DG3.3 is omitted.	NP/DG3.3	NPPF para 58 re plans responding to local character etc while not discouraging appropriate innovation.	Comments noted. The community's priority, made clear through consultation feedback, is to retain the key aspects that determine the character of our area. Our policies encourage innovative, good design; they do not restrict development but instead challenge developers to deliver development that responds to its surroundings and is appropriate for our area.
			We acknowledge landmark views and buildings important. Any application however must be assessed having regard to usual planning balance and need for planning system to perform an economic, social and environmental role. Object to wording 'new developments must avoid any adverse impacts on the landmark views and buildings'. As drafted policy is inflexible and fails to contribute to achievement of sustainable development. Propose re-wording: "New development <u>should seek to</u> avoid any adverse impacts...".	NP/DG4	NPPF para 58 re plans responding to local character etc while not discouraging appropriate innovation. NPPF para 60 ref not stifling innovation, originality or initiative and seeking to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness Also NPPF paras 61, 64 and 66 ref design	Comments noted. These landmark views and buildings are valued by the community and are important to the local area, its heritage and character. Our policies encourage innovative, good design; they do not restrict development but instead challenge developers to deliver development that responds to its surroundings and is appropriate for our area.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Current Borough wide policy is requirement for code level 3. Without an overarching Borough wide LP policy or SPD is premature to a Borough wide policy justification.</p> <p>Propose DG5 omitted.</p>	NP/DG5	NPPF para 93, 95 and 96 ref supporting a move to low carbon future	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Consultation feedback showed a majority in favour of higher environmental standards.</p> <p>Supported by NPPF principles of sustainable development.</p>
			<p>Reliance upon a SANG at Heatherwood hospital threatens to ransom rest of proposed developments. This highlights issues associated with producing a NP in the absence of a strategic planning document given that an appropriate mitigation strategy remains undeveloped for the medium to long term.</p> <p>In absence of a Borough LP, Policy NRM6 cannot be complied with. Accordingly the Policy cannot be deemed to be compatible with strategic local policy or EU Obligations.</p>	NP/SS5	SE Plan Policy NRM6 ref that Priority should be given to directing development to those areas where potential adverse effects can be avoided without the need for mitigation measures.	<p>The designation of SANGs is a matter for the Borough and Natural England.</p> <p>The NP is not reliant upon a SANG at Heatherwood.</p> <p>We have defined a Project – not a Policy – to encourage the bringing forward of suitable sites as SANGs . This has been extended to encompass all potential SANG sites.</p>
72.		Smiths Gore for The Crown Estate	<p>The Crown Estate is a significant and permanent local landowner and has important stake in how area is developed. Would like to commend the Steering Group for very professional way they have approached task of producing a NP. Comments made framed within a context of general support for aims and objectives of the NP.</p>			Thank you for your comments which are appreciated.
			<p>Concerned a degree of inflexibility has crept in to some of the wording. While important to have precisely worded policies, should not be at cost of preventing delivery of policy outcomes. NPPF includes requiring that policy constraints do not render development sites unviable.</p>		NPPF para 173 ref deliverability of plans	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Some policy wording has been amended to aid clarity.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Believe more of a case needs to be made in the NP for the outcomes being promoted. Keen the NP is successfully adopted and key element is requirement to be in general conformity with strategic policies of the LP.</p> <p>Important policies are underpinned by robust evidence base of the type of development that is needed, how much, and the key economic signals that may affect delivery of individual site. Also important and right that NP reflects wishes of local community.</p>		<p>NPPF para 184 re being in conformity</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>A draft NP must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in force if it is to meet the basic conditions. A draft NP is not tested against the policies in an emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>We have liaised closely with RBWM so that they are fully aware of the policies being put forward in our NP and they have confirmed that they are comfortable these are in line with their thinking on their emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Our housing needs will emerge as progress is made on the emerging BLP but these not yet finalised. Housing targets a strategic issue for RBWM.</p> <p>During the preparation of this NP the community has been widely consulted and this feedback has formed the basis for the Plan policies.</p>
			<p>Ascot Centre/High Street Rejuvenation: Fully support strategic intent and share vision. Concern relates to way that policies seek to tie various sites together into a single entity as this may be difficult to achieve. There are specific statutory reasons why The Crown Estate would find it difficult to enter into a development partnership with other landowners.</p>	<p>NP/SS1.1-5</p>		<p>Comment noted and policy has been amended.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Concerned this may be interpreted to mean development needs to come forward through a single planning application. We support RBWM taking a leading role in facilitating production of development brief and collecting S106 and CIL revenues to fund infrastructure improvements. Some landowners could work together, maybe suitable to area "Ascot Green".	NP/SS1.1		Comments noted and policy has been amended.
			Fully support policy for a hotel which will provide benefits to economic function of Ascot. Also welcome de-coupling of this from wider development of High Street.	NP/SS2		Your support is noted.
			<p>As owners of Wensleydale site, welcome proposed redevelopment and enhancement of this area and wish to ensure it's carried out in a way that meets NP's aims of improving economic viability and delivers additional car parking and community amenities.</p> <p>Concerned that resistance to an anchor store may prevent development coming forward. Suggest that either NP provides further justification for wording by demonstrating it's achievable and realistic within plan period OR builds in some flexibility to wording such as: "Retail development in the form of a range of unit sizes and restaurants/cafes. Unless it can be demonstrated to hamper delivery of this site, smaller units will be preferred".</p>	NP/SS6	<p>NPPF para 23 ref guidance to ensuring vitality of town centres</p> <p>NPPF paras 17 and 183 Neighbourhood Planning giving communities power to develop vision for their area and deliver sustainable development</p> <p>NPPF para 184 – right types of development in a local area</p> <p>LP saved policy S1</p> <p>RBWM Executive Summary of Windsor and Maidenhead Retail Capacity</p>	<p>Your support for the redevelopment is noted.</p> <p>Also note your concerns re viability.</p> <p>Our policy intent is to deliver a mixed development of retail and residential with parking and community amenities.</p> <p>Sunningdale is a small centre of 2,135 households and its current retail offering reflects this. LP policy S1 says "new retail development will be permitted where this would enhance the attractiveness and viability of existing centres, provided that the proposal is of a scale commensurate with the size, character and role of the centre, can be integrated into the existing shopping centre area....."</p> <p>The policy seeks to manage the size of units being delivered so as to ensure they complement the existing retail offering in S'dale centre.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
					Update 2009 RBWM Retail Health Check 2011	Some amendments have been made to this policy.
