

BNPP 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 Bray Parish 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.

This document also sets out the BNPP Steering Group's comments to the responses received and any outcomes resulting.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BNPP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
RESIDENTS CONSULTATION RESPONSES								
R01	19-May-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2DL	P.J.N. Harvey	Built Environment	BE15	Agree. Give thought to any possible future fracking. If sited sympathetically it may provide healthy income for the Parish without negative consequences.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R01	19-May-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2DL	P.J.N. Harvey	Transport & Infrastructure	TI4	Agree. There should be a footpath from Holyport village all the way to Holyport College. Cycle routes should not have frequent give way stops. The whole point of easy cycling is to get going and keep going.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R02	20-May-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2EY	Mr R.T. Gibson	Economy	E3	Agree. However I am concerned that from time to time some of our lovely village pubs put up marquees and close for private functions. My view is that these premises have insufficient facilities for these type of events (parking and WC in particular) and should not prohibit their usual customers. After all as their name suggests they are 'public houses'. There are plenty of venues in the area that are more suited to this type of function. Furthermore the marquees are hardly in keeping with the visual amenities of the village.	The Steering Group notes your comments but believe that this is outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan.
R02	20-May-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2EY	Mr R.T. Gibson	n/a	Whole	I am in total agreement with the Neighbourhood Plan as published so far.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R03	21-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2YT	W. Godfrey	Green Belt	GB1-GB3	Agree - without qualification!	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R03	21-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2YT	W. Godfrey	Built Environment	BE1-BE5	Agree - but to be supported by 66% of registered electors.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R03	21-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2YT	W. Godfrey	Built Environment	BE9-BE16	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R03	21-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2YT	W. Godfrey	Transport & Infrastructure	TI1-TI4	Agree. Traffic calming measures to be installed in Holyport Road to stop excessive speeding.	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
R03	21-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2YT	W. Godfrey	Economy	E1-E6	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R04	21-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2QP	Helen Verdcourt	Green Belt	GB1-GB3	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R04	21-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2QP	Helen Verdcourt	Built Environment	BE1	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R04	21-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2QP	Helen Verdcourt	Built Environment	BE2-BE7	Agree. The country is over-populated already. All green space must be preserved - for health as well as amenities - and, most important, local wildlife. I have seen badgers and foxes here frequently.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R04	21-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2QP	Helen Verdcourt	Built Environment	BE8	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R04	21-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2QP	Helen Verdcourt	Built Environment	BE10-BE11	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R05	21-May-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2EA	Joseph Rufino Cordeiro	Green Belt	GB2	I agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R06	22-May-15	Freepost	SL4 4US	Ian Couzens	Green Belt	GB1-E6	I support <u>all</u> of this document's proposed policies. The RBWM Council's plan to put 1,000 dwellings on the Green Belt between the Dedworth Road and the A308 is outrageous. These meadows are full of wildlife and at times are under water. The area must be protected. There is no infrastructure to support the development and the loss of both Garden Centres beggars belief. The Wyvale Centre has become a community centre since the addition of a Café and a children's play pit.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R07	22-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2LL	Robert M. Squire	n/a	Whole	I agree with all your policies and 'thank you' all for looking after the Parish of Bray so well.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R08	23-May-15	E-Mail	SL6 2HA	Andrew Cormie	Detailed Response	Whole	MULTIPLE PAGES OF SPECIFIC AND GENERAL COMMENTS. TOO NUMEROUS TO SUMMARISE. SEE ATTACHED.	The response from Mr. Cormie ran to nearly 25,000 words. These were considered carefully by the SG. If one excludes the suggested rewording that Mr Cormie would like to see, then the main thrust of Mr. Cormie's comments are focused on the protection of the Green Belt. His recommendations are centred on the mandatory exclusion of any development whatsoever in the Green Belt in Bray Parish. As such, Mr Cormie would require the Plan to exercise an authority that goes substantially beyond National Green Belt Policy and the Plan's scope.
R09	25-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2RD	Julia Gerrard	Transport & Infrastructure	TI4	Agreed. A safe crossing-point on Braywick Road - even if halfway up by the speed camera. I love the "nature" trail but accessing on foot us a nightmare from my home - especially with children or elderly relatives.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R10	25-May-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2JH	Tony Bennett	n/a	n/a	No comments made.	Noted. No action required.
R11	27-May-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2AL	Adam Tillion	Built Environment	Whole	The Bray Parish Neighbourhood Plan is the dullest most defensive NP I have ever read. Bray Parish is desperate for an injection of youth and young families, or Bray will become a museum for old people. Bray parish is a sustainably located village and it has a duty to take some new housing, starting on brownfield sites. these homes should not be social housing, but small family homes , 2 and 3 bed shared equity homes or low cost homes for young hard working families. Come on Bray Parish 'put down the drawbridge', and embrace change in a more positive manner.	The Steering Group have sought, over more than 5 years, to reflect the views, wishes and opinions of the Residents of Bray Parish as that is the only route by which a Neighbourhood Plan might achieve acceptance in a Referendum. The SG is sorry that you find it dull. It would have welcomed at any stage of the Plan's formulation your active participation to brighten it up.
R12	28-May-15	Freepost	SL6 1UX	David Jones	Transport & Infrastructure	TI1	Agreed. I believe the Free School at Braywick Park is too large a development. If built it will cause traffic flow problems along Hibbert Road especially at school drop-off time. Parking in Braywick Park Car Park will not solve this problem as it is not big enough. I suggest an alternative site be found or a much smaller school be planned.	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
R13	28-May-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2NX	Sharon Sword	Heathrow	Whole	Very concerned about the lack of support for the 3rd runway. It seems to be the fashionable/trendy response to vote against it. I am stunned by the naivety of this stance. Throughout the document it is stating that the parish council is keen to keep the businesses in the area. If the 3rd runway does not go ahead the impact on a large majority of local businesses will be immense. This is probably not the forum to go on about this subject, but I believe it is a very important one for the long term well being of the area.	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R14	29-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2DZ	John Mercer	Green Belt	GB1-GB2	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R14	29-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2DZ	John Mercer	Built Environment	BE1-BE2	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R14	29-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2DZ	John Mercer	Built Environment	BE8	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R14	29-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2DZ	John Mercer	Built Environment	BE14	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R14	29-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2DZ	John Mercer	Transport & Infrastructure	TI1-TI4	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R14	29-May-15	Freepost	SL6 2DZ	John Mercer	Economy	E2	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R15	01-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2YN	Mr. N. Haines	Green Belt	GB1-GB3	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R15	01-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2YN	Mr. N. Haines	Built Environment	BE2	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R15	01-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2YN	Mr. N. Haines	Built Environment	BE7	Agree. Except more noise reduction fencing required from M4 spur.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R15	01-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2YN	Mr. N. Haines	Built Environment	BE9	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R15	01-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2YN	Mr. N. Haines	Built Environment	BE2	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R15	01-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2YN	Mr. N. Haines	Built Environment	BE12	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R15	01-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2YN	Mr. N. Haines	Built Environment	BE14	Disagree. Remove as much as possible.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R15	01-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2YN	Mr. N. Haines	Economy	E1	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R15	01-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2YN	Mr. N. Haines	Transport & Infrastructure	TI4	Agree. Proper cycle routes required plus safe cycling for all.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R16	04-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2BG	Gary Harpham	n/a	n/a	No comments made.	Noted. No action required.
R17	09-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2DZ	William Collier	Green Belt	GB2	I agree with this policy but it is like closing the stable door after the horse has bolted. Farmglade have been given permission by the Borough to build an estate on this land and they now own all the land from the Oakley Court Hotel to Monkey Island Lane which they will want to build on. Also, at the Squires nursery end, plans have been put forward for a sports complex. How much more will there be left to save?	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R17	09-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2DZ	William Collier	Transport & Infrastructure	Transport	Speed limits on rural roads are too high. I refer to Fifield Road where the 60 MPH road is only 4/10ths of a mile long and has houses and stables along over half of its length. I live on this section of road and I don't have to go to Brands Hatch or Silverstone to see speeding cars and motorcycles, I just listen for them going past my house.	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
R18	09-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2FN	Mrs. Hemmings	Green Belt	GB2	Agree. Maintaining 'Green Gap' is vital to keeping the charm and character of Bray Parish, something that attracts tourists to come and see what makes Bray Parish stand out from the larger towns.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BNPP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R18	09-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2FN	Mrs. Hemmings	Built Environment	BE1	Disagree. There should be no development in Green Belt areas whatsoever! Regardless of the community benefits. It is not benefitting the wildlife whose habitats are being destroyed.	The BNPP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
R18	09-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2FN	Mrs. Hemmings	Transport & Infrastructure	T12	Agree. It is paramount that safe drop-off zones are adequate to allow for every child to be taken and picked up from school safely without compromising on other road users' journeys.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R19	09-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2LZ	Andrew Giles	Green Belt	GB1	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R19	09-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2LZ	Andrew Giles	Green Belt	GB3	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R19	09-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2LZ	Andrew Giles	Built Environment	BE1	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R19	09-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2LZ	Andrew Giles	Built Environment	BE6	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R19	09-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2LZ	Andrew Giles	Built Environment	BE10-BE11	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R19	09-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2LZ	Andrew Giles	Built Environment	BE16	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R19	09-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2LZ	Andrew Giles	Transport & Infrastructure	T13	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R19	09-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2LZ	Andrew Giles	Economy	E1	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R19	09-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2LZ	Andrew Giles	Economy	E3	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R19	09-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2LZ	Andrew Giles	Economy	E5	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R20	10-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2DZ	J.T. McIntosh	n/a	Whole	Agree with all proposals. "Good work".	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R21	10-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BN	Michael Copcutt	Economy	E2	The village (of Bray) is already short of car parking - what additional spaces will be provided and how quickly?	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
R22	11-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL4 4QD	Mark Lloyd	Green Belt	GB1	Disagree. I believe 75% of residents should be in support of any development in Green Belt. If the general principle is that development in the Green Belt is not appropriate, then it should need more than a simple majority to permit it. For many rural individual dwelling proposals, only a very small number of immediate neighbours may be made aware of the proposed development and object, meaning the local developer only needs a few friends to vote in favour for the proposal to be passed.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R22	11-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL4 4QD	Mark Lloyd	Built Environment	BE1	Disagree. I believe 75% of residents should be in support of any development in Green Belt. If the general principle is that development in the Green Belt is not appropriate, then it should need more than a simple majority to permit it. For many rural individual dwelling proposals, only a very small number of immediate neighbours may be made aware of the proposed development and object, meaning the local developer only needs a few friends to vote in favour for the proposal to be passed.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BNPP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R22	11-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL4 4QD	Mark Lloyd	n/a	Whole	ENSURE ADEQUATE RESOURCE FOR ENFORCEMENT. Ideally I would like to see a policy that gives support to ensuring the enforcement of all the other policies in the Plan. My previous experience of the RBWM team indicates that this area is currently under-resourced. It is great to have the Plan but if we must be sure that it is able to be enforced.	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
R23	12-Jun-15	E-Mail	SL6 2HA	Andrew Cormie	Green Belt	GB1	ONE FURTHER COMMENT TO SUPPLEMENT RESPONSE R08. SEE ATTACHED.	The response from Mr. Cormie ran to nearly 25,000 words. These were considered carefully by the SG. If one excludes the suggested rewording that Mr Cormie would like to see, then the main thrust of Mr. Cormie's comments are focused on the protection of the Green Belt. His recommendations are centred on the mandatory exclusion of any development whatsoever in the Green Belt in Bray Parish. As such, Mr Cormie would require the Plan to exercise an authority that goes substantially beyond National Green Belt Policy and the Plan's scope.
R24	14-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2PD	Matthew Nicholls	n/a	n/a	No comments made.	Noted. No action required.
R25	16-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2DJ	Andrew & Fiona Dickinson	Transport & Infrastructure	T12	Agree. Strongly recommend "Kiss & Drop" outside school so nobody can park - they must drive on immediately. Also, could we encourage "walking crocodiles" so more children walk to school?	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R26	17-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2US	H. Jesseman	Green Belt	GB1	Agreed but the 50% should be increased to 75%.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R26	17-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2US	H. Jesseman	Built Environment	BE1	Agreed but the 50% should be increased to 75%.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R26	17-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2US	H. Jesseman	Built Environment	BE6	Agreed except that any proposals should actively seek to reduce the current congestion levels as well.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R26	17-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2US	H. Jesseman	Built Environment	BE8	Agreed except that any proposals should actively seek to reduce the current congestion levels as well.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R26	17-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2US	H. Jesseman	Built Environment	BE15	Agreed except that any proposals should actively seek to reduce the current congestion levels as well.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R26	17-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2US	H. Jesseman	Transport & Infrastructure	T11	Agreed except that any proposals should actively seek to reduce the current congestion levels as well.	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
R26	17-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2US	H. Jesseman	Economy	E2	Agreed except that any proposals should actively seek to reduce the current congestions levels as well.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R26	17-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2US	H. Jesseman	Green Belt	GB & T	The BNPP should be seeking to discourage any attempts to erode the Green Belt and to try and reduce traffic congestion.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R27	19-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2YN	Demelza Sampson	Built Environment	BE11	<p>Disagree. <u>Cemeteries.</u> Having previously lived in an area (with similar geographical & geological qualities to Bray Parish), that had a new cemetery built, I have some concerns over its inclusion in this list without any clauses or caveats.</p> <p>Where I used to live, there were strong and justifiable objections to the cemetery on three main grounds: (1) Concerns over the effect on local water courses of decomposing bodies, particularly in a high flood risk area> In addition, the negative effect on local property of draining ground currently used for flood relief. (2) Increased traffic & congestion. A new cemetery is likely to mean a lot of funerals which generally involves a lot of visitors to the area and extra traffic congestion. This traffic, by its nature, is slow-moving. Parking is also a big concern. (3) The cemetery that was built in my old neighbourhood included segregated areas which were consecrated for various different faiths. Due to racial tensions at the time between various ethnic minorities in the wider area, there were concerns that the cemetery would become a focus for antisocial behaviour and desecration. This was in an area, like Bray, that was not accustomed to such behaviour. I would therefore like to think that any cemetery that is built in the Parish is fully integrated and secular, or merely an extension of the graveyard of an existing church (or other place of worship), and that all traffic and water pollution impacts are fully considered.</p>	Your comments regarding the various impacts of a new cemetery being built where you lived before have been noted and will be borne in mind by the Bray Parish Council if any future application is received.
R27	19-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2YN	Demelza Sampson	Economy	E2	Agree. In respect of new retail, hospitality & service businesses, I would like to see an amendment to the policy to read along the lines of: "...adverse impact on ...neighbours as a result of SMELLS, noise, light pollution,..." as I am aware that cooking smells and large quantities of refuse can cause issues for local residents.	All Policies on the Economy have now been restated as Recommendations in the Plan. Adverse impact on neighbours is always a material consideration in planning.
