

Hurley and the Walthams Neighbourhood Plan

Summary of Representations made at the Regulation 16 consultation to be considered by the Examiner

4 Organisations said they had no comment to make.

5 Individuals said they supported the Neighbourhood Plan as submitted

Historic England made a full and detailed response with the comments below as the main points:

'We consider that it would not be appropriate to make the Plan without amendments to Policies HUR 2 and WW 5 and that it might not be appropriate to make the Plan without amendments to Policies Gen 1 and Gen 5. We are also concerned that Policy Gen 2 is not based on an understanding and evaluation of the defining characteristics of the Plan area as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. We would be pleased to discuss these comments'

An Individual made representations against several policies in the draft plan ENV1, ENV2, SPI, GEN, GEN3, COM 4, this was in support of proposed development of a site.

An individual expressed concerns about policy WW1 and the impact of 79 dwellings on local infrastructure including, roads, schools etc

Emina Estates Ltd, made representations in relation to supporting development of a particular site in the Green Belt, commenting on specific policies,

A planning consultancy made a detailed representation that the plan should have considered gypsy and traveller issues.

Berkshire College of Agricultural made a detailed and long representation seeking policy changes which would have allowed more development, in part, enabling development to support the college financially.

Bracknell Forest BC commented that the strategic policies against which the draft plan has been assessed are out of date and that there may need to be some consideration of amended Green Belt boundaries.

A planning consultancy, on behalf of private individuals made detailed representations objecting to additional technical standards for new housing, they also objected to the lack of a Green Belt boundary review and the failure to include their client's site within a village. There are also detailed objects to policy GEN 1, GEN 3, and COM 4 particularly in relation to safeguarding employment land.

Sorbon Estates objected to the details contained in policy WW 1 as being unrealistic and over prescriptive as well as not complying with current guidance; with related objections to HOU 2 and policies E1, E3,E4 and EC 2.

Thames Water have made detailed representations concerning water supply and sewage treatment works capacity and the impact of any proposed development, they are asking for developers to carry out an assessment before applications are submitted in order to minimise the impact.

An individual has objected to Policy WSL 1 as being too restrictive by not allowing housing for local people to downsize to; or for children of villagers to stay in the area.

Littlewick Green Society made two representations, one in support of the Breadcroft Lane Local Greenspace and the other promoting two additional community facilities which should be included in the list in the plan under Policy GEN 5.

An individual objected to the proposed allocation in Policy WW 1, while agreeing with the need for housing, concern was expressed over the impact of the scale of development on services and infrastructure.

An individual sort the inclusion of policies on small affordable housing.

Maidenhead Civic Society supported the designation of Shottesbrooke Park as an area of 'special character study' and gave their reasons.

Sport England said it is important that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects national policy for sport as set out in their document to ensure proposals comply with National Planning Policy. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing fields along with other comments.

Nexus Planning submitted a representation on behalf of Horizon Business Park, seeking a specific policy for it, which would allow it to expand in the Green Belt, supported by their interpretation of national policy and guidance.