73.	SL5 8AA	Vail Williams for Frimley Park Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	Trust has an interest in the Heatherwood Hospital site and comments are provided ref this site			Noted.
			Council still preparing its LP and undertaking GB review - premature for NP to be finalised in advance of outcomes of these strategies. NP should remain at broad level with location and amount of development left until LP has been adopted.		NPPF para 184, 185 and 215 general conformity with strategic policies and implementation	Neighbourhood Plans when brought into force become part of the Development Plan for the neighbourhood area. DCLG have confirmed that they can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its Local Plan. Other NPs have passed examination in advance of an up to date LP. We have liaised closely with RBWM so that they are fully aware of the policies being put forward in our NP and they have confirmed that they are comfortable these are in line with their thinking on their emerging Local Plan.
			Site extent identified only covers northern part of the site. Not appropriate to identify potential development area or suggest a use for southern part in advance of GB review and LP. NP/SS5.1 too specific and a broader support for redevelopment should be included in the Plan with exact type and amount to be determined	Section 5.3.2 and NP/SS5	NPPF para 17 ref planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings. NPPF para 183 ref	Your comments are noted. The site identified matches the MDS boundary in the current LP. Proposal for southern part to be put forward as a SANG is an appropriate use for land in GB.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if apply)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			through the LP.		Neighbourhood Planning giving communities power to develop vision for their area and deliver sustainable development.	The contents of the policy reflect the views of the community and are important to be considered in any development.
			Development Brief requirement too onerous and will delay planning process - should be deleted. Applications to be determined by majority community support should be deleted as against local and national planning policy.	NP/H1	NPPF para 17 ref planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings. NPPF para 188 ref early engagement	It is good practice to engage the community through the design process and this is encouraged in the NPPF. Development Briefs are a useful tool to facilitate this. The proposals are proportionate to the objective. Reference to requirement for majority community support has been removed.
			Trust has not identified potential use for this part of the site. Suitability for SANG has not been explored and does not appear to have been consulted on. NP is attempting to control and restrict future use of the site which is contrary to NP legislation. Premature for Plan to make decision on future use prior to GB review. Project should be removed.	Section 9.2 and NP/SS5		Your comments are noted. A SANG will be needed to enable residential development at the Heatherwood site but we recognise other sites may be available. We have amended Project 9.2 to encompass alternative options for SANG sites. This is wording relates to a proposed project and is not a NP policy.
			Vision for A, S & S map adds confusion by adding the desired "Projects" - could be seen as agreed policies which they are not	Map p. 20		Comment is noted.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Requirement for new dwellings to meet Code Level 4 should be a target or reduced to Level 3, in accordance with Council's current requirement.	NP/DG5	NPPF para 93, 95 and 96 ref supporting a move to low carbon future	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Consultation feedback showed a majority in favour of higher environmental standards.</p> <p>Supported by NPPF principles of sustainable development.</p>
			Requirement in Tree policy too onerous and does not accord with adopted policy N6 of the LP	NP/EN3.1	<p>NPPF para 118</p> <p>RBWM strategic policies include a policy to minimise the potential adverse effects on the natural and built environment,</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p> <p>Tree policy EN3.1 has been amended.</p>
74.		Boyer for Hodson Developments	<p>Have identified a number of fundamental flaws in NP as drafted, which, if unresolved, will ensure plan cannot be found to accord with either national or local policy at Examination.</p> <p>Propose 3 options to resolve this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delay submission until LP strategic planning approach is clear. 2. Delete EN1, EN2 and Appendix C as they will provide a barrier to development. <p>If wish to proceed amend policy EN1 as proposed.</p>			Your comments are noted.
			RBWM existing LP is out of date and consultation on a new draft plan has not yet taken place. In this context we question whether it is appropriate to bring forward a NP before strategic issues for the area have been determined.		NPPF para 184, 185 and 215 general conformity with strategic policies and implementation	Neighbourhood Plans when brought into force become part of the Development Plan for the neighbourhood area. DCLG have confirmed that they can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its Local Plan. Other NPs have passed examination in advance of an up to date LP.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			We request the NP process is suspended until RBWM adopts an up to date LP that will establish the strategic context for neighbourhood planning in the area.			We have liaised closely with RBWM so that they are fully aware of the policies being put forward in our NP and they have confirmed that they are comfortable these are in line with their thinking on their emerging Local Plan.
			This NP seeks to establish a framework for GB policy within a NP area. NPPF states GB policy is for local authority, therefore NP is in danger of undermining strategic approach to GB in the area and should be delayed.	NP/EN1	NPPF para 83 ref GB boundaries is a matter for local authority NPPF paras 79-80 and 87-89 ref purpose of GB and exceptions to inappropriate development	Your comments are noted. Green Belt matters that do not relate to GB boundaries or other non-strategic GB issues can properly be addressed in the NP. GB boundary reviews is a matter for the local authority. We have worked closely with colleagues at RBWM so that they are fully aware of our GB and related policies.