R28	19-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BW	Melloney Bibra	Green Belt	GB1	<u>Strongly agree.</u>	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R28	19-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BW	Melloney Bibra	Green Belt	GB3	Agree. Bray has a unique visual impact - to be retained.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R28	19-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BW	Melloney Bibra	Built Environment	BE1-BE3	Very very important.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R28	19-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BW	Melloney Bibra	Built Environment	BE6	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R28	19-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BW	Melloney Bibra	Built Environment	BE8	Agree, but local employees already cause parking issues in my road and throughout the village.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R28	19-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BW	Melloney Bibra	Transport & Infrastructure	TI1	Agree. Local parking issues. Consider yellow lines!	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BNPP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R28	19-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BW	Melloney Bibra	Economy	E2	Disagree. Not enough parking for local employees & patrons - surely already plenty pubs & hospitality venues. Brayfield Road already has significant parking issues - large non-resident vehicles make turning into road very difficult. Have even had non-residents park over my driveway. Some double yellow lines definitely required here. Stricter controls required and hospitality venues/owners to take more responsibility.	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
R29	19-Jun-15	Freepost	SL4 5UN	Audrey Woolley	Green Belt	GB1	Very definitely agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R29	19-Jun-15	Freepost	SL4 5UN	Audrey Woolley	Green Belt	GB2	Even more important - agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R29	19-Jun-15	Freepost	SL4 5UN	Audrey Woolley	Green Belt	GB3	Agree	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R29	19-Jun-15	Freepost	SL4 5UN	Audrey Woolley	Built Environment	BE1	Agree	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R29	19-Jun-15	Freepost	SL4 5UN	Audrey Woolley	Built Environment	BE2	Agree	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R29	19-Jun-15	Freepost	SL4 5UN	Audrey Woolley	Built Environment	BE3-11	Agree	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R30	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JX	Robin & Brenda Butler	Green Belt	GB1	Disagree. All three criteria must be satisfied. We feel strongly that the 50% voter threshold is much too low. We must emphasise that the potential hospital site is both in the Green Belt and Flood Plain and that neighbours would be subject to noise and light pollution 24/7 as well as increased traffic.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R30	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JX	Robin & Brenda Butler	Green Belt	GB2-GB3	Disagree. How can you have development and still retain the Bray Green Gap? We suggest no development. Also there is effectively a Green Gap between Ascot Road and Harvest Hill Road - same criteria must apply.	The BNPP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
R30	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JX	Robin & Brenda Butler	Built Environment	BE1	Disagree. This weakens the GB1 policy statement. Again, the voter threshold is too low.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R30	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JX	Robin & Brenda Butler	Built Environment	BE2-BE6	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R30	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JX	Robin & Brenda Butler	Built Environment	BE7	Disagree. Fence height should only be restricted to 1.2m if there is an actual line of sight issue, perhaps at junctions. Otherwise a height of 2m should be allowed.	This Policy has been removed.
R30	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JX	Robin & Brenda Butler	Built Environment	BE8-BE11	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R30	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JX	Robin & Brenda Butler	Built Environment	BE12	Disagree. There are too many horses and horse boxes on the main and side roads already. This leads to congestion. They are not considerate of other road users.	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
R30	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JX	Robin & Brenda Butler	Built Environment	BE13-BE16	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R30	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JX	Robin & Brenda Butler	Transport & Infrastructure	TI1	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R30	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JX	Robin & Brenda Butler	Transport & Infrastructure	TI2	Agree. Arrangements for the new Oldfield School are completely inadequate - there will be significant additional congestion around school arrival and leaving times.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R30	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JX	Robin & Brenda Butler	Transport & Infrastructure	TI3	Qualified agreement. Prefer that the reference to less sustainable forms of transport is deleted. I am not 'anti-cyclist' but cars and cyclists in the same road space is increasingly a problem - separate cycle tracks which cyclists actually use are required.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R30	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JX	Robin & Brenda Butler	Transport & Infrastructure	TI4	Agree. The 'appropriate provision of footpaths, bridleways & cycle routes' may also require bridges over certain roads.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R30	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JX	Robin & Brenda Butler	Transport & Infrastructure	Transport	Pedestrian crossing provision has been overlooked. There is no crossing on the Ascot Road, although needed. And none at the Braywick Roundabout, on any of the feeder roads. Traffic lights would improve safety at the Braywick roundabout & improve traffic flow.	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
R30	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JX	Robin & Brenda Butler	Economy	E1-E6	Agree. Garden centres should also be included in these policies.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R31	23-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	Patricia Del Vecchio	Green Belt	GB1-GB3	Agree. Strongly endorse the Green Belt policies. Preserving green space is vital for our, and our children's, physical and mental wellbeing.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R31	23-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	Patricia Del Vecchio	Built Environment	BE1-BE16	Agree. Strongly support these policies.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R31	23-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	Patricia Del Vecchio	Transport & Infrastructure	TI1-TI4	Agree strongly. Public transport is so important to reduce the number of cars on the crowded roads.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R31	23-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	Patricia Del Vecchio	Economy	E1-E4	Agree strongly.	Support appreciated, thank you. No action required.
R31	23-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	Patricia Del Vecchio	Economy	E5	Agree strongly. Better broadband services would be welcome.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R31	23-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	Patricia Del Vecchio	Economy	E6	Agree strongly.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R31	23-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	Patricia Del Vecchio	n/a	Whole	A really good document. The work entailed to produce this Plan is very, very much appreciated.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R32	23-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2AT	Richard Baldwyn	n/a	Whole	Having lived here for 45 years, I can only thank those who have put so much work into the Bray Parish Neighbourhood Plan. I fear I cannot be much of a help in offering views on the individual policies because it seems to me the policies outlined are all sensible and obviously thoroughly thought through. So thank you for all that has been done by those involved and congratulations to all those concerned.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R33	24-Jun-15	Freepost	SL4 4PZ	John Dunn	Green Belt	GB1-GB3	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R33	24-Jun-15	Freepost	SL4 4PZ	John Dunn	Built Environment	BE1-BE16	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R33	24-Jun-15	Freepost	SL4 4PZ	John Dunn	Transport & Infrastructure	TI1-TI4	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R33	24-Jun-15	Freepost	SL4 4PZ	John Dunn	Economy	E1-E6	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R34	24-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 1UT	R. Shaw	Green Belt	GB1	Strongly agree. I would suggest that 75% of the Parish Ward electors should approve, not 50%.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R34	24-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 1UT	R. Shaw	Green Belt	GB2	Strongly agree. There is too much encroachment between Maidenhead and Bray (i.e. Oldfield School).	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R34	24-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 1UT	R. Shaw	Green Belt	GB3	Strongly agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R34	24-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 1UT	R. Shaw	Built Environment	BE1	Strongly agree. I would suggest that 75% of the Parish Ward electors should approve, not 50%.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R34	24-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 1UT	R. Shaw	Built Environment	BE2	Strongly agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R34	24-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 1UT	R. Shaw	Built Environment	BE3	Strongly agree. An example of lack of proper consultation is Braywick Park Court School.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R34	24-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 1UT	R. Shaw	Built Environment	BE4	Strongly agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R34	24-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 1UT	R. Shaw	Built Environment	BE5	Strongly agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R34	24-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 1UT	R. Shaw	Built Environment	BE6	Strongly agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R34	24-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 1UT	R. Shaw	Transport & Infrastructure	TI2	Strongly agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R34	24-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 1UT	R. Shaw	Economy	E6	Strongly agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R35	25-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2YJ	A. Keyte	Green Belt	GB1-GB3	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R35	25-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2YJ	A. Keyte	Built Environment	BE1-BE16	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R35	25-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2YJ	A. Keyte	Transport & Infrastructure	T11-T14	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R35	25-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2YJ	A. Keyte	Economy	E1-E5	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R36	29-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BJ	John Woodcock	Green Belt	GB1-GB3	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R36	29-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BJ	John Woodcock	Built Environment	BE1-BE3	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R36	29-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BJ	John Woodcock	Built Environment	BE4-BE5	I have reservations regarding these Policies as the criteria usually boils down to a matter of opinion. There should be more flexibility.	The Policies have be redrafted in the Plan but provide for some flexibility on the part of the Planning Officer.
R36	29-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BJ	John Woodcock	Built Environment	BE6-BE8	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R36	29-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BJ	John Woodcock	Built Environment	BE9	There should be more flexibility in the use of modern materials in the maintenance of Listed Buildings. If it looks OK, use it!	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
R36	29-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BJ	John Woodcock	Built Environment	BE10-BE16	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R36	29-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BJ	John Woodcock	Transport & Infrastructure	T11-T13	I consider traffic is the No. 1 problem but I am mainly concerned with the village of Bray which suffers badly from through traffic. This will not be helped by the Southern Relief Road, now under construction, and will be worsened when the new Oldfield School in Bray Road opens. The temporary(?) bridge over The Cut in the Upper Bray Road must be coming to the end of its life. To preserve it and considerably reduce the through traffic in Bray Village, it should be closed to all traffic except buses and public service vehicles. Access to Bray Village and Oldfield School would only be via Bray Road and Hibbert Road. This would solve a multitude of problems and I fail to see why this should fall outside the scope of the BPNP.	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
R36	29-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BJ	John Woodcock	Transport & Infrastructure	T14	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R36	29-Jun-15	Freepost	SL6 2BJ	John Woodcock	Economy	E1-E6	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R37	30-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2HG	Keith Hopkins	Green Belt	GB1	I disagree with this wording and propose the following instead: "This Bray Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan excludes from any possibility of development the areas identified in the RBWM First Preferred Options Consultation as Area 5C and Area 7A."	The BPNP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
R38	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2HF	Peter W. Dibb-Fuller	n/a	n/a	No comments made.	Noted. No action required.
R39	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 1UT	Mrs. M.A. Lilley	Green Belt	GB1	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R39	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 1UT	Mrs. M.A. Lilley	Built Environment	BE4	Refer to Planning Application 15/00801 - Changes to Braywick School not suitable.	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
R39	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 1UT	Mrs. M.A. Lilley	Built Environment	BE13	Refer to above. This extension is a potential eye-sore and to attach it to a centuries-old building is vandalism.	Noted

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R39	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 1UT	Mrs. M.A. Lilley	Built Environment	BE	Listed Buildings - Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R40	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	C.G. Brown	Green Belt	GB1	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R40	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	C.G. Brown	Built Environment	BE1	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R40	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	C.G. Brown	Built Environment	BE13	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R40	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	C.G. Brown	Built Environment	BE15	Agree. Fracking in immediate area - what are proposals if any?	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R40	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	C.G. Brown	Built Environment	BE16	Disagree. No landfill. Methane gas release into atmosphere?	On advice the Steering Group has turned this Policy into Recommendation L in the Plan.
R40	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	C.G. Brown	Transport & Infrastructure	TI1	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R40	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	C.G. Brown	Transport & Infrastructure	TI3	Agree. No mention of noise reduction on M4.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R40	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	C.G. Brown	Transport & Infrastructure	TI4	Agree. More cycle/rambling routes with overnight camping areas.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R40	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	C.G. Brown	Economy	E1	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R40	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	C.G. Brown	Economy	E2	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R40	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	C.G. Brown	Economy	E3	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R40	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	C.G. Brown	Economy	E4	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R40	01-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	C.G. Brown	Economy	E6	Agree. Greater emphasis on the Over-60's age group.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R41	01-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2HQ	Peter & Anette Abrahamsen	Green Belt	GB1	Agree, with the caveat that there will be no development whatsoever on the field between Holyport Road and Ascot Road (Area 7A). No development either on the Littlewick show ground (Area 5C). Any development will add to traffic congestion, noise and air pollution	The BPNP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
R41	01-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2HQ	Peter & Anette Abrahamsen	Built Environment	BE1	Agree, with the caveat that there will be no development whatsoever on the field between Holyport Road and Ascot Road (Area 7A). No development either on the Littlewick show ground (Area 5C). Any development will add to traffic congestion, noise and air pollution	The BPNP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
R41	01-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2HQ	Peter & Anette Abrahamsen	Built Environment	BE2	Agree, with the caveat that there will be no development whatsoever on the field between Holyport Road and Ascot Road (Area 7A). No development either on the Littlewick show ground (Area 5C). Any development will add to traffic congestion, noise and air pollution	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R41	01-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2HQ	Peter & Anette Abrahamsen	Built Environment	BE3	Agree, with the caveat that there will be no development whatsoever on the field between Holyport Road and Ascot Road (Area 7A). No development either on the Littlewick show ground (Area 5C). Any development will add to traffic congestion, noise and air pollution	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R41	01-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2HQ	Peter & Anette Abrahamsen	Built Environment	BE4-BE16	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R41	01-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2HQ	Peter & Anette Abrahamsen	Transport & Infrastructure	T11-T14	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R41	01-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2HQ	Peter & Anette Abrahamsen	Economy	E1-E6	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R42	02-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2LB	Diane Harket	Green Belt	GB1	The term "unless very special circumstances" is not specified and could be a loophole to permit development in the Green Belt.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R42	02-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2LB	Diane Harket	Built Environment	BE5	The term "sustainable housing" is not defined. This is too woolly a phrase and can mean anything anyone wants it to. Does this include a requirement for green energy, i.e. solar or ground source heat, water recycling, access to cycle routes etc? Or does it mean "not too many" houses in one place?	The Plan does not include any proposals for "sustainable housing".
R42	02-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2LB	Diane Harket	Built Environment	BE8	Agree as far as it goes. Important to include adjacent areas to prevent views to and from the Conservation Area being impeded or spoiled.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R42	02-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2LB	Diane Harket	Built Environment	BE11	Agree as far as it goes. Any change of use must seek to incorporate measures to enhance and encourage homes for wildlife in the vicinity that may be affected.	A Neighbourhood Plan is not able to mandate such measures.
R42	02-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2LB	Diane Harket	Built Environment	BE13	Agree, however there is also a need to ensure that extensions do not create light pollution in rural areas, or impact adversely on wildlife through loss of habitat.	Impacts of all types are material considerations in planning.
R42	02-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2LB	Diane Harket	Built Environment	BE15	No! There is no mention here of Fracking. There should be a presumption against fracking in the Parish, especially as Fifield has already been identified as a possible trial site. Is this omission deliberate?	The Steering Group has only received one comment regarding Fracking. Given our location the SG believes that it is not a relevant consideration.