			Also concerned EN1 is seeking to limit the very special circumstances to relating solely to community benefit, which goes beyond established national approach. But these can often be made up of many aspects which do not always have to involve a clear community benefit but may instead involve economic or environmental very special circumstances. We request the wording as drafted is removed or amended so as to not undermine national policy approach to GB. Suggested amend to EN1.2: "A planning application for development in GB under the "very special circumstances" argument shall only be permitted where:	NP/EN1	NPPF paras 79-80 and 87-89 ref purpose of GB and exceptions to inappropriate development	Comments noted. EN1 has been amended to aid clarity. Requirement for majority community support has been removed.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>(a) the “very special circumstances” includes demonstration that the community benefits of the proposal have been considered, AND</p> <p>(b) they are accompanied by a Statement of Community Consultation as set out in Appendix E”</p> <p>with Appendix E revised to remove reference to need for majority community support.</p> <p>Further, there is no definition as to what will constitute a community benefit leading to uncertainty over the policy’s application.</p>			
			<p>Other fundamental problem is for all proposals to be supplemented by a Statement of Community Support that shows a majority in support of the proposal. No definition of what will constitute majority support.</p>	NP/EN1.2		<p>Requirement for majority community support has been removed.</p>
			<p>Plan identifies a number of areas between villages to be protected save for very special circumstances. Approach similar to Local Green Space designation but these need to be made first in wider context of sustainable development of an area.</p> <p>Concern that policy seeks to introduce control over development in advance of RBWM LP. Request EN2 is deleted.</p> <p>Policy wording essentially the same as in EN1 and same points apply.</p>	NP/EN2	<p>NPPF paras 17, 109 and 183</p> <p>NPPF para 184, 185 and 215 general conformity with strategic policies and implementation</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Policy EN2 has been amended to aid clarity.</p> <p>There is very strong support from the community to protect the separation between the villages.</p> <p>Requirement for majority community support has been removed.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
STATUTORY BODIES CONSULTATION RESPONSES						
SB1	SL6 1RF	RBWM	To meet the basic conditions a NP must have appropriate regard to national policy, be in general conformity with strategic policies of the BLP, be compatible with human rights requirements and EU obligations.	Conformity		Noted.
			Borough's planning policy appraisal of the Plan and new policies that will emerge from this document are appended to letter. Note that the Council in the latter stages of reviewing the BLP and new policies will emerge. Taken care to ensure that BLP policies will not conflict with the NP, and have responded with these policies in mind. Additionally matters of general conformity have been discussed with the authors. Happy to assist with final wording and comment further if required in advance of submission to council.			Noted.
			Basic Conditions Appraisal: Plan embodies many of key facets of NPPF in promoting sustainable development. Whilst some policies may not entirely adhere to specific NPPF guidance they all embody principles promoted in NPPF and Plan delivers these principles. No amendments required.	Whole Plan Conditions appraisal		Noted.
			Whilst draft policy requires a mix, it is based on physical appearance and neighbouring dwellings. NPPF requires LA to plan to meet housing needs of population, and policy may conflict with this need when established. Amend wording to allow needs to be met once evidence established or could reflect the emerging evidence so this approach taken in absence of evidence of need.	NP/H2		Comments noted. Policy H2 has been amended.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			NP/H3: Location of flats / apartments: Some potential conflict with H8 of LP. Expected that emerging LP will amend this approach to deliver mix whilst respecting the surroundings. No change needed.	NP/H3		Comments noted.
			As drafted would be contrary to policies GB1, GB2, GB3 and R1 of LP. NP gives guidance on improvements required which, in local opinion, would help to demonstrate special circumstances. No change needed as site being progressed (as a community defined opportunity) through the BLP and is expected to conform with approach of this policy.	NP/SS1		Comments noted.
			Policy proposes inappropriate development in GB and would be contrary to GB1, GB2 & GB3, but site being progressed through BLP (as a community defined opportunity), so no change needed.	NP/SS3		Comments noted.
			<p>Policy proposes inappropriate development in GB and would be contrary to GB1, GB2 & GB3. However site is predominantly previously developed land in GB with some existing buildings. Whilst some parameters set for development here not clear special circumstances can be defined for this site. Suggest development may be difficult to achieve while reducing impact on the GB.</p> <p>Revise to either demonstrate a preference for what may occur on site or tighten policy to be more in line with current GB policy. Any app would need to demonstrate VSC.</p>	NP/SS4		Comments noted. Policy has been amended.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Revise map to reflect existing MDS area.	NP/SS5		Map has been amended.
			Policy states affordable housing not a site priority. In conflict with H3 of current LP and likely to conflict with emerging BLP. Remove this part of the policy to allow discussions on inclusion of affordable housing as part of an app. Could highlight preference for delivery of other important priorities ahead of affordable housing here.	NP/SS8		This has been removed from the policy.
			Revise the map to reflect existing MDS area. Whilst broadly in line with policies for the MDS at S'dale Park, it may conflict with emerging BLP policies due to restrictive nature of policy.. Suggest remove policy and make a project to engage with land owners and council in revising MDS policy in emerging BLP.	NP/SS9		Map amended. Policy has been reviewed and amended.
			Revise the map to reflect existing MDS area. Whilst broadly in line with policies for the MDS at Silwood Park, it may conflict with emerging BLP policies due to restrictive nature of policy. Suggest remove policy and make a project to engage with land owners and council in revising MDS policy in emerging BLP.	NP/SS10		Map amended. Policy has been reviewed and amended.
SB2 a	GU15 3HD	Surrey Heath BC	<p>Comment only, as unable to present to Exec before closing date. Comments on the NP relate to S'dale, which is adjacent to SH and a crossing point of roads & rail services through the wider area.</p> <p>Concerned that no approaches from NPSG or any other body during plan preparation given strategic infrastructure in S'dale area.</p>			Comment is noted

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if apply)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Taking these 3 policies together appears NP has targeted S'dale for growth, including an unspecified amount of residential intensification in form of flats along London Rd., significant intensification of parking provision associated with station and existing retail area, increased retail provision (unspecified in terms of floorspace), and access improvements including road and pedestrian links across A30.</p> <p>S'dale already a pinch / congestion point on A30 as result of level crossing and several busy intersections. NP comments S'dale has already seen considerable development along A30 resulting in serious traffic and parking issues. Plan policies have potential for significantly raised traffic levels in area.</p> <p>Evidence base does not include traffic impact assessment of effects of the policies. Also does not include a retail or needs assessment in support expansion of centre.</p>	<p>NP/H3; NP/SS6 & NP/SS7</p>	<p>RBWM Local Transport Plan</p>	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>It is not proportionate to expect a NP to undertake traffic impact assessments or retail needs assessments; this is for the LPA.</p> <p>RBWM Transport Plan has been updated – now for 2012-2026</p>
			<p>Therefore SHBC raises a standing objection to S'dale policies on grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of detail re the developments makes it difficult to assess policy impacts. Would expect detailed parameters would be given for site specific developments. • No evidence to support proposals other than wishes of residents. • Cumulative impact of policies does not appear to have been looked at. 			<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Detail will be considered in the Development Briefs.</p> <p>Sites being considered are relatively small. It is not reasonable to expect a NP to address issues of cumulative effect. We recognise the potential implications of our policies and expect these issues to be addressed through the Development Brief process.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			SHBC is not therefore able to satisfy themselves the S'dale NP policies won't have a detrimental effect on traffic flows and safety on A30 and the Chobham Road. A30, a strategic cross boundary piece of infrastructure, of particular concern.			We understand that RBWM is producing a transport model which includes a number of these sites and will take account of these issues.
SB3	BS1 6EH	Homes and Communities Agency	NPs are very much part of Localism agenda and we work on a national level, so don't comment on NPs.			Comment noted.
SB4	CW1 6GJ	Natural England	NE pleased to note NP highlights significance of TBH SPA and need for mitigation to be provided for housing within 5km. Recommend for completeness the paras at bottom of pg 12 should refer to exclusion zone of 400m around SPA, within which housing should not be permitted. Would clarify importance of zones shown on map 2.	5.2.1	Thames Basin Heaths SPA RBWM SPD	Comments noted and para bottom of p. 12 has been amended.
			NE advise the following corrections to description of designated sites in 1 st para: WF and Great Park is a <i>Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</i> , Chobham Common is not an SPA, but a SSSI, which is also designated as TBH SPA. 3 rd para refers to nationally protected sites and SSSIs, however SPAs and SACs are internationally and nationally protected sites. Advise the plan states that all protected species will be protected through Plan, with species listed as examples.	6.1.5		Comments noted and relevant sections have been amended.
			Advise para clarified to reflect the referenced sites have national and international protection and that SACs are added.	NP/EN5.2		As these sites are all protected by national legislation and/or BLP policies, this policy is not adding anything and has therefore been removed from this NP.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			NE recommends these policies include reference to need for new housing to provide appropriate mitigation for TBH SPA on line with council's TBH SPD pt 1.	NP/SS1, SS3, SS5, SS6, SS9 & SS10.		The requirement for mitigation is made clear in the NP and is covered by BLP policies.
			NE advise that SANGS would need to be agreed with council and NE, and assessed against NEs SANG guidelines.	9.2		Comment is noted.
SB5 b	-	Environmental Agency	Pleased the NP includes policies on biodiversity and green corridors. Majority of watercourses in plan area classed as ordinary.			Comments noted.
			<p>All listed SSIs lie within Flood Zone 1 as defined in Table 1 in NPPF Technical Guidance and in accordance with our Flood Risk Mapping.</p> <p>For sites over 1 ha Development Briefs to include a flood risk assessment for SW drainage. Smaller sites need to consider sustainable drainage.</p> <p>Sites 2,3,6 & 7 may have past contaminative uses and you will need to consider this on any development of the sites. Desk top study required in first instance to see if any contaminative uses that could be polluting ground water.</p>	Strategic Sites		<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Flood zones are included in requirements for a Development Brief (Appendix D – now Appendix C)</p> <p>Past contaminative uses is a matter that will be addressed through the normal planning process.</p>
SB6 a	GU1 3EH	English Heritage	EH welcomes references to the historic development of the 2 communities. However should be more info about listed buildings and their significance. Should also be ref to non-designated features of local interest (in table in 6.3.4?).	6.3.4		Comments are noted.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Should also be reference to the current and potential future condition of these assets, inc particular threats to them.			Comments are noted. This level of detail is not appropriate for this NP.
			Welcome ref to the character of the 3 communities and the aims to conserve / enhance that distinctive character. If further characterisation studies required there are links in the appendix to this letter.			Thank you and comments noted.
			Whilst welcome the intent behind aim to minimise impact of development on built environment, should be recognised that development can have a beneficial effect – indeed should be objective of all development to enhance the built environment.			Comment is noted.
			As conservation and enhancement of historic environment is integral to sustainable development as promoted in NPPF, would welcome this being one of main aims of the Plan and given greater emphasis in Plan strategy. Disappointed not to see an environmental policy for conservation of local historic environment, particularly S'dale Conservation Area.	Environme ntal Policies.		Comments are noted. Conservation areas already benefit from protection through the Borough LP and it was felt that a NP policy could add little to this.
			Welcome the requirement for Development Briefs for sites of 10+ dwellings	NP/H1		Your support noted.
			Also welcome this policy for recognition that conversion may be only viable future use for large existing dwellings and its requirement to retain the aspects that make it a heritage asset.	NP/H3.2		Your support noted.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Welcome design guidelines but suggest NP/DG3.4 should read <i>“Listed buildings, Conservation Areas and their settings will be conserved and enhanced to reinforce their significance, quality and character”</i>. Ref could be made to para 137 of NPPF.</p> <p>Policies NP/DG1-3 do not provide specific protection for designated heritage assets, unlike DG4 does for non-designated sites.</p>	NP/DG 1 DG2, DG3 and DG4		Policy wording has been amended. (Policy also moved into same section as Landmark buildings and views and renamed)
			Our records show only the strategic sites for new hotel in Ascot Racecourse, Heatherwood Hospital, S'dale Park and Silwood House may affect designated heritage assets. However for all sites the HER should be consulted and the possibility of currently unknown archeological remains being found acknowledged.			Your comment is noted.
			In the ‘context’ there should be recognition that site lies within the setting of the Grade II listed former Tote building, and a requirement that any redevelopment is not to detract from significance of the Tote building.	NP/SS2		<p>Comment is noted.</p> <p>Listed old Tote building is not in the close proximity of proposed hotel development and would be unlikely to be affected adversely by it.</p> <p>Protection also covered by DG4.</p>
			In the “context..” there should be recognition of the Bell Barrow on Bowledge Hill, a scheduled monument, and the requirement for redevelopment to retain the monument and enhance / better reveal its significance.	NP/SS5		<p>Comment is noted.</p> <p>Policy has been amended.</p>
			The “context...” identifies that the site is a registered historic park and garden (Grade II) and Northcote House is Grade II listed. Should be a requirement in policy for retention of Northcote Ho., and not to adversely affect the	NP/SS9		<p>Your comment is noted.</p> <p>Any development on this strategic site is subject to our policy DG4.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			significance of these assets, and ideally to enhance / better reveal them. Redraw map 23 to exclude the registered parkland.			Re-drawn map shows both the extent of the Registered Parkland and the area that is the designated MDS. It is not in the scope of the NP to alter MDS boundaries; this is a matter for the Borough.