R42	02-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2LB	Diane Harket	Built Environment	BE16	Yes, as far as it goes. Time limits should be set with severe penalties if they are overrun. Boundaries must be maintained especially hedgerows - any replanting should be native species only, never laurel or leylandii.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R42	02-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2LB	Diane Harket	Transport & Infrastructure	T13	Yes, but do not cut down mature trees! It is well known that trees afford protection against traffic pollution. Cutting a swathe through Green Belt trees to extend the Stafferton Way link road is horrendous and will add to air problems for residents, not to mention noise and light pollution.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R42	02-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2LB	Diane Harket	Economy	E1	Agree as far as it goes. Does adverse environmental impact include impact on wildlife? If not, specific reference to wildlife habitat should be included.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R42	02-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2LB	Diane Harket	Economy	E4	Why have Schools been excluded here? One of the greatest adverse impacts on the Green Belt within Bray Parish has come from the ongoing development of new schools, the likely demands for new extensions and associated increase in traffic. They should be specifically identified as their environmental impact is great, especially when built on the floodplain.	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
R43	02-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DD	Dennis Bray	Green Belt	GB1	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R43	02-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DD	Dennis Bray	Green Belt	GB2	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R43	02-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DD	Dennis Bray	Built Environment	BE1	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R43	02-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DD	Dennis Bray	Built Environment	BE4	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R43	02-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DD	Dennis Bray	Built Environment	BE15	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R43	02-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DD	Dennis Bray	Built Environment	BE16	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R43	02-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DD	Dennis Bray	Transport & Infrastructure	T11	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R43	02-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DD	Dennis Bray	Transport & Infrastructure	T12	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R43	02-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DD	Dennis Bray	Economy	E2	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R43	02-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DD	Dennis Bray	Economy	E3	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R43	02-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DD	Dennis Bray	Economy	E5	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R43	02-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DD	Dennis Bray	Economy	E6	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R44	03-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2HQ	Mr. & Mrs John McCarthy	n/a	Whole	We do not have any specific comments. However, having lived in the Parish for 35 years, we are keen to see it remain as it is as much as possible, with only the minimum and necessary development and, where possible, improvement to the current traffic and congestion situation at peak times.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R45	03-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2AA	Peter & Tina Sands	Transport & Infrastructure	T11	With the construction of the Southern Relief Road south of Maidenhead, there will be no good reason for through traffic to use Bray Village to 'rat-run'. Therefore traffic calming and management measures should be considered, like a mini-roundabout at the Bray Road/Hibbert Road junction. Also speed-reduction measures in the village centre, even such radical measures as a raised pedestrian/car paved area from the War Memorial area through to Church Drive.	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
R45	03-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2AA	Peter & Tina Sands	Transport & Infrastructure	T14	Bray Road is particularly narrow and should have a cycleway for its whole length following the relocation of Oldfield School. Old Mill Lane needs a footpath added for safety reasons - it should be natural wood chip finish.	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Green Belt	GB1	How would the 50% vote work – is the Neighbourhood Plan proposing a referendum on all applications that constitute inappropriate development (e.g. even large residential extensions)? Is this feasible and justified? Policy does not appear to be consistent with the NPPF – unclear as to how 50% voting in favour would constitute Very Special Circumstances (NPPF para. 88 indicates VSC is a balancing exercise which cannot be specified in advance).	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Green Belt	GB1	What is considered to be 'significant benefits to the local community'? For instance, applicants who want to build new housing could argue providing housing is a significant social and economic benefit to the community (meeting housing requirements and increasing spend in the local economy).	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Green Belt	GB2	What about construction of other buildings? NPPF para. 89 relates to 'construction of new buildings'.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Green Belt	GB3	Should harm to the character and appearance also be considered in policy GB2? Perhaps merge these policies.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Built Environment	BE1	This policy appears to repeat policy GB1.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Built Environment	BE2	Clarity should be provided on if 5 dwellings is net or gross. Thought should be given as to how the Development Brief requirements would be applied to Outline applications. Also, applications for more than 5 dwellings on sites of less than 0.25ha do not need to be considered against this policy?	The Policy is to be applied if a Planning Application is for 5 or more dwellings or for sites of more than 0.25ha.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Built Environment	BE3	So is this effectively part of BE2? How would the 50% vote work – is the Neighbourhood Plan proposing a referendum on all applications? Is this feasible and justified?	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Built Environment	BE4	Bit confused as to when this policy applies – is it only to refurbishments/redevelopments/change of use in 'recognised settlements'? Also the term 'Recognised Settlements' has not been defined – the map on page 6 of the Draft Plan shows urban areas, but these do not all appear to be excluded settlements. (Also see para. 86 of NPPF).	This Policy applies to all developments. The phrase "Recognised Settlement in the Green Belt" is a standard term in planning parlance.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Built Environment	BE4	Does this policy apply to any net increase in residential development, or is it the same as BE2?	These two Policies address different requirements however they have now been redrafted in the Plan.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BNPP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Built Environment	BE5	Could this be merged with BE4?	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Built Environment	BE6	The supporting text refers to NPPF para. 55, so does this policy apply to just areas in the countryside?	This Policy would apply to the whole of Bray Parish
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Built Environment	BE7	Unclear why 1.2m is specified.	This Policy has been removed.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Built Environment	BE8	This policy does not appear to be consistent with para. 32 of the NPPF.	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Built Environment	BE9-BE10	What about consideration of the significance of the heritage asset? See NPPF para. 132.	The Steering Group notes your comments but believe that this is outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Built Environment	BE11	Since all countryside in Bray is also Green Belt, this policy should be consistent with National Green Belt policy. Perhaps delete the bullet points to avoid duplicating higher level policy?	On independent advice, the Plan relies on current National Policy to control development in the Green Belt.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Built Environment	BE12	Need to consider the use class these establishments fall into – might not fall into the exceptions listed in NPPF para. 89.	The Policy has been removed.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Built Environment	BE13	What is the evidence/justification for the thresholds in this policy? In some parts of the parish (particularly the built-up areas) a building in a garden of just under 30sqm would still be disproportionate compared to the surrounding area. Does this apply to Green Belt areas? Construction of new buildings is inappropriate subject to certain exceptions (NPPF para. 89).	The Steering Group has taken professional planning advice.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Transport & Infrastructure	T12	Are there new proposed school sites to which this policy relates? Or does it apply to existing school sites also?	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Transport & Infrastructure	T14	Agree with the aspiration of this policy though these may need to be Parish Council-led projects. Have any routes been identified that could be shown on a map? Also are there any local level aspirations that would improve use of sustainable transport modes e.g. bike racks at Holyport local centre?	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Economy	E1	Does "where general access to the facility is limited" refer to physical access, or private/public access? How is 'genuine redundant' being defined?	Policies associated with the Economy have now been restated as Recommendations in the Plan. Buildings classed as "Redundant" are defined under National Policies.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Economy	E2-E3	So is 200 sq.m. considered to be small? Why was this threshold chosen?	The Steering Group was taking professional advice from a Planner.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Economy	E4	Can the existing designated business areas be shown on a map in the document?	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Economy	E	Second paragraph on page 38 seems to contradict previous sections which are seeking to reduce commuting and through flow of traffic.	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
R46	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YS	Charlotte Fulcher	Green Belt	GB	The paragraph on page 43 refers to Green Belt sites that may have potential for leisure facilities – which sites are considered to have potential? Proposals in the Green Belt would need to be considered against Green Belt tests set out in NPPF. Leisure development is listed as a main town centre use in the NPPF, so depending on proposals sequential/impact tests may be required.	The BNPP fully supports the Green Belt. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies.
R47	06-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2NX	Mike Thorne	Built Environment	BE1	Disagree. The final words of the policy "and who vote in a survey" should be deleted and it should require to be supported by a 50% or more majority of the registered electors in the Parish Ward affected irrespective of the number of responses or votes on any survey.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R48	08-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2NU	Paul N. Berry	Green Belt	GB1	The statement is unclear - is it 50% of registered electors who must vote in favour OR 50% of those who vote in a survey? Also, on one recent such survey, the questions were so loaded towards one set of answers that it was quite clearly biased - how will you ensure that this does not happen? Finally, not all registered electors are equally affected by development - how will you "weight" for this? Need to define clearly what constitutes "significant benefits" to avoid smokescreen offers of amenities in return for land use changes.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R48	08-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2NU	Paul N. Berry	Built Environment	BE1	Same comments as for GB1. Need to define clearly what constitutes "significant benefits" to avoid smokescreen offers of amenities in return for land use changes.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R49	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2HG	Geoffrey Cox	Green Belt	GB1	Agree. But cannot see how you are going to get more than 50% to vote on each project.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R49	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2HG	Geoffrey Cox	Built Environment	BE7	Disagree. Totally impractical. Many fences are a lot higher. Will this apply to hedges?	This Policy has been removed.
R49	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2HG	Geoffrey Cox	Built Environment	BE11	Agree. But won't supporting the expansion of sports & recreation increase traffic and require car parking space?	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
R49	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2HG	Geoffrey Cox	Transport & Infrastructure	TI2	Agree. From long experience in traffic control, parents will park as close to a school as possible and not bother about blocking driveways and paths. Whatever off-road parking is provided it will not be enough.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R50	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2HG	Barbara Bou-Sreih	Green Belt	GB1	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R50	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2HG	Barbara Bou-Sreih	Green Belt	GB2	Agree. It is essential that we keep villages as villages and not part of towns.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R50	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2HG	Barbara Bou-Sreih	Built Environment	BE2	Agree. I will add that access to and from already busy 'A' roads should be considered.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R50	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2HG	Barbara Bou-Sreih	Built Environment	BE8	Agree most strongly.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R50	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2HG	Barbara Bou-Sreih	Transport & Infrastructure	TI1	Agree and would <u>insist</u> on <u>strong</u> regulatory requirements re increased traffic.	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
R50	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2HG	Barbara Bou-Sreih	Transport & Infrastructure	TI2	Agree very strongly.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R50	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2HG	Barbara Bou-Sreih	Transport & Infrastructure	TI4	Agree, on the condition that a cyclist found not using a cycle path is penalised.	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
R51	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2HA	Gaynor Stuart-Burnett	Green Belt	GB1	The Green Belt preservation is of vital importance. Also, if building, this can in parts cause flooding as Holyport has a very high water level. If any building does take place, there should be screening by trees.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R51	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2HA	Gaynor Stuart-Burnett	Built Environment	BE7	Any major building will congest our roads to an impossible level - also adding to polluted air.	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
R51	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2HA	Gaynor Stuart-Burnett	n/a	Whole	I agree with your proposals in preserving as much of our countryside, which also goes towards restricting noise & pollution. We must keep Bray and Holyport as villages and not an appendage to Maidenhead.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R52	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2PD	J. Foulger	Green Belt	GB1	Including the 'gap' between Maidenhead and Bray/Fifield.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R52	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2PD	J. Foulger	Built Environment	BE4	Residential conversions should only be allowed if adequate off-street parking is provided.	The Steering Group agrees with your statement. Local Plan Policies address this issue.
R52	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2PD	J. Foulger	Built Environment	BE12	Will only be supported, and if the Parish is not over-burdened with such establishments.	Explicit support for equestrian enterprises has been removed.
R52	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2PD	J. Foulger	Built Environment	BE14	Should be strictly controlled and kept to a minimum.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R52	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2PD	J. Foulger	Transport & Infrastructure	TI2	Encouragement should be given to deliver pupils to school by coach.	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
R53	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2PQ	Barbara Goodhew	Green Belt	GB1-GB3	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R53	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2PQ	Barbara Goodhew	Built Environment	BE1	Agree. Add "Protecting the Green Belt, the ancient areas of the Parish and the two Conservation Areas is seen....."	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R53	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2PQ	Barbara Goodhew	Built Environment	BE2	Agree. Add "Development proposals within the Bray Parish which include 5 or more dwellings....."	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R53	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2PQ	Barbara Goodhew	Built Environment	BE3-BE11	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R53	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2PQ	Barbara Goodhew	Built Environment	BE12	Disagree. Should <u>not</u> be in the Policy but come under normal Planning laws to protect adjoining neighbours' property - not enough protection given!	The Policy has been removed.
R53	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2PQ	Barbara Goodhew	Built Environment	BE13	Disagree. Should <u>not</u> be in the Policy but come under normal Planning laws to protect adjoining neighbours' property - not enough protection given!	The Steering Group notes the comments but believes that this is outside the scope of the Plan.
R53	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2PQ	Barbara Goodhew	Built Environment	BE14-BE16	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R53	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2PQ	Barbara Goodhew	Transport & Infrastructure	TI1-TI4	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R53	09-Jul-15	Parish Office	SL6 2PQ	Barbara Goodhew	Economy	E1-E6	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BNPP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R54	11-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 SUG	Andrew Hall	Built Environment	BE16, TI3, E1-E3	Disagree. I disagree with these policy descriptions because of the sparse mention of "noise". If there is justification for Air pollution to be detailed in TI3, shouldn't there be a section on Noise pollution?	Policy B16 has been removed and all Policies on Traffic and the Economy have been restated as Recommendations.
R54	11-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 SUG	Andrew Hall	Noise	BE16, TI3, E1-E4	Even the Heathrow Runway 3 documentation cites the international understanding that "all wellbeing measures are impacted by exposure to 55db" and UK industrial regulations restrict exposure, beyond 3 hours, to the same level. If the BNPP specifies boundary fencing to be 1.2m high, surely we can specify that we find the 54db contour (as on the Heathrow noise plans) is the Bray upper limit? Average noise levels over a period are one factor. Short duration peaks are another. I suspect we have all experienced overhead flights that stop conversation, e.g. Datchet? I ask that peak short duration levels should also be specified as unacceptable - is that 65db or 70db?	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
R54	11-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 SUG	Andrew Hall	Noise	BE16, TI3, E1-E5	Those who live near to converted redundant farm buildings where aggregates are being washed (in a huge rotating tumble bin full of stones), or who live under the easterly approach route to Heathrow will welcome some noise protection in the BNPP.	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
R54	11-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 SUG	Andrew Hall	Noise	BE16, TI3, E1-E6	Then there is expansion. Should a local airfield propose to host helicopter air show events or just expand helicopter pilot training capacity, then quite a large area will be affected. The BNPP should set some standard as to what noise levels are in keeping with a quiet rural setting.	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
R54	11-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 SUG	Andrew Hall	Economy	E1-E3, E6 & Plan Objective 12	I disagree with the wording of these policies in that they contain too many "generalisations" that can be taken advantage of. Plan Objective 12 makes the blanket statement that policies should "generally support businesses". Please add words such as "small businesses" and "local businesses". Since Legoland can be considered by some as a small business compared to Centrica, bland words are clearly inadequate. Centrica and Legoland are radically different concerns. The wording of this objective and the follow-up policies should contain some metrics.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R54	11-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 SUG	Andrew Hall	Economy	E1-E3, E6 & Plan Objective 13	Again, if we specify 1.2m for a fence, we should be saying "less than 200 staff", "less than 100 delivery / despatch / visitor / employee... traffic movements per day", "events attracting only 500 people or less" etc. I leave you to debate the numeric values.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R54	11-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 SUG	Andrew Hall	Economy	E1-E3, E6 & Plan Objective 14	This also applies to expansion. At what point does expansion turn a small local business into a "cuckoo" in its local "nest". Two (three?) existing local businesses are definitely bumping into local limitations.	All Policies associated with the Economy have been restated as Recommendations in the Plan.
R54	11-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 SUG	Andrew Hall	Economy	E1-E3, E6 & Plan Objective 15	There is a basic conflict between Green Belt and commercial activity.	Noted, however the Plan utilises existing National Policy to control all development in the Green Belt.
R54	11-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 SUG	Andrew Hall	Economy	E1-E3, E6 & Plan Objective 16	Nearly all businesses seek to expand. It might be more parking, more visitors for new events (polo, airshows?) or just bigger, more frequent events and the supporting infrastructure, more hotel rooms. The list is long. But all face in the opposite direction to the idea of maintaining Green Belt and the separation of Windsor and Maidenhead.	The Plan utilises existing National Policy to control development in the Green Belt and defines the Green Gap between Windsor & Maidenhead
R54	11-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 SUG	Andrew Hall	Economy	E1-E3, E6 & Plan Objective 17	I ask that we include a statement that we do not welcome large businesses and that we numerically size the parameters that our small semi-rural green belt parish is unable, and should not, support.	Planning Policy is about enabling rather than preventing development and the Plan is not able to accommodate such a statement.
R55	14-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JA	Leo Walters	Green Belt	GB1	Disagree. I consider it would be unwise to leave the gathering of evidence on any development in the Green Belt be arranged and provided by would-be developers or other parties proposing such development. Such a survey should be carried out quite independently by an official body.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R55	14-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JA	Leo Walters	Built Environment	BE1	Disagree. Although certain leisure facilities may, per se, be acceptable in the Green Belt the Neighbourhood Plan should not state nor imply that "on the back" of such leisure facilities housing in the Green Belt would be acceptable within the Parish of Bray.	The Plan does not in any way link the development of houses with leisure facilities, in fact Leisure Use was offered as an alternative.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R55	14-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JA	Leo Walters	Transport & Infrastructure	TI1	Disagree. The current wording of the Draft Plan (the last paragraph on page 31) implies that the Bray Parish Council could be seen to be inadvertently suggesting that the Link Road referred to could come southwards off Junction 8/9 of the M4. This would mean a 4-lane, elevated and lit road off Junction 8/9 cutting right through the Holyport Conservation Area. I suggest that the paragraph is changed to include the following: "This could possibly be achieved by the creation of a new Junction on the M4 between J8/9 and J10. This would also have the advantage of reducing commercial traffic passing through Bray Parish causing congestion particularly on the A308 and the A330.	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
R55	14-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JA	Leo Walters	Wording change	Wording Changes to Draft Plan	The date quoted on page 16 of the Draft Plan at the beginning of section C (RBWM Consultation on 23 Green Belt sites) should read '2014' rather than '2013'. I suggest also that this Section may need revision in the light of subsequent RBWM decisions.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R55	14-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2JA	Leo Walters	Wording change	Wording Changes to Draft Plan	At the top of page 32, add the following after the first sentence: "This support is conditional on the constraints already requested of the Highways Agency (e.g. lighting, noise and pollution reduction, etc.) due to the closeness of Bray and Holyport Villages with their Conservation Area status and the large number of Listed Buildings all within the Green Belt."	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R56	14-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL6 2ED	Joan Dennison	n/a	n/a	No comments made.	Noted. No action required.