			The “context” to this policy recognises that the site contains a number of Grade II listed buildings. Should be a policy requirement for development to retain / not adversely affect these buildings, and ideally enhance / better reveal their significance.	NP/SS10		Your comment is noted. Covered by policy DG4.
			We welcome these policies.	NP/SS1.4 and SS5.3		Comment noted.
			Wonder if a review of the Conservation Area Appraisal for S’dale could be considered, and a review of the list of “landmark” buildings shown on map 10.	Projects		Your comment is noted.
			The number and grade of listed buildings should be identified and reference made to scheduled monument at Bowledge Hill in the section on cultural heritage. Also ideally make reference to non-designated assets.	SEA		Comment noted.
			S’dale Park is a Grade II park and Garden, not grade I.	SEA 7.7.4 (and 18.3.2)		Noted.
			Welcome in principle the sustainability objective for cultural heritage, but it should “conserve and enhance”.	SEA 8.2		Noted.
			This fails to identify potential impact that redevelopment of NP/SS2, SS5, SS9 and SS10 might have on the former Tote Building, the bell barrow, S’dale Park and Silwood Park.	SEA 18.3		Noted.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			NP/DG1-3 don't provide specific protection for designated heritage assets in the way DG4 does for non-designated assets.	SEA 18.4.1		Noted.
			Not appropriate only to monitor those issues the SEA / SA has identified as being potentially negative. All plan policies should be monitored against SEA objectives to ensure they meet intended objectives without unintended consequence.	SEA 22.2		Noted.
SB7	SL5 7JF	Barton Willmore for Heatherwood and Wexham Park NHS Foundation Trust.	Following the Trust's review we set out a number of amendments which we consider will ensure the Plan is found sound by an inspector and that plan will enable Trust to plan for and deliver a healthcare led redevelopment of the site. Useful for Plan to include individual para numbers for ease of future use.	NP/SS5	Localism Act NP (General)) Regs	Comments noted.
			The Plan aims would benefit from re-wording of 3 rd bullet point as it relates to Ascot centre. Generally supportive but would welcome a minor alteration as follows: “ “To encourage and facilitateand its High Street, <i>including the Heatherwood Hospital Site</i> , to deliver a more	Section 4		Comment is noted. This bullet point is specific to Ascot Centre and the High Street.
			The Trust notes that the Plan has identified the HH site as a location the Plan would like to see designated as a SANG. At present the Trust is not in a position to confirm how it intends to use its landholding, particularly where the SANG is concerned. The Trust considers the provision of SANG is a strategic issue which is for the BLP, and not part of the NP process. Request all	5.2	NRM6	Identifying additional SANG(s) is considered important to delivery of our NP. While we recognise this is a matter for the Borough and Natural England, we nonetheless wish to encourage the bringing forward of suitable sites as SANGs – hence we have identified this as a Project (note this is not a policy).

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			references to SANG are removed, including on all maps.			The area south of the MDS at Heatherwood we believe is a suitable area and we would like to see it brought forward for this purpose.
			Trust supports the identification of the HH site as a SS, and for flexibility, its identification should be for 'Healthcare Facility plus significant housing'.	Map 4		Text in Table has been amended.
			Trust supportive of NP/EN1.1 in which the BLP policies will apply to all GB areas apart for the exceptions set out in the SS policies, which includes the HH site.	NP/EN1		Support noted.
			<p>However Trust objects to additional requirement for developments in GB to be considered as "very special circumstances". The BLP and para 89 of NPPF clearly identifies the circumstances in which GB development will be considered acceptable. Neither requires GB development to gain majority community support. This policy does not therefore accord with BLP or NPPF.</p> <p>Furthermore the RBWM statement of Community Involvement (SCI), June 2006 commits the Council to a clear and consistent approach that actively involves people in planning process. All apps required to follow 3 tier process (chapter 7), depending on size & scale, and this doesn't include a requirement to demonstrate 'majority community support'. Policy does not comply with adopted SCI. Also this requirement falls outside the parameters of a NP when assessed against para 155 of NPPF, which states that NPs should 'reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed principles'. Policy should simply set out the 'agreed principles' which GB developments should adhere to. Whilst views of local residents</p>	NP/EN1.2	NPPF paras 79-80 and 87-89 ref purpose of GB and exceptions to inappropriate development	<p>Your comment is noted.</p> <p>Policy EN1 has been amended to aid clarity.</p> <p>Requirement for majority community support has been removed.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>are important in preparing applications it would be inappropriate for applicants to demonstrate their proposals have 'majority community support'. NP does not include a NDO and neither the SG or local residents have a legal right to determine a planning application.</p> <p>It is considered the inclusion of this process is unjustified and unnecessary as level of community support for an appn is already taken into account by the LPA when determining apps.</p> <p>It is considered that a Statement of Community Consultation should only be sought for schemes in accord with NP/H1.</p> <p>EN1.2 should be deleted.</p>			
			<p>The Trust objects to the requirement of this policy as unnecessarily onerous and not in accord with adopted BLP policy N6. The <i>'presumption trees will be retained unless there are exceptional circumstances to justify removal'</i> is overly restrictive and could impede development. The policy wording should be amended to accord with N6 of the BLP. It is also considered that the wording <i>'in the event of a tree.....before any trees are removed'</i> is unsound and should be deleted as it will not always be possible or appropriate to re-provide a replacement tree on site. With this in mind the following wording should be included – "in the event of a tree needing to be removed <i>the decision as to whether like for like replacement or the provision of additional trees should be a matter of judgement on a case by case basis as part of an overall landscaping and planting scheme which should accompany such</i></p>	NP/EN3	<p>BLP policy N6</p> <p>NPPF para 118</p> <p>RBWM strategic policies include a policy to minimise the potential adverse effects on the natural and built environment</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Amendments have been made to this policy.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<i>application”</i>			
			The requirement for all residential and commercial development to submit a tree survey alongside an application is considered unsound as does not accord with borough’s adopted validation checklist. This checklist clearly identifies the circumstances in which a Tree Survey is required.	EN3.2	NPPF para 118 RBWM strategic policies include a policy to minimise the potential adverse effects on the natural and built environment	Comment noted. The Borough’s checklist is not a strategic policy.
			The Trust objects to this policy as drafted as it should refer to the Borough’s validation checklist when assessing proposals that should require the submission of an Ecological Survey.	NP/EN5.1		Comment noted. The Borough’s checklist is not a strategic policy.
			It is considered the wording of this policy is unnecessarily onerous and does not accord with general principles of para 118 of the NPPF (criterion 1), which states: <i>“If sig harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or at last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused”</i> . As drafted an application which is ‘likely’ to cause harm should simply be refused, whereas NPPF states permission should only be refused where all avoidance measures have been exhausted. An amended policy wording is proposed.	NP/EN5.2	NPPF para 118	Comments noted. As these sites are protected in any event, this policy has been removed from the NP.
			On map 7 it is unclear whether the ‘Secondary Corridor’ running along the W and S boundary of the site runs through the site. If so the Trust objects to the corridor running through private land where there is no public right of way. Trust will only consider future links through site when	NP/EN6	NPPF paras 109, 114, 117, 118	Comments noted. Designation of green corridors does not include a requirement for public access.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			preferred redevelopment option determined.			
			The borough SCI sets out a 3 tier approach to public consultation depending on size and scale of development proposals, Neither the SCI or the BLP includes a requirement for a development brief to be submitted to the local community prior to a planning submission. The requirement of the policy is therefore unjustified, a duplication of policy requirements, an unnecessary stage in the planning process and would delay delivery. The SCI requirements cover most of documents proposed for the development brief (appendix D). Policy should be deleted.	NP/H1.1	NPPF para 17 ref planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings. NPPF para 188 ref early engagement	Comments noted. The Borough Statement of Community Consultation is not a strategic policy document and pre-dates NPPF. The requirement for a Development Brief will provide an opportunity for local residents to be consulted and to influence design.
			The Trust objects to the requirement for applications to be determined by 'majority community support' as set out in Appendix E. Has no legal basis and does not accord with borough or national planning policy, so should be deleted.	NP/H1.2		The requirement to demonstrate majority community support has been removed.
			Although supportive of overarching aim, Trust does not support the current wording. We consider both houses and flats are important in meeting local need. Policy H8 of the BLP identifies that the borough will particularly favour proposals that will include dwellings which include small households. An up to date SHMA has not been produced by borough and Plan should not prejudice the conclusions of its findings. Para 184 of NPPF states NPs should ' <i>be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area</i> '. The approach of the draft Plan is therefore unsound as it only takes into	NP/H2	BLP policy H8 NPF para 182 and 184 Localism Act NP (General) Regs	Comments noted. The wording of this policy has been amended.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>consideration the immediate community.</p> <p>The policy should establish that there should be a balanced mix of <i>dwelling</i>s rather than <i>housing</i> within the plan area. Also, policy to include flexibility, to respond to changing mix requirements over the plan period.</p> <p>Whilst the Plan identifies the need to respond to the character of the surrounding area it does not identify the importance of development proposals responding to the characteristics of the existing site. The Plan should provide realistic guidance on the type of development considered acceptable.</p> <p>A proposed rewording of this policy is presented.</p>			
			Trust supports proposals to manage flats / apartments within the plan area.	NP/H3		Your support noted.
			<p>The Trust considers that each development proposal should be considered on a site by site basis and should take into account the site's location as well as the context of the site and surrounding area.</p> <p>It is considered that the policy wording would not be effective for larger development sites (the SSSs) as the character of the surrounding area is less clearly defined. This policy should therefore exclude major strategic sites.</p>	NP/DG2	<p>NPPF para 58 re plans responding to local character etc while not discouraging appropriate innovation.</p> <p>NPPF para 60 ref not stifling innovation, originality or initiative and seeking to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness</p> <p>Also NPPF paras 61, 64 and 66 ref design</p>	We disagree.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if apply)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>Given the emerging BLP requires new housing developments to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3, the requirement to achieve Level 4 is considered unsound. The statement that it should be achieved because of the 'relatively affluent area' is a sweeping statement and does not take into account the potential effect on development viability. A revised wording is proposed.</p>	NP/DG5	<p>NPPF para 93, 95 and 96 ref supporting a move to low carbon future</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Consultation feedback showed a majority in favour of higher environmental standards.</p> <p>Supported by NPPF principles of sustainable development.</p> <p>Some amendments have been made to this policy.</p>
			<p>The Trust notes that maps 12 and 19 are not consistent, and favours the inclusion of map 12 as it does not outline a cycle route through the southern section of the site, and more appropriately shows it running alongside the existing highway. Whilst the Trust is prepared to consider options for its land, including possible pedestrian and cycle routes, such options need to be consistent with the wider development options. The NP should not therefore refer to any such routes through the HH site.</p>	NP/T2		<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Map 12 shows desired through cycle routes. Map 19 shows a desired cycle route to link Heatherwood with Ascot station. This has now been removed from the Heatherwood site map. Note also that map numbering has changed.</p>
			<p>The Trust has no comment on the policies in this chapter except for NP/SS5.</p>	Section 8		<p>Comment noted.</p>
			<p>The Trust supports the identification of HH as a strategic site, suitable for redevelopment, and the location for a new 'healthcare facility', and the identification of the remainder of land (excluding existing housing) as a Major Development Site within the GB. The Trust reiterates its concerns over the southern part of the site being subject to NP/EN1 unless the policy is changed in accordance with the trust's objection.</p>	NP/SS5 and NP/EN1		<p>Comments are noted.</p>

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Whilst the Trust will ensure that it engages with and consults the local community (including the PC) before any planning application is submitted for the redevelopment of the site, it considers the current wording of NP/H1 is unnecessarily restrictive and unjustified in the context of local and national policy. Reference to the requirement for a development brief should therefore be deleted from this policy.	NP/SS5.2	NPPF para 17 and 183 ref planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings. NPPF para 188 ref early engagement	Comment noted. The requirement for a Development Brief will provide an opportunity for local residents to be consulted and to influence design at an early stage in the planning process.
			The Trust supportive insofar that it will provide a suitable mix of housing within the site but concerned with the approach to providing flats as part of the overall mix. Policy should be amended to allow a greater proportion of flats on the site.	NP/SS5.4 (a)	NPPF Section 6 ref LPAs need to meet objectively assessed needs for housing NPPF para 17 ref planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings. NPPF para 183 ref Neighbourhood Planning giving communities power to develop vision for their area and deliver sustainable development.	Comment noted. The concern regarding flats arises from the strength of feeling in the community about the number of flats being developed. This is apparent from a number of public consultations. The question of flats on the Heatherwood site was specifically consulted on.