R57	15-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL4 SUB	Paul Jennings	Green Belt	GB1	Agree in general, however, the last statement is ambiguous and needs to be clarified. Parish Ward boundaries need to be advertised. The Green Gap must be maintained....no building on green fields!	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R57	15-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL4 SUB	Paul Jennings	Built Environment	BE1	Agree in general. Again, the submission of 50% is ambiguous. How is 'affected by the development' ascertained?	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R57	15-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL4 SUB	Paul Jennings	Built Environment	BE7	Agreed. I see however, that this has not been applied to the fences around the Queens Head on the A308. Why not?	This Policy has been removed.
R57	15-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL4 SUB	Paul Jennings	Built Environment	BE11	In general agreed. However, the promotion of these businesses must not inconvenience residents of the area, whose objections must be taken into account....they have to live with the consequences!	Already part of planning application process.
R57	15-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL4 SUB	Paul Jennings	Built Environment	BE12	I do not agree with these expansions.	Explicit support for equestrian enterprises has been removed.
R57	15-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL4 SUB	Paul Jennings	Transport & Infrastructure	TI1	Agreed. The A308 is already too congested and contributing to high levels of air pollution. Any development must take this into account.	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
R57	15-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL4 SUB	Paul Jennings	Transport & Infrastructure	TI4	Agreed. More cycle paths, and encouragement to use them is necessary! The Drift Road is particularly dangerous for cyclists and cars alike.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R57	15-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL4 SUB	Paul Jennings	Economy	E1	This must be rigorously investigated. I do not want businesses springing up on previous farm land, which may be expanded in the future. This is an agricultural area, NOT an industrial one. This could be open to abuse.	All Policies associated with the Economy have been restated as Recommendations in the Plan.
R57	15-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL4 SUB	Paul Jennings	Economy	E2	See my comments on E1 above. This is NOT an industrial area, nor should it be one.	The Steering Group does not propose any sites for industrial development.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R57	15-Jul-15	On-Line Survey	SL4 SUB	Paul Jennings	Economy	E6	A great deal of caution should be applied here. The 'leisure facilities' normally have a large influence on road traffic congestion in the area. The A308 is busy enough without more expansion.	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
R58	19-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 SUG	David Short	Built Environment	BE	I support the comments made by the Down Place Residents Association in full and would like to expand on my view that redundant agricultural buildings should be used for agricultural purposes only. Many of them have been built in abuse of the planning system - to allow them to subsequently be used for alternative purposes would merely extend that abuse	Change of use of agricultural buildings is already governed by National Legislation on Permitted Development.
R59	19-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2PG	Alasdair Kenney	Green Belt	GB1	Agree most strongly.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R59	19-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2PG	Alasdair Kenney	Green Belt	GB2	Agree most strongly.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R59	19-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2PG	Alasdair Kenney	Built Environment	BE1	Agree most strongly.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R59	19-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2PG	Alasdair Kenney	Built Environment	BE15	Agree most strongly.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R59	19-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2PG	Alasdair Kenney	Built Environment	BE16	Agree most strongly.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R59	19-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2PG	Alasdair Kenney	Transport & Infrastructure	TI1	Agree most strongly.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R59	19-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2PG	Alasdair Kenney	Economy	E1	Agree most strongly.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R59	19-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2PG	Alasdair Kenney	Economy	E6	Disagree with "create" - should only be to expand existing.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R60	19-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 SUB	Ann, Bill & Corin Taylor	n/a	Whole	Exact replication of OGFRA comments (VL08).	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R61	20-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 SUD	Nigel & Kate Borg-Cardona	n/a	Whole	Exact replication of OGFRA comments (VL08).	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R62	20-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2NX	Ryan Best	n/a	n/a	No comments made.	Noted. No action required.
R63	21-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2PF	John Francis	Green Belt	GB1	Disagree. This concession policy should be removed from the list of Green Belt policies.	GB1 has been removed from the Plan.
R63	21-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2PF	John Francis	Built Environment	BE1	Disagree. This concession policy should be removed from the list of Built Environment policies.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R64	22-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2HZ	Bob Tavinor	n/a	n/a	No comments made.	Noted. No action required.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R65	22-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2LB	Gareth Bullock-Bailie	Built Environment	BE1	Include a minimum participation guideline of say 100 community residents, that will require the council to properly promote important planning developments to all sections of the community. The clause 'and who vote in the survey' could lead to a scenario where no or few residents voices are heard and policy decisions made on a non representative basis.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R65	22-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2LB	Gareth Bullock-Bailie	Built Environment	BE2	5 dwellings or more is too lenient and will encourage rapid densification of dwelling on existing plots. Reduce this to 3 dwellings per 0.25ha, or better still a like for like policy. Replace 1 dwelling, replace with 1 dwelling. 5 is too lenient. Developers were given permission to replace 1 dwelling and replace with 3 separate dwellings on the same plot on Holyport Road, and this quickly changes the character of the area.	The Steering Group appreciates your concern and points out that the density of dwellings on any site should be similar to existing sites in the area
R65	22-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2LB	Gareth Bullock-Bailie	n/a	BPNP Communication	There really needs to be greater transparency around what the key changes are, when the deadline to vote is, and where the links are. Putting posters in Bargain Booze that people walk past isn't going to get noticed. Budget to fund leaflet drops needs to be found if the outcome is to be accepted and owned by the community.	The Referendum giving the Residents of the Parish the opportunity to approve or reject the Final BPNP will be administered by RBWM. It will be widely advertised.
R66	22-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 4QF	Adam Binns	Built Environment	BE1	Disagree with the policy Whilst the principle of voting on each development is in principle very sound, the reality of poor response rates and complexities and cost of administration make it an impractical solution. Practical ways of taking account of local opinion already exist through planning guidelines at the national, authority and local level and through planning officer and committee deliberations. Such mechanisms should be used without the need to resort to consultation on an application by application basis.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R66	22-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 4QF	Adam Binns	Built Environment	BE6	The phrase "preserving visual amenity" is too broadly drafted. The intention should not be to prevent the built environment from changing visually - that is inevitable and natural. It should seek to give due consideration to visual amenity, not seek to preserve it unchanged, forever.	The phrase "visual amenity" is a standard term in planning parlance. The Plan does not seek to preserve it unchanged.
R66	22-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 4QF	Adam Binns	Built Environment	BE7	I do not agree that "Fences along the public highway should not exceed 1.2m height". It is a householder's right to make their property secure protect to their family from harm. A fence of 1.2m or less will not achieve this. It is wrong for planning guidance to require this.	This Policy has been removed.
R66	22-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 4QF	Adam Binns	Built Environment	BE11	I fully support BE11 and that the Plan should support growth of all types of business in rural areas. Rural areas will decline and deteriorate to the detriment of all if they cannot support business uses and local employment. BE11 should make it clear that support is also provided for change of use, not just infilling replacement and redevelopment.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R66	22-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 4QF	Adam Binns	Built Environment	BE13	I do not agree that there should not be any increase in ridge height, a small increase should be permitted.	The Steering Group notes the comments but believes that it is right to constrain the ridge height thus constraining the mass and impact of the building..
R66	22-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 4QF	Adam Binns	Built Environment	Built Environment	Section III A - The Built Environment - Housing: The text recognises that "re-use of previously developed sites and re-development of derelict and unattractive sites" was supported by residents. This desire should be specifically reflected in the Plan. The built environment must be allowed to evolve and refresh otherwise it will decay and become unfit for purpose.	The Steering Group notes the comments.
R67	22-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2YN	Helen Pearson	Green Belt	GB1	Disagree. Any development proposals involving the Green Belt should be rejected.	The BPNP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
R67	22-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2YN	Helen Pearson	Green Belt	GB2-GB3	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R67	22-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2YN	Helen Pearson	Built Environment	BE1	Disagree. Any development proposals in these areas should be rejected.	The BPNP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
R67	22-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2YN	Helen Pearson	Built Environment	BE2-BE16	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R67	22-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2YN	Helen Pearson	Transport & Infrastructure	T11-T14	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R67	22-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2YN	Helen Pearson	Economy	E1-E6	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R68	22-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2YN	Mike Booth	Environment	Various	In several sections reference is made to "significant adverse impact on neighbours through noise, light pollution, increased traffic levels, increased flood risk or inadequate provision of parking". It seems to me that you have omitted one other pollution and that is unpleasant or obnoxious odours. If a takeaway wished to open near houses or a farm development producing fresh manure were to be planned, there would be no way of opposing them on "smell" reasons. I request that this additional category is added to the Plan in the appropriate sections.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R69	23-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 1UQ	Edgar Wallner	Transport & Infrastructure	Transport	1. There have been numerous thefts from cars in Bray village and guests of mine have suffered as the village seems so peaceful. No mention is made in the Plan of security. Internet cameras with a voluntary supervision rota would address this. 2. With the completion of the new school we now have five different speed zones, 30,20,30,20,40, along the Bray Road and in the village. It should be 20mph all along this stretch. Could local residents contribute to speed check systems?	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
R69	23-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 1UQ	Edgar Wallner	n/a	General	I would like to thank all those involved in preparing this plan for their time and diligence. They should not be disappointed by any perceived apathy because pretty well everyone really supports the protection of our lovely village.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R70	23-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2LR	Hazel Irmak	n/a	n/a	No comments made.	Noted. No action required.
R71	23-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2NX	Mr & Mrs P.S. Smith	Green Belt	GB1	Disagree. This proposal does not specifically take into consideration the views of those who are most affected by the development. The views of those electors should be sought firstly, e.g. a majority of the registered electors who live within 500 metres of the development and secondly by a second vote extended to the parish ward should the first vote approve the scheme.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R71	23-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2NX	Mr & Mrs P.S. Smith	Green Belt	GB3	Agree only with following amendment: "and be in keeping with the surrounding development".	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R71	23-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2NX	Mr & Mrs P.S. Smith	Built Environment	BE1	Disagree. This proposal does not specifically take into consideration the views of those who are most affected by the development. The views of those electors should be sought firstly, e.g. a majority of the registered electors who live within 500 metres of the development and secondly by a second vote extended to the parish ward should the first vote approve the scheme.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R71	23-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2NX	Mr & Mrs P.S. Smith	Built Environment	BE2	Agree with the following amendment: This should be extended to cover proposals for commercial/leisure developments and not just residential.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R71	23-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2NX	Mr & Mrs P.S. Smith	Built Environment	BE11	Only agree with the following caveat. The views of local residents appear not to be important here and the views of the local community should be of paramount importance.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R71	23-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2NX	Mr & Mrs P.S. Smith	Built Environment	BE15	Agree but policy should make reference to fracking to be totally excluded within the Borough.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R71	23-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2NX	Mr & Mrs P.S. Smith	Economy	E6	Agree but the views of the local community must also be considered.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R71	23-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2NX	Mr & Mrs P.S. Smith	Green Belt	Green Belt	We strongly oppose any development on greenbelt land and think it is important to maintain the separation of Windsor and Maidenhead. We feel that very often planning proposals are not communicated in a time frame which enables residents to respond appropriately.	The BPNP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
R72	23-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL6 2HZ	Geoff Hayes	n/a	General	The Bray Parish Neighbourhood Plan is a well thought-out comprehensive document.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Green Belt	GB1	Agree with the first part of the wording as follows: "Land use decisions should be consistent with Green Belt preservation, safeguarding the open and rural character of the countryside. Inappropriate development with the Green Belt will not be supported unless very special circumstances apply, to include evidence that the development offers significant benefit to the local Community and is supported ...". But the rest of the wording is unclear and ambiguous – so substitute with these words instead: "... by a Consultation of Residents in accordance with the provisions of SECTION VIII Statement of Community Consultation of this Plan."	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Green Belt	GB2-GB3	Disagree. Everyone you ever speak to says that preserving this Gap is extremely important. But we are currently seeing Development Creep of now nearly 70 Houses in the past 4 years and only half of open space is covered. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 44 Houses in Water Oakley with over 100 Garages • Bray Studios Site – the subject of a new Application to turn Down Place House – a listed Building – into 10 Apartments plus another 15 Houses (25 Total) • 2 Gypsy Sites and • One large House at Brayfield Farm The way these Policies are currently written provides little protection from additional future development. A Developer just needs to hide Development behind a hedge – set back from the A308 - and clear up a Site they have deliberately let deteriorate. Let's upgrade this important Gap to a Preservation Area and raise the bar for future Approvals! And why not make subject to the 50% plus Residents Support Rule?	The Steering Group have taken advice and it is not possible to provide Green Belt land with any greater protection than is currently provided by National Policy. Therefore GB Policies have been removed from the Plan.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Built Environment	BE1	Agree subject to same comments on GB1.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Built Environment	BE2-BE3	Agree. I like the proposals for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community involvement in proposals for 5 or more Dwellings on Sites larger than 0.25 hectares The Development Brief requirement 	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Built Environment	BE4-BE6	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Built Environment	BE7	Agree, subject to: (a) Amend to additionally include Walls and Hedges in the 1.2 metre limit and (b) Substitute the words " ... should be encouraged ..." with the word "must" i.e. if they change they must conform to new limit of 1.2m .	This Policy has been removed.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Built Environment	BE8	Agree, subject to: (a) Traffic Assessments are really important for Developments of more than 5 houses and (b) Add additional wording to cover appropriate provision for, and impacts of, car parking.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Built Environment	BE9	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Built Environment	BE10	Agree, subject to: Add the words "....must be in keeping with the character of the existing building and...." before the words "....must not impair visual amenity...." to stiffen up this important Policy.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Built Environment	BE11	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Built Environment	BE12	What does ".... Provide suitable access to the relevant associated infrastructure such as exercise facilities" mean? It is too loose and open to abuse, e.g. the building of Club Houses and Facilities for Grooms etc.	Explicit support for equestrian enterprises has been removed.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Built Environment	BE13-BE15	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Built Environment	BE16	Agree, subject to: The wording " .. only in the interests of agriculture or equestrianism .." is far too loose. We have had hundreds of thousands of tons of material of dubious quality dumped in the Parish in the last few years – solely for money-making purposes. Suggest additional wording to include "minimum raising of land necessary to improve agricultural yields and improved equestrian and sporting surfaces and without impeding visual amenity." Also, Operators should be liable for any damage to nearby Buildings and Property caused by vibration for example from Heavy Vehicular Traffic.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Transport & Infrastructure	TI1	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Transport & Infrastructure	T12	Disagree. Policy is too limited and should include the urgent need for "appropriate parking provision".	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Transport & Infrastructure	T13	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Transport & Infrastructure	T14	Agree, subject to adding "footways and/or pavements" to the list please.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Economy	E1	Disagree. Farmers could and do exploit this by declaring Buildings "redundant" and letting them out for commercial gain and then build additional units for "Agricultural purposes". The test on whether the Building is genuinely redundant or not needs to be very tight with an additional provision that no additional Building can take place anywhere on the same working Farm for a period of 5 years after conversion of use.	Change of use of agricultural buildings is already governed by National Legislation on Permitted Development.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Economy	E2-E5	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Economy	E6	Disagree. Leisure Facilities can be large in scope and attract many visitors/members from outside the Parish as well as inside. This Policy should be subject to SECTION VIII Statement of Community Consultation	The Steering Group notes the comments and advises that Economy Policies have been restated as Recommendations within the Plan.
R73	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4QF	Grenville Annetts	Detailed Response	Wording Changes to Draft Plan	THE RESPONSE ALSO CONTAINED MANY HELPFUL SUGGESTED CHANGES TO THE WORDING. THERE ARE TOO MANY TO SUMMARISE. SEE ATTACHED.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R74	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 5UL	Pat Morrish	n/a	Vision Statement	Completely agree with this.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R74	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 5UL	Pat Morrish	Green Belt	GB1	The statement 'and is supported by more than 50% of the registered electors who live in the Parish Ward affected by the development and who vote in a survey' This is ambiguous and need clarification, please. Ward boundaries need to be clarified.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
R74	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 5UL	Pat Morrish	Built Environment	BE1	See comments for GB1. For additions to housing stock through refurbishments (P20 Consultation Doc) Conversions should still meet Green Belt criteria.	The BPNP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
R74	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 5UL	Pat Morrish	Built Environment	BE2	Agree. Parish Councillors should be more active in meeting residents in their Ward. Need to quantify.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R74	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 5UL	Pat Morrish	Built Environment	BE3	Page 22 Plan Housing Criteria. Green Belt policy should still apply even when converting from Derelict Agricultural buildings.	On independent advice, the Plan relies on current National Policy to control development in the Green Belt.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R74	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 5UL	Pat Morrish	Built Environment	BE5	Green Belt criteria must apply.	On independent advice, the Plan relies on current National Policy to control development in the Green Belt.