			The Trust objects to requirement for proposed build footprint to be set back from road boundaries as the SG has not provided sufficient evidence to justify their approach. It is considered that the wording ' <i>Build footprint should be set back from the road boundaries and</i>	NP/SS5.4 (b)		Comment noted. Wording of policy has been amended.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<i>not overpower its surroundings'</i> should be deleted to provide greater flexibility towards future development with sufficient design guidance already contained in other plan policies.			
			As highlighted above the Trust is prepared to enter into discussions with RBWM and makers of the NP to explore the potential for a new alternative cycle/pedestrian route through its land, including the wooded area in the southern part of the site. At this stage it is appropriate to remove all references to the route from map 19.	NP/SS5.4 (c)		Comment noted. Cycle route has been removed from the map. The requirement to provide safe and accessible pedestrian and cycle routes remains in the policy.
			It is considered that the wording of this policy is too restrictive, as it does not take into consideration potentially acceptable alternative uses. Whilst it is understood that residential use would be favoured the redevelopment of the remaining land could also provide a C1 use (ie a Hotel, Class A1-A5 (ie retail etc) and class B1 ie Offices as part of a mixture of uses. Add an additional bullet point which states: ' <i>where an alternative development option to residential dwellings is proposed on the remaining Heatherwood site, it should be designed in accordance with Policy NP/DG2.2 of the NP and any other relevant local and national guidance'</i>	NP/SS5		Your comments are noted. The NP would not support a hotel at this location as a non town centre site and, whilst some employment may be appropriate, our preference is for residential development here.
			It is noted that the section includes a project to designate the southern part of the site as SANG. The Trust is investigating a range of options for this part of the site, including other healthcare related uses, parking, open space or other complementary uses.	Section 9		Comment is noted. Identifying additional SANG(s) is considered important to delivery of our NP. While we recognise this is a matter for the Borough and Natural England, we nonetheless wish to encourage the bringing forward of suitable sites as SANGs – hence we have identified

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
						<p>this as a Project (note this is not a policy).</p> <p>The area south of the MDS at Heatherwood we believe is a suitable area and we would like to see it brought forward for this purpose.</p>
SB8	NW1 2DN	Network Rail	Network Rail supports policy for Ascot Station, subject to following qualifications:	NP/SS3		Thank you for your support.
			<p>NP supports treating the site as a GB exception site (NP pg 22 & 23). Despite this designation it is essentially a previously developed / "brownfield" site on the southern edge of the GB. Development here will help the borough to meet its housing requirements while taking pressure off other GB sites of higher environmental or visual amenity.</p>	Green Belt issues		Comments noted.
			<p>The 2 main elements of the emerging proposals are housing and a deck on the existing car park. It needs to be recognised that the deck is unlikely to come forward on its own, and needs the residential element to contribute to its cost.</p> <p>During formal pre-app advice and dev control process NR will consider with the LPA what scale of wider benefits for the area the scheme is capable of delivering. NR supports in principle the improvement of FPs running past the site as one of these benefits, but believed that all major development sites in the area should also contribute to the improvements identified in NP/SS3.3. NP/SS3 should make reference to this.</p>	S106 & CIL NP/SS3.3		Your comments are noted.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			NP supports NP/SS3.4(a) regarding residential development on lower part of car park and the retail or other commercial uses adjoining the station. To maximise the chance of finding a suitable quality retail tenant it is considered that the 50 sq.m limitation ay be too restrictive, as retailers normally prefer an area up to 280 sq.m in order to meet Sunday Trading legislation criteria, and would prefer this to be the limit.	NP/SS3.4(a)		Policy has been amended.
			NP have confirmed to the borough our intention to see the site developed within the first 5 yrs of the plan. Our studies show the site could accommodate as much as 80 units, but a more measured appraisal of the mix of different size units suggests 50-60 units, which is thought to match the LPAs own capacity assumptions.			Comments noted.
SB9	SL5 9AZ	SPAЕ	It is encouraging that many of the key aims of the NP are aligned with those of the SPAЕ constitution. These include endeavouring to ensure that all development is consistent with the existing character of the area, including its green and leafy appearance and the distinct character of our villages. Further, that all development will be in accord with Gov. policies “to meet new housing demand in a way that is sympathetic to the area”. Also to ensure, as far as possible, that all development shall be within approved Government GB policies where applicable. Finally, it should retain existing natural features of the area, including the flora and fauna.			Your comments are noted and thank you for your positive words.
			Development within selected areas of GB in Ascot is proposed, albeit supported by a majority of the community. SPAЕ has concern that this could set a precedent for other pressured GB areas around the SE. SPAЕ recognises that the			Comments noted. Our policy NP/EN1 makes it clear how strongly the community feel regarding protection of the GB.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>BLP policies will apply to all GB areas across the borough, including the local neighbourhood.</p> <p>SPEA supports this NP.</p>			
SB1 0	RG7 5DZ	CPRE	<p>The draft NP is a very impressive piece of work and will be an excellent template for other area plans. CPRE's policy is very much in line with that of the Plan's authors. We therefore support the broad sweep of the Plan's strategy. Specifically we welcome the determination to keep the open spaces between the villages and the establishment of green corridors.</p> <p>Our organisation is always uneasy about any encroachment on GB land, but recognise there is a case for this to happen on the S side of Ascot High Street, and would not seek to oppose this part of the plan. We also offer our full support against any application to build houses on GB sites at Silwood</p>			Your comments are noted and thank you for your support.
SB1 1	OX4 4XT	BBO Wildlife Trust.	We welcome the clear intention and effort that has been made to include the protection and biodiversity throughout the NP. Our comments are:			Thank you for your comments.
			<p>In relation to the TBH SPA the use of the words "<i>appropriate equivalent</i>" does not give an accurate description of what is required from SANG provision for new developments within 5km of the SPA. The TBH SPA delivery framework states that "<i>SANG should be provided on the basis of at least 8ha per 1000 population</i>". This should be clearer in the Plan.</p> <p>The delivery framework sets out a 2-pronged approach to mitigate the effect of net new</p>	5.2.1		Comment noted and text has been amended.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>dwelling within 5km of the SPA. These are the provision of SANGs and financial contributions towards strategic access management and monitoring (SAMM). The NP makes no reference to SAMM, and this must be rectified. Suggested alt wording is:</p> <p><i>'The significance of this on housing development is that to mitigate any effect of net new dwellings within 5km of the SPA, SANG must be provided as well as a financial contribution towards SAMM'.</i></p> <p>Delivery Framework also states that the impact of dwellings within 400m of the SPA is likely to be such that it is not possible to conclude no effect on the SPA, and there should be a presumption against development in this zone. Suggest following additional wording:</p> <p><i>"Within 400m of the SPA (as the crow flies) there is a presumption against residential development to avoid any significant effect on the integrity of the nearby SPA. This 400m zone affects the SE corner of the S'dale parish (see map 12).</i></p>			
			<p>This identifies two internationally important conservation areas. I recommend including a map in this section, which identifies all of the international, national and locally designated sites within your area. The Windsor Great Park and Woodlands plus Silwood Park Biodiversity Opportunity Area should be included.</p> <p>This clear hierarchy set out in NPPF should be reflected in the NP.</p> <p>We suggest the following alternative wording:</p>	6.1.5	NPPF para 188 ref conservation and enhancement of biodiversity	Comments noted. Text in 6.1.5 has been amended.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<i>“In such instances, if there is no satisfactory alternatives, we wish to ensure at least that appropriate mitigation, or, as a last resort, compensation, is provided”.</i>			
			In this policy the terms ‘mitigation and compensation’ cannot be interchanged and need to be clearly defined. (a suggested alternative wording is presented)	NP/EN5		Wording in policy has been amended.
			This should include all international and nationally designated sites, including proposed and candidate sites. Suggested alt wording is: <i>“Development proposals which are likely, either directly or indirectly, to adversely affect an international or nationally designated site shall be refused”</i>	NP/EN5.2		As these sites are all protected by national legislation and/or BLP policies, this policy is not adding anything and has therefore been deleted from this NP.
			Again, terms ‘mitigation’ and ‘compensation’ have been confused and interchanged. Suggest alt wording is: <i>“A survey report by aappropriate mitigation measures, or, as a last resort, compensation to significantly reduce the likely impact”</i> Obligations under NERC Act 2006. Priority habitats and species must be noted in the NP.	NP/EN5.3 (b)	Section 41 of NERC Act 2006 lists habitats and species of principle importance to guide the LA in its duty under section 40 of the Act.	Policy text has been amended. Comment re NERC Section 41 is noted. It is the responsibility of Local Planning Authority and, consequently, not considered necessary to list habitats and species in the NP.
			We have serious concerns over potential residential development of this site due to its close proximity to the TBH SPA. It is 500-600m from the SPA and neither Allen’s Field nor proposed H’wood SANG is in the vicinity to provide for a development in this location.	NP/SS6		Concern is noted.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			Similar wording regarding “ <i>appropriate equivalent SANG</i> ” appear in the details of this project; this should be edited with the suggested alt wording above.	Project 9.2		Text has been amended to delete “equivalent”. This is wording supporting a proposed project and not a NP policy.
			Silwood Park site lies within the Windsor Great Park and Woodland, including Silwood Park Biodiversity Opportunity Area (as defined above), and this should be noted in this section of Plan.	NP/SS9		Text has been amended to include reference.
			Welcome the inclusion of this project but concerned about wording of first part of this statement: “ <i>While we recognise.....green corridors</i> ”. It is not unreasonable to prohibit development on designated habitats and species in any location. Suggested alt wording: “ <i>While we recognise that it is unreasonable and unrealistic to prohibit development on non-designated biodiversity habitats that run through built up areas and people’s gardens,</i> ”.	Project 9.3		Text has been amended.
			We support the inclusion of this policy and welcome this positive approach to providing linkages and connecting up important habitats.	NP/EN6		We appreciate your support.
SB1 2	RG12 1JD	Bracknell Forest	Whilst the Council supports the development of a NP for the area, it is not clear how the Plan is in conformity with relevant strategic policies for the area, particularly as the saved policies of the BLP were adopted 10 years ago and are dated. Whilst it is noted the NP contains proposals involving some housing development, there is concern that further development may need to be considered in the area, depending on the outcome of the borough’s objective assessment of housing need.		NPPF para 184, 185 and 215 general conformity with strategic policies and implementation	DCLG have confirmed that there is no barrier to NPs coming forward before the Local Planning Authority has produced its LP, provided that discussions have taken place with the LPA and that every effort has been made to ensure the policies in the NP will not conflict with those being progressed in the Borough LP. Confirmation that these discussions have taken place with RBWM is included in their response to this pre-submission consultation.

A, S & S NP PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION: PUBLIC AND STATUTORY BODY RESPONSES AND OUTCOMES

No.	P/CODE	NAME	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	POLICY/ SECTION (if applic)	SOME RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS (eg. NPPF) & OTHER FACTORS	NP COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
			<p>BF needs to gain a better understanding of the potential of proposals (particularly in the Ascot area) to impact on its infrastructure, for example, the transport network, but needs further details of the nature and scale of proposals to establish this.</p> <p>Evidence is required on the predicted traffic impact from all sites on all routes between your area and BF (study scope outlined).</p>			<p>Your comments re potential impact of proposals on its infrastructure are noted. We understand that RBWM is producing a transport model which should address these issues.</p> <p>It is not proportionate to expect a NP to undertake traffic impact assessments or retail needs assessments; this is for the LPA.</p>
			<p>One of the “Basic Conditions” is that the NP conforms with EU obligations. This includes the Habitats Directive and EC Wild Birds Directive and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2012. No Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) seems to have been undertaken. For sites within 5km of the SPA whilst the requirement for SPA mitigation is recognised, both provision of SANG and contribution towards SAMM is likely to be required.</p> <p>Non-residential sites may require to be assessed through HRA.</p>		EU Habitats Directive	<p>An HRA screening was undertaken by the Borough and Natural England have confirmed they are supportive of its conclusions. These documents are included in our Evidence Base.</p>