R74	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 5UL	Pat Morrish	Built Environment	BE7	Disagree. Please clarify whether this refers to fences or walls or hedges.	This Policy has been removed.
R74	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 5UL	Pat Morrish	Built Environment	BE9	As well as residents support for maintaining the two Conservation Areas and 83 Listed Buildings, it is also important to maintain surrounding areas and properties in keeping with those Listed Buildings.	The Steering Group notes your comments but believe that this is outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan.
R74	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 5UL	Pat Morrish	Built Environment	BE11	Disagree. The community supports the re-use or conversion of existing buildings for business expansion or new business development subject to proper consideration of traffic and environmental implications. TOO FLEXIBLE. NEEDS TO BE AGRICULTURE-RELATED AND WITHIN GB RULES. The Parish supports sustainable growth of all types of business in rural areas and promotes diversification of agricultural businesses. Justifiable developments may include: - - Buildings supporting agriculture and forestry uses of the land – - Facilities for expanding SOME outdoor sports and recreation – - Cemeteries – - Limited infilling in recognised settlements DISAGREE - Limited infilling, partial or complete replacement, or redevelopment of previously developed sites or permanent buildings, whether redundant or in use AS LONG AS GREEN BELT RULES APPLY BUILDINGS ON PREVIOUSLY GREEN BELT LAND AND THAT WERE TEMPORARY SHOULD NOT BE REPLACED, BUT PUT BACK TO GREEN BELT. E.G. GARDEN CENTRES.	The Steering Group notes the comments but believes that National Policy already supports the change-of-use of agricultural buildings and any new development would be governed by current Green Belt legislation.
R74	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 5UL	Pat Morrish	Built Environment	BE12	Disagree. We do not agree with development and enlargement of polo establishments. There are already a large number within the Parish.	Explicit support for equestrian enterprises has been removed.
R74	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 5UL	Pat Morrish	Economy	E1	Disagree. Applications to convert genuine redundant agricultural buildings on working farms into suitable offices or light industrial workshops or warehouses will be supported ... TOO FLEXIBLE. NEEDS TO BE APPROPRIATE TO THE GB. LIGHT INDUSTRIAL WORKSHOPS HAVE A TENDENCY TO GROW. NEED TO LIMIT SIZE. EXCESS HEAVY TRAFFIC OFTEN ASSOCIATED WITH THEM AND A LOT OF NOISE.	Change of use of agricultural buildings is already governed by National Legislation on Permitted Development.
R74	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 5UL	Pat Morrish	Economy	E2	Disagree. No mention of erosion of the Green Belt here. Green Belt needs to be safeguarded more within this point.	The BPNP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
R74	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 5UL	Pat Morrish	Economy	E6	Disagree. No mention of erosion of the Green Belt here. Green Belt needs to be safeguarded more within this point. Ref. recent Squash Club application - no mention of Green Belt effects. Comments of local residents should be taken into account (as for GB1 and BE1). Economy policies loaded too much in favour of business development, without giving due regard to effects on Green Belt.	The BPNP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R74	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 5UL	Pat Morrish	Detailed Response	Wording Changes to Draft Plan	THE RESPONSE ALSO CONTAINED MANY HELPFUL SUGGESTED CHANGES TO THE WORDING. THERE ARE TOO MANY TO SUMMARISE. SEE ATTACHED.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R75	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 5UL	Dr. Leslie Morrish	n/a	Whole	Exact replication of comments submitted by Pat Morrish (R74)	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R76	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DT	Mr. P.J. Blockley	Green Belt	GB1	Agree. Subject to the words "decision should" being replaced with "decision must".	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
R76	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DT	Mr. P.J. Blockley	Green Belt	GB2	Agree. Subject to the words "decision should" being replaced with "decision must".	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R76	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DT	Mr. P.J. Blockley	Built Environment	BE1	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R76	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DT	Mr. P.J. Blockley	Built Environment	BE16	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R76	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2DT	Mr. P.J. Blockley	Transport & Infrastructure	TI4	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R77	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL4 4LN	Mrs Elizabeth Mary Mead	n/a	Vision Statement	Agree. Thank you to all who have contributed to this document.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R77	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL4 4LN	Mrs Elizabeth Mary Mead	Green Belt	GB1	Agree. Ward boundaries need to be clearly defined.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R77	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL4 4LN	Mrs Elizabeth Mary Mead	Built Environment	BE6	Agreed, provided increased traffic movements are minimal.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R77	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL4 4LN	Mrs Elizabeth Mary Mead	Built Environment	BE8	Agree. A Traffic Impact Assessment is most important.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R77	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL4 4LN	Mrs Elizabeth Mary Mead	Economy	E1	Agreed, provided "light industrial" means "LIGHT industrial".	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R78	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL4 5UL	Robert Thomas Sperling	Green Belt	GB1	Green Belt areas must be preserved for today's and tomorrow's generations.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R78	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL4 5UL	Robert Thomas Sperling	Built Environment	BE1	All housing conversions etc. must meet Green Belt criteria at all times.	On independent advice, the Plan relies on current National Policy to control development in the Green Belt.
R78	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL4 5UL	Robert Thomas Sperling	Built Environment	BE2	Agree. Any meaningful consultations are welcome.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R78	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL4 5UL	Robert Thomas Sperling	Built Environment	BE3	All building should meet the Green Belt criteria.	On independent advice, the Plan relies on current National Policy to control development in the Green Belt.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BNPP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
R78	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL4 5UL	Robert Thomas Sperling	Built Environment	BE5	Green Belt criteria must apply to any proposals.	On independent advice, the Plan relies on current National Policy to control development in the Green Belt.
R78	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL4 5UL	Robert Thomas Sperling	Built Environment	BE7	Disagree. This needs to be made clearer before any meaningful comments can be made.	This Policy has been removed.
R78	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL4 5UL	Robert Thomas Sperling	Built Environment	BE9	Listed Buildings are an important part of our heritage and should be viewed on a regular basis to ensure they are compliant to the area they are in.	Support appreciated, thank you. No action required.
R78	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL4 5UL	Robert Thomas Sperling	Built Environment	BE11	Disagree. Too open-ended. Needs to be more specific and Green Belt criteria must be maintained at all times.	The Plan utilises existing National Policy to control development in the Green Belt.
R78	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL4 5UL	Robert Thomas Sperling	Built Environment	BE12	Horse riding establishments and stabling of all types are plentiful within the area.	Explicit support for equestrian enterprises has been removed.
R79	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL4 5UL	Jeanette Myra Sperling	n/a	Whole	Exact replication of comments submitted by Robert Thomas Sperling (R78).	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
R80	24-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 2EY	Malcolm & Gillian Turner	Green Belt	GB1	<p>Modify. Andrew Cormie has written to the Steering Group suggesting that "the Plan should specifically exclude the possibility of any development of the areas identified in the RBWM First Preferred Options Consultation as Areas 5C and 7A".</p> <p>It seems to us inevitable that, in due course, there will be an attempt to develop these areas and the Steering Group should consider elevating them as a "special Case" (effectively another 'Green Gap') for protection against development. The packed Memorial Hall on the evening of the first Neighbourhood Plan meeting was entirely the result of local anxiety about the recent change of ownership of these areas.</p>	The BNPP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
PARISH & LOCAL COUNCIL CONSULTATION RESPONSES								
C01	11-Jun-15	E-Mail	SL6 1RF	RBWM	Detailed Response	Whole	12 pages of specific comment. SEE ATTACHED.	<p>In RBWM's letter of 11.06.15, Rebecca Williams (a Senior Planning Officer at RBWM) listed four 'Essential Comments/Changes'. The SG has addressed three of these and considered that as there are no site-specific policies in the Plan a Policies Map would not add anything.</p> <p>In addition comments were made under the 'Beneficial Comments/Changes' heading. On the advice of RBWM in earlier comments, the SG undertook an RICS NPIERS health check using an independent planning consultant, Ann Skippers, and we have implemented her recommendations in full which address the points raised.</p>

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
C02	01-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL7 3RS	Little Marlow Parish Council	n/a	Whole	Little Marlow Parish Council would like to congratulate Bray Parish Council on their Draft Plan. We fully understand the amount of effort and commitment it takes just to get to this stage. We commend your Plan and hope that it will be successful when considered by the Planning Inspectorate.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
C03	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	RG12 1JD	Bracknell Forest Council	Built Environment	Assessment of Housing	It is noted that the Plan is to cover the period 2015 – 2030. Whilst this Council has no objection to the development of a Neighbourhood Plan for the area, some concern is expressed about the approach taken to future housing development in the area. A Strategic Housing Market Assessment has been commissioned by the Berkshire Authorities including the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. This will generate a figure for an objective assessment of housing need in the Borough. Whilst it is appreciated that this is not a housing target, paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), makes it clear that an Authority should aim to meet its full objectively assessed housing need unless a robust case can be put forward demonstrating lack of additional sites to meet the identified need. Bracknell Forest Council is of the view that this evidence might need to include the outcome of a Green Belt Review. Therefore the text relating to the nature of possible future housing sites on pages 16-18 and the objectives set out on page 19, need to be seen against this background.	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
C03	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	RG12 1JD	Bracknell Forest Council	Green Belt	Housing Assumptions	The figures provided in the third paragraph on page 17 of the Draft Bray Neighbourhood Plan state "...8,000 to 15,000 homes planned in North Bracknell...". The Bracknell Forest Core Strategy (adopted February 2008) identified a need for 11,139 net dwellings in Bracknell Forest over the period 2006 - 2026; the Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) (adopted July 2013) allocated sites to meet the outstanding element of this requirement. The figures in the Draft Bray Neighbourhood Plan relating to 'North Bracknell' are therefore not correct. The urban extension for 'Land at Warfield' has an allocation for 2,200 residential units; the Land at Amen Corner North (Binfield) for 400 residential units; and the Land at Blue Mountain (Binfield) for 400 residential units. There are also a few smaller sites. Further information on the all the site allocations in Bracknell Forest can be found in the SALP: http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/developmentplan	Section removed.
C03	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	RG12 1JD	Bracknell Forest Council	Transport & Infrastructure	Traffic Impact of Bracknell Housing	The third paragraph of page 17 refers to housing developments planned in North Bracknell, and that this "will substantially increase transit traffic through the Parish into Maidenhead, and thus the traffic congestion can only get substantially worse." Bracknell Forest Council undertook modelling work in 2012 to assess the impact of traffic generated by the strategic sites on the road network. This included modelling on the A330 Ascot Road. This modelling showed an increase of 5.4% (85 trips) in peak hour (am) northbound trips, and a decrease in southbound of -2.5% (-21 trips). For peak hour traffic (pm), it showed a decrease of -1.4% (-12 trips) in northbound traffic and an increase in southbound trips of 6.3% (85 trips).	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit. Since 2012, have Bracknell Forest Council surveyed the actual peak hour traffic flows on the A330?

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
C03	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	RG12 1JD	Bracknell Forest Council	Transport & Infrastructure	North-South Link Road	<p>The Draft Plan refers to support for the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) proposals for north-south links between the M40/M4 and M4/M3 (see page 31, last para). The LEP proposals support improvements in north-south links for the 'Slough A355' which will improve links between the M4-A4-M40, and also north-south links along the A322 and A329 corridor (Coral Reef) linking the M3 and M4 motorways.</p> <p>As the text in the Draft Plan is unclear, it is not known whether it is proposing/supporting a new link road between the M4 (at J8/9) to the M3 that avoids the A330 Ascot Road. This is considered likely to have implications for Bracknell Forest. As such Bracknell Forest has concerns about the lack of information and evidence supporting this paragraph (such as modelling data information), and has concerns about the potential impact upon the road network in Bracknell Forest. A map showing the proposed/supported route would be useful.</p>	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
C03	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	RG12 1JD	Bracknell Forest Council	Green Belt	GB1-GB3	A number of the policies do not appear to be consistent with national policy, for example, those dealing with development in the Green Belt and Section 9 of the NPPF.	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
C03	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	RG12 1JD	Bracknell Forest Council	n/a	Wording Changes to Draft Plan	The Plan would be more user friendly if paragraphs were numbered	Noted.
C04	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	RG40 1BN	Wokingham Borough Council	Green Belt	GB1	The BPNP might want to consider this policy in the context of the NPPF and NPPG. It is difficult to see how this policy would be workable in practice, in terms of requiring a survey to support proposals.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
C04	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	RG40 1BN	Wokingham Borough Council	Built Environment	BE1	Same comment as GB1.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
C04	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	RG40 1BN	Wokingham Borough Council	Built Environment	BE15	This policy deals with mineral extraction which is considered 'excluded development' (Sch. 1 of 1990 Act).	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
C04	03-Jul-15	E-Mail	RG40 1BN	Wokingham Borough Council	Built Environment	BE16	This policy also deals with 'excluded development' in that it deals with waste..	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
C05	20-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 1RF	RBWM	Detailed Response	Whole	9 pages of Meeting Notes. SEE ATTACHED.	The Minutes contained in RBWM's response of 20.07.15 related to discussions between BPNP SG and the Planning function at RBWM. The meeting made suggestions on Transport, Green Belt & Built Environment Policies. Since this meeting advice from our independent consultant was that Transport was not within the scope of the BPNP. In respect of RBWM's suggestions on the Green Belt and Built Environment these have been adopted.
C06	20-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 1RF	RBWM (Strategic Assets Team)	Detailed Response	Whole	4 pages of Meeting Notes. SEE ATTACHED.	This response from RBWM details the reasons why Transport in general is outside the terms of reference of the BPNP.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
C07	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	HP20 1UY	Buckinghamshire County Council	Transport & Infrastructure	Whole	To inform progress of this Neighbourhood Plan we would like to draw attention to the following with the regards to potential cross boundary infrastructure. (1) Buckinghamshire County Council have secured funding through the Local Growth Fund for a cycle route along the A4 from Maidenhead Bridge to Slough , linking up to Taplow Rail Station. This will help to improve access to the rail station (including the new Crossrail Services) for those in the Bray area. (2) Pending further discussions Buckinghamshire County Council have requested crossing improvements over the A4 (near to Maidenhead Bridge). This would provide a link for those from the Bray direction to the north of the A4.	Thank you for your update regarding the cycle route passing through Bray Parish and re discussions on further improvements of a crossing over the A4. These have been noted. No action required.
LOCAL BUSINESSES CONSULTATION RESPONSES								
LB01	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 5UL	Christine Harrington for Cardinal Clinic	n/a	Whole	Exact replication of comments submitted by Pat Morrish (R74)	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
VOLUNTARY & LOCAL BODIES CONSULTATION RESPONSES								
VL01	26-May-15	On-Line Survey	OX9 2NZ	Tom Cackett for National Farmers Union	Economy	E1	Agree - it is important that redundant agricultural buildings are allowed to be converted in order to enhance the rural economy and provide local employment.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
VL01	26-May-15	On-Line Survey	OX9 2NZ	Tom Cackett for National Farmers Union	Green Belt	GB1	It is very concerning to read that "This Plan [therefore] does not propose any further housing development within Bray Parish". This is restricting the rural economy by not providing housing for workers and may enhance the current problems encountered with traffic levels due to increased commuting.	In consultation with Residents, the Steering Group found no support for identifying potential sites and therefore this Plan does not allocate any sites for development.
VL02	02-Jun-15	E-Mail	TW17 8AS	Claire Walters for Bus Users UK	Transport & Infrastructure	Transport	<p>Concerns about an hourly service being inadequate and the need for later evening services are entirely valid. An hourly service does make connections with other services/modes difficult, and a dependable evening service is essential for younger people and those on low incomes to access employment opportunities in surrounding towns, which are increasingly outside the traditional working day.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the current approach of central and local Government, and the need for fiscal prudence, does mean that the level of service currently being supplied in Bray is normal for such an area and, without radical solutions, is unlikely to be improved. It is worth looking at the option of community bus services, run by volunteers and increasingly favoured by Government, as a potential means of enhancing the local bus service. It is important that such services are designed to complement and feed into the existing local network and not to undermine it. This could also be developed so that it meets key commuter trains morning and evening at Windsor and/or Maidenhead stations. A similar community bus has recently been introduced in Cobham, Surrey (www.chatterbus.org.uk), though it is too early yet to evaluate the success of this venture.</p> <p>We would certainly agree that good public transport provision is essential for any further development of housing or business in the area, and Section 106 funding, enabling planning gain to be channelled into transport projects, can be useful for enhancing bus services where new development is taking place. This may be especially the case where the benefits of connecting local developments to Crossrail are concerned.</p>	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
VL03	06-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	RG2 6GP	Richard Tyndall for Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	Economy	E1	The LEP supports this policy	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
VL03	06-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	RG2 6GP	Richard Tyndall for Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	Economy	E2	The LEP would encourage the Parish to consider removing the restriction in this draft policy which limits support for new premises to "retail, hospitality or service premises". We see no reason why this policy could not encompass small-scale premises for any type of business, subject to the restrictions already listed.	Reference to the LEP has been removed.
VL03	06-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	RG2 6GP	Richard Tyndall for Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	Economy	E3	The LEP supports this policy.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
VL03	06-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	RG2 6GP	Richard Tyndall for Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	Economy	E4	The LEP supports this policy.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
VL03	06-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	RG2 6GP	Richard Tyndall for Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	Economy	E5	Developments which promote wider availability of broadband services in the Parish will be supported. The LEP supports this policy, and encourages the Parish to embrace the wider reach of broadband to service all properties, domestic and commercial, and also to improve the effective bandwidth available on existing connections to reach "superfast" and "ultrafast" specifications	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
VL03	06-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	RG2 6GP	Richard Tyndall for Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	Transport & Infrastructure	Transport	There is no mention in the consultation draft of the promotion of public transport as a means of tackling traffic congestion and road capacity issues. We would encourage the Parish to contemplate a wide range of innovative public transport initiatives alongside Buses and Trains. In particular, the use of e-enabled car sharing, car clubs, taxis, bicycle-sharing schemes should all be encouraged in order to aid the Plan's stated vision of retaining and protecting the distinct character of our villages and hamlets. The LEP welcomes the economy policies, in particular "Both promote new low-cost flexible premises and make better use of redundant farm buildings in order to support existing and new local businesses - Support people working in home-based businesses"	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.
VL04	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Helen Price for West Windsor Residents Association	Green Belt	GB1	Disagree. We are concerned that a small number of Bray residents can determine the relaxing of Green Belt preservation, albeit for very special circumstance, as if only a few voters bother to vote the outcome could be determined by a few. The Green Belt is enjoyed by residents outside Bray. Whilst accepting that it is impractical to involve outside residents in the voting process we believe that more protection should be afforded by proposing that the outcome is determined by a % of the electorate not by a % of voters.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
VL04	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Helen Price for West Windsor Residents Association	Built Environment	BE1	Disagree. We are concerned that a small number of Bray residents can determine the relaxing of Green Belt preservation, albeit for very special circumstance, as if only a few voters bother to vote the outcome could be determined by a few. The Green Belt is enjoyed by residents outside Bray. Whilst accepting that it is impractical to involve outside residents in the voting process we believe that more protection should be afforded by proposing that the outcome is determined by a % of the electorate not by a % of voters.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
VL04	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Helen Price for West Windsor Residents Association	Transport & Infrastructure	T13	Disagree. In light of the recent Supreme Court Ruling on Air Pollution we would like to see this Policy strengthened.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BNPP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
VL04	22-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Helen Price for West Windsor Residents Association	Built Environment	Boundaries	We would like to see a recognition of the implications of the boundary line to the East of Bray Area. This boundary artificially divides West Windsor and thus some policies taken by Bray NP have an immediate and direct impact on West Windsor residents. For example the two Garden Centres are heavily used by West Windsor residents. We consider these Garden Centres as very important to the quality of life of local residents and would regard them as Community Assets and would seek that this view is reflected in the Bray NP.	The Steering Group responded to the RBWM Consultation on Sites in March 2013 rejecting the two Garden Centre sites as unsuitable for housing.
VL05	24-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Mary Tomlinson for Natural England	Environment	Special Sites	<p>There are 5 SSSIs either within or within the vicinity of the Parish boundary. These are listed below. The Draft Plan should consider these sites in the context of the plan so that there is no likelihood of harm to these sites in relation to the plan's proposed objectives or policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Windsor Forest & Great Park SSSI (within Parish) - Bray Pennyroyal Field SSSI (within Parish) - Great Thrift Wood SSSI (close proximity) - Chawridge Bourne SSSI (close proximity) - Bray Meadows SSSI (close proximity) <p>Please note that Windsor Forest & Great Park is also an SAC and therefore of European Importance, and so the Local Planning Authority (RBWM) has already prepared and consulted Natural England on both an SEA screening and HRA screening. As the Draft Plan is not allocating any sites for development, we have advised so far that it is unlikely the assessments will need to progress beyond the screening stage unless there is a material change in circumstance.</p>	The Plan provides protection for SSSI's within the Parish by requiring Developers to complete a Development Brief which includes a site map showing such sites.
VL05	24-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Mary Tomlinson for Natural England	Environment	Natural Environment	<p>I note that your Draft plan focuses primarily on the Green Belt, the Built Environment, Transport and the Economy (pages 5-9). I would therefore advise including a section on the Natural Environment and Biodiversity, with consideration of the below issues (please note this is not necessarily an exhaustive list):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - local sites (biodiversity and geodiversity) - local landscape character - biodiversity enhancements - air quality - access and rights of way - climate change - local or national biodiversity priority habitats and species - protected species - green infrastructure <p>For instance for green infrastructure, new development proposals can provide opportunities to enhance and increase open/green space provision, provide links to and across existing facilities, through green chains, green corridors and potentially help towards promoting sustainable transport options such as walking and cycling.</p>	Early consultation with Residents identified these four areas as of key concern. Many of the topics listed are outside the scope of the Plan.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
VL05	24-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Mary Tomlinson for Natural England	Green Belt	Draft Plan Referencing	As a general point, I would advise that there are numerous links and references to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that could be made within the document, e.g. references to paras 99, 109, 117, 118, 151, etc. We also advise that references and links to RBWM's Core Strategy should be built into the draft plan wherever possible. References to these documents would help strengthen the draft document further.	Noted.
VL06	02-Jul-15	Freepost	SL6 8JT	Martin McNamee for Maidenhead Civic Society	Built Environment	Whole	We agree with most policies and appreciate that Bray Parish is adversely impacted by development activity beyond its boundaries. However we fundamentally <u>disagree</u> with the statement in bold in the Introduction, namely "This Plan therefore does not propose any further housing development within Bray Parish". This is not compatible with housing pressure within RBWM.	The Steering Group note the comments, however in consultation with Residents there is no support for identifying potential sites and therefore this Plan does not allocate any sites for development.
VL07	10-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 3JQ	Claire Milne for Windsor Neighbourhood Plan	n/a	Overview	The Windsor NP supports many of the policy ideas and shares some common issues. This Consultation Document was very clear and easy to read and we liked the format and link between Issue, Objective and Policy in the table. The Vision statement and Objectives seem fine.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
VL07	10-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 3JQ	Claire Milne for Windsor Neighbourhood Plan	Green Belt	GB1 BE1	We have been advised that Green Belt Policy is covered by the NPPF and Borough Local Plan. In our view this policy will therefore not be able to stand.	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
VL07	10-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 3JQ	Claire Milne for Windsor Neighbourhood Plan	Built Environment	BE3	The main issue for the Windsor NP is obviously the impact of any Bray development on Windsor. Our main concern (apart from traffic) is the potential loss of the two Garden Centres on the western edge of Windsor and the amenity they provide, not only to Windsor residents but also to Bray residents. Your policy BE3 does potentially help with this. However, is it possible to have something that acknowledges the specific amenity provided here (children indoor play area, retail facility, eating & drinking) and accessibility to the population in this area of Bray Parish, (as well as West Windsor) and suggesting a mixed-use development on the site to potentially maintain the amenity, at the same time as providing more housing/retail or food & drink business space?	The Plan does not allocate any sites for development and all Policies associated with the Economy have been restated as Recommendations.
VL07	10-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 3JQ	Claire Milne for Windsor Neighbourhood Plan	Built Environment	BE8	Isn't the Traffic impact assessment covered in the emerging Borough Local Plan?	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
VL07	10-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 3JQ	Claire Milne for Windsor Neighbourhood Plan	Transport & Infrastructure	General	The overall effect of the plan is very general. In our view some more site-specific policies (as per schools in policy T12) would be to its benefit.	Consultation with Residents found that there was no support for site-specific Policies.
VL07	10-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 3JQ	Claire Milne for Windsor Neighbourhood Plan	Built Environment	BE	There is no mention of the river here. Windsor NP have concerns regarding inappropriate riverside development. Can this issue be considered?	Consultations with Residents identified the top four topic areas on which the Steering Group should focus. The Thames did not figure in any responses. The SG looks to National and Borough Policies to protect the Setting of the Thames.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Green Belt	GB1	Statement re voting criteria is ambiguous. Does this mean that if, say, in a parish ward of 200 people, 101 residents supported the proposal and these 101 people also voted in favour in a survey, then the proposed development would go through? And if fewer than 101 people voted in favour, it would not go through? Needs clarification.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Built Environment	BE	The issue could have a very local effect, so perhaps local residents views only may need to be taken into account e.g. within 100m? Needs to be a hierarchy of degree to which different parts of the community have influence. Also the Ward boundaries need to be clarified.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Built Environment	BE1	See comments for GB1. Also, for additions to housing stock through refurbishments etc. (page 20 of Draft Plan), conversions should still meet Green Belt criteria.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Built Environment	BE2	Agree. We welcome new measures to consult with the community. Parish councillors should consult actively with residents in their Ward. Need to quantify.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Built Environment	BE3	Plan Housing Assessment Criteria - Housing from derelict or agricultural buildings should still meet Green Belt criteria.	On independent advice, the Plan relies on current National Policy to control development in the Green Belt.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Built Environment	BE5	Green Belt criteria must apply.	On independent advice, the Plan relies on current National Policy to control development in the Green Belt.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Built Environment	BE7	Disagree. Clarify whether this refers to fences or walls or hedges.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Built Environment	BE9	The policy should extend the Parish Council commitment to support not only the maintenance of Listed Buildings but also "surrounding areas/properties in keeping with those Listed Buildings".	Existing legislation ensures that development in the curtilage of a Listed Building is managed in an appropriate fashion.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Built Environment	BE11	Disagree. Too flexible. Needs to be Agriculture-related and within Green Belt rules.	The Steering Group notes the comments but believes that National Policy already supports the change-of-use of agricultural buildings and any new development would be governed by Green Belt legislation.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Built Environment	BE	Should support only <u>some</u> "outdoor sports and recreation".	Noted.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Built Environment	BE	Disagree. Should not support "Limited infilling in recognised settlements".	The Steering Group notes the comments but believes that limited infilling in recognised settlements is a way to allow some development with the minimum impact on Green Belt land.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Built Environment	BE	Should support "Limited infilling, partial or complete replacement, or redevelopment of previously developed sites or permanent buildings, whether redundant or in use" <u>as long as Green Belt rules apply.</u>	On independent advice, the Plan relies on current National Policy to control development in the Green Belt.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Green Belt	GB	Buildings on previously Green Belt land and that were temporary should not be replaced, but put back to Green Belt (e.g. garden centres).	The BPNP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Built Environment	BE12	Disagree. We do not agree with development and enlargement of polo establishments. There are already a large number within the Parish.	Explicit support for equestrian enterprises has been removed.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Economy	E1	Disagree. Too flexible. Needs to be appropriate to the Green Belt. Light industrial workshops have a tendency to grow. Need to limit size. excess heavy traffic often associated with them and a lot of noise.	The Steering Group notes the comments but believes that National Policy already supports the change-of-use of agricultural buildings and any new development would be governed by Green Belt legislation.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Economy	E2	Disagree. No mention of erosion of the Green Belt here. Green Belt needs to be safeguarded more within this point.	The BPNP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Economy	E6	Disagree. No mention of erosion of the Green Belt here. Green Belt needs to be safeguarded more within this point. Reference the recent Squash Club planning application - no mention of Green Belt effects.	The BPNP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Economy	E6	Comments of local residents should be taken into account (as for GB1 & BE1).	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Economy	E1-E6	Economy policies are loaded too much in favour of business development, without giving due regard to the effects on the Green Belt.	Economy policies are now Recommendations within the NP and national legislation provides the framework of development in the Green Belt.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Green Belt	Wording Changes to Draft Plan	On pages 10 & 11, Objective 3 is contradicted by Objectives 6 and 9 where no Green Belt-related restrictions are proposed.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	n/a	Wording Changes to Draft Plan	Objective 8 - what does this mean? Plain English please!	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	n/a	Wording Changes to Draft Plan	Objective 10 - Any increased build will increase congestion.	The second most important issue for Residents in the Parish is traffic congestion. This congestion occurs primarily in peak hours by traffic transiting the Parish. However the power to address this lies with National Agencies therefore the Plan now makes Recommendations rather than attempting to set Policies which are outside its remit.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	n/a	Wording Changes to Draft Plan	Objective 12 - Too much emphasis on business with no mention of residents. Statement is open to abuse.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	n/a	Wording Changes to Draft Plan	Objective 13 - <u>Existing</u> business - Yes. Also Hotels and B&B's.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	n/a	General	We consider that, overall, the Introduction to the Consultation Document is good.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	n/a	Vision Statement	We fully agree with the Vision Statement.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Green Belt	GB	We do however consider it to be very important that existing Green Belt rules are observed, and it is unclear in some parts of the document as to whether this will be the case.	The BPNP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
VL08	17-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL4 4PZ	Roderick Ball for Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association	Green Belt	GB	Overall we are concerned that the rules regarding development on Green Belt are: - much more flexible than previously - more flexible regarding infill - slanted in favour of business and development in the Green Belt mainly the economy policies) rather than protection of the Green Belt and residents.	The BPNP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
VL09	19-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 5UG	David Short for Down Place Residents Association	Built Environment	BE1	Agree, but it is open to interpretation - needs clarification. "Residents support" and similar claims are made throughout the Plan - do such statements comply with BE1?	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
VL09	19-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 5UG	David Short for Down Place Residents Association	Built Environment	BE2	Agree.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
VL09	19-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 5UG	David Short for Down Place Residents Association	Built Environment	BE11	Disagree. What is the evidence for stating 'The community supports the reuse or conversion of existing buildings.....implications'...? Policy BE11 should be deleted.	Advice from Independent Planning Consultants has been that no Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted to grant Residents affected by new development the sole right to approve development. Consequently all Policies granting Residents that right have had to be removed from the Plan.
VL09	19-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 5UG	David Short for Down Place Residents Association	Built Environment	BE12	Disagree.	Explicit support for equestrian enterprises has been removed.
VL09	19-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 5UG	David Short for Down Place Residents Association	Economy	E1	Disagree. This applies to economic policies generally (not just E1). The claim that 'Residents are keen to promote and support the economic and leisure enterprises within the Parish' is spurious. Residents are more likely to support such activities that are for people within the Parish, not those that would attract many people from outside it thereby adding to traffic congestion - e.g. Legoland. Specifically we strongly disagree with using redundant farm buildings for anything other than agricultural purposes. To allow such buildings to be used for other purposes encourages their ill-considered development. Currently they are a blight on our landscape and we are forced to make development decisions in the Green Belt which otherwise we would not. So, specifically, we disagree with E1	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
VL09	19-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 5UG	David Short for Down Place Residents Association	Economy	E2-E6	Agree, subject to each of these policies stating "subject to Green Belt regulations".	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
VL09	19-Jul-15	On-line Survey	SL4 5UG	David Short for Down Place Residents Association	Green Belt & Environment	General	<p>1. Strongly agree the Vision Statement</p> <p>2. OBJECTIVES - should include (a) infrastructure as specifically related to any development and (b) noise pollution in all its forms</p> <p>3. Objective 3 states ".....for uses appropriate to the countryside". This far too loose - they should be for agricultural purposes only</p> <p>4. GREEN BELT - the section on "need to preserve the Green Belt" refers to 'inappropriate development'. The word 'inappropriate' should be deleted as any development in the Green Belt should be "discouraged". We should say "banned".</p> <p>5. Any new development must be required to fund the added infrastructure needed to support it.</p> <p>6. Noise pollution is already at unacceptably high levels in (some parts) of the Parish and new developments that are likely to exacerbate the problem should not be allowed.</p>	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
STATUTORY BODIES CONSULTATION RESPONSES								
SB01	27-May-15	E-Mail	n/a	Justin Austin for National Grid	n/a	Whole	The high pressure gas distribution pipeline falling within the Neighbourhood Plan area does not interact with any development site.	Noted. No action required.
SB02	02-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Stephen Yandell for Highways England	n/a	n/a	No comment to make at this stage.	Noted. No action required.
SB03	15-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Peter Stewart for Equality & Human Rights Commission	n/a	n/a	No comment to make at this stage. Reminded Parish Council of their obligation to consider the potential for planning proposals to have an impact on equality for different groups of people.	The Bray Parish Council has noted your comments regarding the potential for planning applications to impact on equality. This is an ongoing responsibility.
SB04	23-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Savills for Thames Water Utilities Ltd	Built Environment	BE	<p>Thames Water consider that text along the lines of the following should be added to the Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <p><u>Water Supply & Sewerage Infrastructure</u></p> <p>It is essential that developers demonstrate that adequate water supply and sewerage infrastructure capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water & sewerage infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, then the developer needs to contact the water company to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development.</p>	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
SB05	26-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Mono Consultants for Mobile Operators Association	Built Environment	BE14	We have some concerns about the proposed wording "Street furniture, advertising hoardings and utility infrastructure should be unobtrusive and appropriate to the local setting". We suggest that it is amended to "Street furniture, advertising hoardings and utility infrastructure will be supported, provided that such sites do not have an unacceptable impact on the local setting."	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
SB05	26-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Mono Consultants for Mobile Operators Association	Built Environment	Wording Changes to Draft Plan	In Section E (Other Developments) we are concerned about the following: "Sites for telecoms masts, telecoms equipment boxes, utility substations and other similar equipment should be subject to Parish Council review and located in less obtrusive locations and/or appropriately disguised to diminish the effect on local area appearance." In order to allow for the possibility of specific technical requirements and constraints, we suggest that the wording be amended to: "The siting and appearance of sites for telecoms masts, telecoms equipment boxes, utility substations and other similar equipment should seek to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area".	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
SB06	29-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Martin Small for Historic England	Built Environment	BE2-BE3	Historic England suggests that these two policies could be combined i.e. "Development Proposals.....a Development Brief as set out in Section VII of this Plan and Statement of Community Consultation as set out in Section VIII of this Plan to RBWM." Reference could also be made to the need to submit a Heritage Impact Statement where the proposal would affect a heritage asset or assets.	The Policies have been redrafted in the Plan.
SB06	29-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Martin Small for Historic England	Built Environment	BE9	Historic England would prefer this policy to say ".....of a Listed Building, where such use or modification would conserve or enhance the significance of the existing building and support the owner's ability....."	Noted
SB06	29-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Martin Small for Historic England	Built Environment	BE10	Historic England suggests that this policy be combined with Policy BE9 e.g. ".....of a Listed Building, where such use or modification would conserve or enhance the significance of the existing building, support the owner's ability..... and not impair visual amenity or create noise nuisance for neighbours."	Policy removed
SB06	29-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Martin Small for Historic England	Built Environment	BE14	Historic England supports the principle of this policy, although signage and advertising hoardings are, of course, intended to be noticeable. Not all street furniture requires planning permission.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
SB06	29-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Martin Small for Historic England	Built Environment	BE16	Historic England would welcome the addition of another criterion: "not result in the loss of any historic features, including historic landscapes".	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
SB06	29-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Martin Small for Historic England	Economy	E1	Historic England would welcome the addition of another criterion: "or where features of architectural or historic interest would be lost".	All Policies associated with the Economy have been restated as Recommendations in the Plan.
SB06	29-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Martin Small for Historic England	Development Brief	Appendix VII	Historic England suggests that reference could be made here to the need for a Heritage Impact Statement where the proposal would affect a heritage asset or assets.	The Steering Group have received several comments claiming that a Development Brief itself is burdensome so to add an additional Heritage Impact Statement would seem to be beyond what the SG believe to be reasonable.
SB06	29-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Martin Small for Historic England	n/a	Vision Statement	Historic England welcomes and supports the reference to the distinct character of the villages and hamlets, but we would also welcome a reference to the rich historic environment of Bray Parish being conserved and enhanced.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
SB06	29-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Martin Small for Historic England	n/a	Key Facts	<p>Historic England welcomes the reference to the Parish being "steeped in history". According to the National Heritage List for England, there are only 8 grade II* structures in the parish, not nine. There are also two scheduled ancient monuments.</p> <p>We would like to see a reference in the Plan to the archaeological interest of the Parish – information on non-scheduled archaeological remains is available from the local Historic Environment Record – and, ideally, to historic landscape character (the Historic Landscape Character Assessment for the Royal Borough is currently underway).</p> <p>Is there a list of locally important buildings, which often make an important contribution to creating a sense of place and local identity?</p>	Noted.
SB06	29-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Martin Small for Historic England	n/a	Objectives	Historic England welcomes and supports Objectives 6, 7 and 9, but we would welcome a specific objective for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment of the parish.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
SB06	29-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Martin Small for Historic England	n/a	Housing Assessments	<p>Historic England welcomes and supports the reference to proposed designs for a development being of high quality, in keeping with the character of the area and enhancing the built environment.</p> <p>There are a number of references to character throughout the Plan, which we welcome, but, we wonder if there has been any character assessment of the parish as a whole (we are aware of the Conservation Area Appraisal Statements for Bray and Holyport) which would provide advice to prospective developers on the characteristics of the parish and therefore how to design in keeping with the character of the area.</p> <p>Historic England considers that Neighbourhood Development Plans should be underpinned by a thorough understanding of the character and special qualities of the area covered by the Plan – indeed paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) refers to local and neighbourhood plan policies for an area being based on an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics.</p> <p>A characterisation study can help inform locations and detailed design of proposed new development, identify possible townscape improvements and establish a baseline against which to measure change. We promote the use of characterisation toolkits such as "Placecheck", "Understanding Place" or the Oxford Toolkit, links to which can be found in the appendix attached to this response form.</p>	Noted.
SB06	29-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Martin Small for Historic England	Environment	Whole	Historic England considers that Neighbourhood Development Plans should be underpinned by a thorough understanding of the character and special qualities of the area covered by the Plan – indeed paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) refers to local and neighbourhood plan policies for an area being based on an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics.	Noted. The Plan is fully compliant with paragraph 58 of the NPPF.
SB06	29-Jun-15	E-Mail	n/a	Martin Small for Historic England	Environment	Whole	A characterisation study can help inform locations and detailed design of proposed new development, identify possible townscape improvements and establish a baseline against which to measure change. We promote the use of characterisation toolkits such as "Placecheck", "Understanding Place" or the Oxford Toolkit, links to which can be found in the appendix attached to this response form.	Noted.
SB07	02-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	South East Water	n/a	n/a	No comments at this stage as no further housing development is proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted. No action required.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
PROPERTY DEVELOPERS CONSULTATION RESPONSES								
PD01	22-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Wolf Bond Planning for Bloor Homes	Green Belt	GB1 & BE1	Similar policies were proposed in the Ascot, Sunninghill & Sunningdale NP and were assessed by the Planning Examiner. In his report the Examiner confirmed that the policies fail the 'Basic Conditions' and therefore must be deleted.	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
PD01	22-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Wolf Bond Planning for Bloor Homes	Detailed Response	Area 5C for Development	Each of the Draft Plan's Objectives is measured against the proposed development of up to 400 houses on Area 5C.	The Plan does not propose any development sites in the Green Belt.
PD01	22-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Wolf Bond Planning for Bloor Homes	Detailed Response	Documents	THE RESPONSE FROM BLOOR HOMES CONSISTS OF A DETAILED LETTER, A VISION DOCUMENT OUTLINING THE PROPOSAL, A DOCUMENT DESCRIBING THE ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS & OPPORTUNITIES AND A LOCATION PLAN. ALL ARE ATTACHED.	The response from Bloor Homes as it affects the Plan has been noted.
PD02	22-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Paul Butt Planning for Mr. Bal Singh Hans	Detailed Response	Area 5E plus further site	Mr. Hans owns Area 5E (south of Harvest Hill Road and referred to on page 16 of the Draft Plan) plus "an area of land to the south of Kimbers Lane also in the BPNP area" being submitted to RBWM's recent 'Call for Sites'.	The Plan does not propose any development sites in the Green Belt.
PD02	22-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Paul Butt Planning for Mr. Bal Singh Hans	Green Belt	GB1	Disagree. This policy does not meet the 'Basic Conditions' for a neighbourhood plan as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 in that it: - does not have regard to national policy and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State; - does not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development; - is not in general conformity with the strategic policies for the area in the RBWM Local Plan 1999 (incorporating Alterations adopted in 2003).	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
PD02	22-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Paul Butt Planning for Mr. Bal Singh Hans	Built Environment	BE1	Disagree. This policy in a number of respects repeats policy GB1 and, in addition, would only allow for appropriate development in the Green Belt in the event that: (i) a planning application can be shown to deliver "significant community benefits" which are in any event undefined in the Plan; and (ii) 50% of registered electors who live in the Parish ward affected by a development who vote in a survey (again undefined in the Plan as to how that should take place) support the planning application. These criteria are so strict that they would, in effect, prevent many (if any) planning applications being granted planning permission for appropriate development in the Green Belt.	The Steering Group accepts the comments and has removed Policy GB1, redrafting Policy BE1 to remove the requirement to demonstrate Community Benefits and the proposals for Resident Participation.
PD02	22-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Paul Butt Planning for Mr. Bal Singh Hans	Built Environment	BE5-BE6	Disagree. These policies are not clearly defined and in some aspects are restrictive and arbitrary in their provisions. See full Response for detailed comments.	The Steering Group have re-evaluated the wording of some Policies and believe that they are now clear and implementable.
PD02	22-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Paul Butt Planning for Mr. Bal Singh Hans	Built Environment	BE8	Disagree. These policies are not clearly defined. See full Response for detailed comments.	The Steering group have been told by Residents that, after Green Belt, Traffic is their next biggest concern. Therefore requesting a Traffic Assessment for developments over 5 dwellings ensure that this topic is addressed at an early stage in the process and addresses Residents concerns.
PD03	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2HZ	Mervin Foulds	n/a	Area 5E	Area 5E is the area of land between the A308 and Harvest Hill Road, which was included in the original Preferred Options Consultation for the Local Borough Plan as "Land South of Harvest Hill". This land is owned by 3 different people but only one parcel was included in the final Phase 1 consultation document; the other 2 being excluded on what are now known to be erroneous grounds of "mineral extraction". All 3 owners are interested in the development of their land for housing.	The Plan does not propose any development sites in the Green Belt.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BNPP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
PD03	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2HZ	Mervin Foulds	n/a	Area 5E	I have no vested financial interest in this area of land but I should point out that I am member and director of Maidenhead Golf Club, who own the middle tranche of the area. Through my association with the Golf Club, I know that representations have been made on our behalf and that of one of our neighbours, to RBWM regarding this land and that an outline possible design proposal has been sent to them showing a housing development on the higher part of the land together with a country park on the lower area, which is prone to flooding, and which would maintain the green lung area between the A308 and the proposed housing development.	The Plan does not propose any development sites in the Green Belt.
PD03	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2HZ	Mervin Foulds	n/a	Area 5E	Whilst agreeing in principle with the majority of the Objectives of the Bray Parish Neighbourhood Plan, there is one issue which the RBWM cannot escape and that is the need for additional housing within the Borough. I believe it is incumbent upon all Parish councils within the Borough to try and find land which is available within their boundaries to assist with this. Predominantly, there is very little land available within Bray which is not Green Belt and which, if built upon, would have a severe detrimental effect of the residents of the Bray Parish.	The BNPP fully supports the Green Belt. All of the comments received, other than those from Developers, were adamant in their desire to fully protect the GB. Advice received is that National Legislation protecting the GB cannot be further enhanced by Local Policies. Consequently, Policies aimed at further enhancing Green Belt protection have been removed from the Plan.
PD03	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2HZ	Mervin Foulds	n/a	Area 5E	However, I believe that there is a parcel of land which should be considered by Bray Parish Council for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan. This is the area of land between the A308 and Harvest Hill Road, which was included in the original discussion document for the Local Borough Plan as "Land South of Harvest Hill". This area of land could provide a considerable numbers of houses (possibly in excess of 250) and any proposed development of this area of land would have minimal impact on the existing residents of Bray other than those who reside on or near Harvest Hill Road. In fact, I doubt that many residents of Bray even realise that this land lies within the Parish boundary.	In consultation with Residents, the Steering Group found no support for identifying potential sites and therefore this Plan does not allocate any sites for development.
PD03	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2HZ	Mervin Foulds	n/a	Area 5E	This would also show Bray Parish's commitment to contributing towards the Borough's housing needs without having to consider land which is close to the centre of Bray, such as the Littlewick Green triangle or the land near Philberds between the Ascot Road (A330) and Holyport Road - the development of which would considerably affect many Bray residents.	In consultation with Residents, the Steering Group found no support for identifying potential sites and therefore this Plan does not allocate any sites for development.
PD03	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2HZ	Mervin Foulds	n/a	Area 5E	I urge Bray Parish council to give serious consideration to the inclusion of this land in their Neighbourhood Plan.	In consultation with Residents, the Steering Group found no support for identifying potential sites and therefore this Plan does not allocate any sites for development.
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Detailed Response	Regulatory Context	Two pages of commentary on alleged lack of compliance issues of the Draft Plan plus comments how the Draft Plan is not succinct and nor do the policies provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and certainty. Many of the policies are aspirational, ambiguous, duplicate existing policy or have requirements that are in conflict with national and local requirements. SEE ATTACHED.	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Green Belt	GB1	Disagree. Green Belt land is currently protected by both national and local plan policy, which sets out that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. No definition is provided as to what constitutes very special circumstances. NP Policy GB1 seeks to repeat the above policy however includes a requirement for the "evidence that the development offers significant community benefits to a local community and is supported by more than 50% of registered electors who live in the Parish ward affected by the development and who vote in a survey". These requirements are overly onerous and ambiguous (what constitutes a significant community benefit for example) and in conflict with both national and local plan policy and as such fail to meet the basic conditions. Policy BNP-GB1 duplicates existing national and local plan policies and should be deleted.	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Green Belt	GB2	Disagree. All of the land within the proposed Green Gap is located within the Green Belt. The five purposes of the Green Belt are as follows: to check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting of and special character of historic towns; and to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Given that the land is already designated as Green Belt (which protects against coalescence) we consider that there is no additional local benefit to be gained by designating the land as a Green Gap. If the Parish's aspiration is enhance the landscape of this area, the Policy could be renamed Landscape Enhancement Area.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Built Environment	BE1	Disagree. As with Policy GB1, the Policy states that development in the Green Belt will only be supported "where they can be shown to deliver significant community benefits and are supported by more than 50% of the registered electors who live in the Parish ward affected by the development and who vote in a survey". Given that development on Green Belt land is controlled by national and local policies, the NP Policy has no justification and in any case, is in conflict with this policy. The policy should be deleted as it does not meet the basic conditions.	The Steering Group accepts the comments and has removed Policy GB1, redrafting Policy BE1 to remove the requirement to demonstrate Community Benefits and the proposals for Resident Participation.
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Built Environment	BE2	Disagree. Wates Developments object to the NP requirement for sites of 5 or more dwellings to be supported by a Development Brief. The cost and time involved in preparing a Development Brief should always be compared against the likely cost and time of securing acceptable development without it. Relevant policies at both national and local level provide appropriate guidance to inform development. The Policy is onerous, unnecessary, is likely to lead to the delay in securing planning permission and should be deleted.	The Steering group notes your concerns but believes that this is an appropriate and reasonable method of managing development in Bray Parish.
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Built Environment	BE3	Disagree. As above, the Council's local list of validation requirements should set out when a Statement of Community Consultation is required and as such the policy should be deleted as it places an unnecessary burden and cost on the applicant.	The Steering group notes your concerns but believes that this is an appropriate and reasonable method of managing development in Bray Parish.
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Built Environment	BE4-BE5	Disagree. A number of The Plan Housing Assessment criteria either duplicate existing national and local policy or are ambiguous and open to interpretation. For example, there is a lack of clarity on what constitutes a strong Parish and community benefit.	The Steering Group have re-evaluated the wording of some Policies and believe that they are now clear and implementable.
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Built Environment	BE6-BE8	Disagree. These policies either repeat development plan policy or make onerous requirements (for example proposals for development over 5 units must provide a traffic impact assessment). The NPPF and NPPG and local validation lists provide guidance as to when a Transport Assessment is required. As such, the policies are unnecessary and should be deleted.	The Steering group have been told by Residents that, after Green Belt, Traffic is their next biggest concern. Therefore requesting a Traffic Assessment for developments over 5 dwellings ensure that this topic is addressed at an early stage in the process and addresses Residents concerns.
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Built Environment	BE9-BE10	Disagree. The policies repeat national and local policy and should be deleted.	These Policies have been deleted.
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Transport & Infrastructure	TI1	Disagree. The policy as worded is unclear and vague as to its requirements and in any case, impact on highways and access are already controlled by national and local policies. In particular, it is unclear what is meant by 'any development that have an impact on traffic movements must provide a road infrastructure that is appropriate for all forms of transport allowing for regulatory requirements and forecasted increases in such movements'. It is not clear how this requirement would be assessed and as such we would suggest the policy is deleted.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Transport & Infrastructure	TI4	Disagree. As above, the policy repeats national and local development plans policy requirements and therefore we would suggest that the policy is deleted.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Detailed Response	Summary	In summary, the draft NP does not plan positively to support local development or provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and certainty.	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Detailed Response	Summary	Rather the draft NP is a regulatory document that includes a number of policies that seeks to control development. Many of the policies however duplicate existing national or local plan policy whilst a number are in conflict with strategic policies and would therefore fail to meet the basis conditions. We have stated above where we believe that this is the case. Page 5 of 5	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Detailed Response	Summary	More significantly, there is a noticeable lack of evidence to support the draft NP particularly in respect to local housing need. As a result, there is no clear strategy as to how any housing need will be met in the Parish or assessment as to the implications of not meeting the need.	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Detailed Response	Summary	Going forward, we would recommend that the Parish undertakes a housing need assessment to identify the level of housing need within the Parish. This will help inform decisions relating to the requirement for new housing within the Parish.	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Detailed Response	Summary	Following the outcome of this assessment, the Parish may need to re-consider the allocation of residential sites (to include Green Belt land). In such circumstances, the Council would have to re-consult on a draft NP that is informed by a Sustainability Appraisal that considers the suitability of potential development sites against set criteria.	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
PD04	23-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Philip Allin of Boyer Planning for Wates Developments	Detailed Response	Summary	As currently drafted, we consider that the NP cannot be supported as it lacks a suitable evidence base upon which to determine whether the NP is an appropriate strategy to meet development needs going forward.	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
PD05	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2PG	Peter Rawlinson (Pegasus Group) for Roger Huntingdon	Detailed Response	Willow Manor & Manor Grange site in Fifield for Development	Mr. Huntingdon owns the Willow Manor/Manor Grange site in Fifield and believes that housing development on that Green Belt site can provide sensitively designed market and affordable housing to address the need for housing in the area, without detracting from the purposes of the Green Belt, as set out in para. 80 of the NPPF.	The Plan does not propose any development sites in the Green Belt.
PD05	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2PG	Peter Rawlinson (Pegasus Group) for Roger Huntingdon	Detailed Response	Regulatory Context	The bolded statement ' This Plan therefore does not propose any further housing development within Bray Parish ' could easily be misconstrued by local residents as confirming that no new housing developments will be approved within the Parish. Although later policies suggest that some housing will be approved it is felt that the bolded statement is at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework requirement to significantly boost the supply of housing.	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
PD05	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2PG	Peter Rawlinson (Pegasus Group) for Roger Huntingdon	Green Belt	GB1	Disagree. This policy suggests that the 'very special circumstances' test would be applied to any development within the Green Belt. This is considered to be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 89 which clearly sets out the exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The wording of this policy should therefore be altered to allow for development within the confines of the exceptions set out in the NPPF that would not be subject to the 'very special circumstances' test.	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
PD05	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2PG	Peter Rawlinson (Pegasus Group) for Roger Huntingdon	Green Belt	GB1	SEVERAL OTHER DETAILED COMMENTS/CRITICISMS HAVE BEEN MADE OF GB1. SEE ATTACHED>	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
PD05	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2PG	Peter Rawlinson (Pegasus Group) for Roger Huntingdon	Green Belt	GB2	Agree, but it is suggested that consideration be given to a review of the boundaries of existing settlements in the near future, particularly in the light of the Court of Appeal decision in Wood .v. Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government [2014] EWHC 683 (Admin). SEE ATTACHED FOR FURTHER DETAIL.	Thank you for your response. We recognise that this is of concern to you and others. Unfortunately this falls outside the terms of reference for this Plan.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BPNG STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
PD05	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2PG	Peter Rawlinson (Pegasus Group) for Roger Huntingdon	Built Environment	BE1	Disagree. See comments on GB1 and the unreasonableness for all development proposals to deliver significant community benefits and be supported by more than 50% of the registered electors who live in the Parish Ward affected by the development and who vote in a survey.	The Steering Group accepts the comments and has removed Policy GB1, redrafting Policy BE1 to remove the requirement to demonstrate Community Benefits and the proposals for Resident Participation.
PD05	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2PG	Peter Rawlinson (Pegasus Group) for Roger Huntingdon	Built Environment	BE2	Agree. This policy encourages wider and more comprehensive consultation for larger schemes which is considered to be appropriate. This policy would be in accordance with existing statutory publicity requirements for planning applications which require stakeholder consultation.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
PD05	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2PG	Peter Rawlinson (Pegasus Group) for Roger Huntingdon	Built Environment	BE4	Disagree. The 'Plan Housing Assessment Criteria', set out in the full Neighbourhood Plan document pages 21 and 22, states that the construction of new housing is considered inappropriate in the Green Belt and that very special circumstances must be established to justify any development in the Bray Green Gap, Conservation Areas or within the Flood Plain. This stance fails to recognise that the NPPF identifies several exceptions that are not inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Of particular relevance to Bray Parish is the limited infilling of villages. The policy should be amended to recognise these exceptions.	The Plan does recognise that limited infilling in special circumstances is acceptable.
PD05	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2PG	Peter Rawlinson (Pegasus Group) for Roger Huntingdon	Built Environment	BE6	Disagree. The requirement for housing development to respect the Housing Layout Objectives set out in the Draft Plan will not be reasonably achievable for all housing development. The policy should be amended to allow the Housing Layout Objectives to be applied where relevant rather than a blanket approach.	The Steering Group believes that applying these Objectives "where relevant" would not be clear and suggests that applying them to all developments will produce higher quality outcomes.
PD05	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2PG	Peter Rawlinson (Pegasus Group) for Roger Huntingdon	Built Environment	BE7	Disagree. The stated desire to encourage owners replacing existing boundary structures higher than 1.2m to comply with the 1.2m limit would appear to be unachievable through a Neighbourhood Plan Policy because it is outside of the Neighbourhood Plan's ability to determine. Fences not more than 1m high fronting the highway are allowed through permitted development. For fences higher than this fronting the highway a planning application will be required where a full assessment can be made on a case by case basis. Whilst restriction to a height of 1.2m may be justified in some cases, there will be others where a higher enclosure is entirely appropriate.	The Steering Group did not anticipate this Policy being applied retrospectively but in any case this Policy has now been removed from the Plan.
PD05	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2PG	Peter Rawlinson (Pegasus Group) for Roger Huntingdon	Built Environment	BE11	Agree. The support of local businesses is agreed with and the justifiable developments set out in the policy seem reasonable. It is suggested that the justifiable developments of 'limited infilling in recognised settlements' and 'limited infilling, partial or complete replacement, or redevelopment of previously developed sites or permanent buildings, whether redundant or in use' should also be applied to policies relating to new housing development within the Parish. As previously discussed this would bring these housing policies in line with the requirements of the NPPF.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
PD05	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	SL6 2PG	Peter Rawlinson (Pegasus Group) for Roger Huntingdon	Built Environment	BE12	Agree. The desire to support local businesses is supported however the impact of the increased activity, resulting from an expansion or development of equestrian use, to the surrounding area in terms of noise and traffic generation, particularly in residential areas must be carefully assessed.	Explicit support for equestrian enterprises has been removed.
PD06	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	N1 9RL	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners for Legoland Windsor Park Ltd	n/a	LEGOLAND context	Part of the existing LEGOLAND Windsor ('LLW') site is within Bray Parish. LLW has also recently purchased some 20ha of land & a collection of buildings (part of St. Leonards Farm) which adjoins LLW and is also within the Bray NP area.	Noted.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BNPP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
PD06	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	N1 9RL	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners for Legoland Windsor Park Ltd	n/a	Key Facts	As a major attraction with a large proportion of it now being within Bray Parish, we would expect the following to be included in the list of 'Key Facts': "LEGOLAND Windsor is a major tourist attraction which contributes to the local economy through visitor and operational expenditure and provision of a range of jobs for local people".	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
PD06	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	N1 9RL	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners for Legoland Windsor Park Ltd	Green Belt	GB1	A DETAILED COMMENTARY/CRITICISMS OF THE GB1 POLICY CONCLUDES THAT WHILE IT MAY BE AN ASPIRATION TO IMPOSE GREATER RESTRICTIONS IN THE GREEN BELT THAN NATIONAL POLICY DOES, THIS IS NOT REALISTIC AND THEREFORE THE POLICY IS NOT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NPPF. SEE ATTACHED.	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
PD06	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	N1 9RL	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners for Legoland Windsor Park Ltd	Transport & Infrastructure	T11	This Policy is also not consistent with the NPPF as it requires that "...any developments that have an impact on traffic movements in the Parish must provide a road infrastructure that is appropriate for all forms of transport allowing for regulatory requirements and forecasted increases in such movements." However the requirement in the NPPF (para. 32) is that improvements are undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development: "Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe."	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
PD06	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	N1 9RL	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners for Legoland Windsor Park Ltd	Economy	E6	Agree. We support this Policy as it is a good example of a positively worded policy which is in line with the sustainable economic growth policies set out in the NPPF.	Thank you for your response. Your comments have been noted.
PD06	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	N1 9RL	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners for Legoland Windsor Park Ltd	Built Environment	Wording Changes to Draft Plan	The 'justifiable developments' set out in the policy wording for BE11 are confused, particularly the last bullet which is a copy of the NPPF wording for acceptable development in the Green Belt. This wording should be referred to in the Green Belt policies and not as part of a policy for general 'other development.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
PD06	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	N1 9RL	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners for Legoland Windsor Park Ltd	Built Environment	Wording Changes to Draft Plan	Policy BE13 is also poorly worded as it sets stringent requirements for the height or extension of existing buildings which fail to have regard to the fact that extension by a certain height in one place may have no adverse impact compared to another, by reason of topography, sightlines, landscaping etc. A blanket restriction is not appropriate.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered during the revision of the Plan.
PD06	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	N1 9RL	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners for Legoland Windsor Park Ltd	Green Belt	Conclusions	On behalf of LLW we have set out concerns with the current draft of the BNPP. The Draft Plan is contrary to a number of key strategic policies in the NPPF, namely those in relation to the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the Green Belt, transport and the requirements for preparing planning policies. To be fit to proceed to the Referendum stage, the Draft Plan requires revisiting and redrafting of several policies in order to meet the basic conditions. The Plan should be redrafted and then subject to a further round of public consultation.	Following the Consultation changes have been made to the Plan to comply with national and local policies.
PD07	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Dijksman Planning for Maidenhead Golf Club, Chris Lutman & Katherine Rockall	Detailed Response	Area 5E	Area 5E is the area of land between the A308 and Harvest Hill Road, which was included in the original Preferred Options Consultation for the Local Borough Plan as "Land South of Harvest Hill". This land is owned by 3 different people but only one parcel was included in the final Phase 1 consultation document; the other 2 being excluded on what are now known to be erroneous grounds of "mineral extraction". All 3 owners are interested in the development of their land for housing.	The Plan does not propose any development sites in the Green Belt.

No.	DATE RECEIVED	METHOD	POST CODE	NAME	PLAN SECTION	POLICY / SUBJECT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RECEIVED	BNPP STEERING GROUP'S COMMENTS & OUTCOMES
PD07	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Dijksman Planning for Maidenhead Golf Club, Chris Lutman & Katherine Rockall	Detailed Response	Context of Draft Plan	<p>The RBWM is currently seeking to establish what land is available for development via a "Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessment" consultation. It awaits the initial conclusions of the Berkshire local authorities' 'Strategic Housing Market Assessment' There is therefore no question that the strategic development plan context of the BNPP will change in the near future.</p> <p>It is therefore highly likely that as currently drafted the BNPP will, in a relatively short time, not be in conformity with the new RBWM Local Plan. In that situation the strategic policies of the Local Plan will take legal precedence over the policies of the BNPP. This would of course include the strategic housing allocation policies.</p>	The Plan does not propose any development sites in the Green Belt, neither does it speculate.
PD07	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Dijksman Planning for Maidenhead Golf Club, Chris Lutman & Katherine Rockall	Built Environment	BE1-BE3	<p>Whilst we support the need to deliver community benefits and the need to submit a Development Brief to RBWM as set out within policies BE1, BE2 & BE3, we take the view that Bray Parish would have significantly greater influence in relation to a strategic allocation by identifying a potential site and accommodating key development principles and infrastructure requirements within the Draft Plan.</p>	The Steering Group note the comments and have redrafted Policies BE1, BE2 and BE3, removing the need to demonstrate Community Benefits, However in consultation with Residents there is no support for identifying potential sites and therefore this Plan does not allocate any sites for development.
PD07	24-Jul-15	E-Mail	n/a	Dijksman Planning for Maidenhead Golf Club, Chris Lutman & Katherine Rockall	Detailed Response	Other Comments	<p>The Response includes other comments which promote the Area 5E site as a suitable candidate for inclusion in the Draft Plan as a method of safeguarding the rest of the Parish from possible future encroachment. SEE ATTACHED.</p>	The Plan does not propose any development sites in the Green Belt.
OTHER CONSULTATION RESPONSES								
O01	01-Jun-15	On-Line Survey	RG42 5JA	Ally	n/a	n/a	No comments made.	Noted. No action.