

## Summary of Responses Received at Publication

This document summarises the main comments received by the Council on the Submitted Neighbourhood Plan.

Name / Organisation	Summary of response
Shorts Group	<p>Welcomes the change to the policy away from employment use, but considers that the site should be allocated for housing in the plan. Suggests that the current use does not conform to surrounding uses, the site has been used for inert waste, the site is available in the short term for redevelopment, the site is previously developed land in the Green Belt, therefore the site should be identified as a housing site in preference to others in the plan.</p> <p>Suggests that the requirement for improvements to St George's Lane is unreasonable as not within the Shorts ownership. It is unreasonable for a policy to require this, but should be the result of traffic studies relating to a specific scheme.</p> <p>Objection to draft policy EN1 which attempts to define what 'very special circumstances' (VSC) are. States that VSC may differ and it is unlawful for the plan to try to define this in a plan and requirement for a Statement of Community Consultation as part of a case for VSC is contrary to case law.</p> <p>Objection to draft policy H2 as no housing needs analysis has been undertaken and the policy will result in uncertainty, with no justification. Criticism of the plan proceeding without housing numbers. Criticism of the approach leading to consideration of Green Belt sites.</p> <p>Objection to draft policy H3 which is considered to interfere with the housing market with inadequate evidence to support it. Considers the policy to be unworkable and seeking to impose a blanket ban is not consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>Objection to draft policies DG1 and DG2 as they require development to be the same as that already in the area. Policies are inflexible.</p> <p>Objection to draft policy E1 as considers the requirement for 12 months marketing can be an unreasonable burden to the property owner.</p> <p>Objection to draft policy SV1 as suggests that the wording is vague and it is not quantified. Also objection to housing needing to provide parking for visitors and tradesmen as well as residents as might affect the viability of schemes. Policy is not supported by robust evidence.</p>
Highways Agency	No comments to make.
Environment Agency	Pleased to see inclusion of flood zones in the requirement for development briefs. To ensure clarity and accuracy would like to see further text on flood risk including the requirement for a flood risk assessment for SUDS and fluvial flood risk. Also suggests that it

<b>Name / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of response</b>
	needs to include the requirement for any contaminated land sites in the development brief requirements.
Surrey Heath	Disappointed not to have been approached by the Steering group during the plan preparation.
	Particularly concerned by draft policies H3, SS6 and SS7 which in combination would lead to an unspecified amount of residential intensification, increased parking provision and increased retail provision which would lead to traffic problems on the A30, London Road. Concerns about the lack of detail by which to assess the issues.
	Concerns about the evidence base, in particular no detailed transport or retail assessments.
Adrian Keal	Concerned as no justification or benefit for increasing parking capacity at Sunningdale Station – it will have a detrimental impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties.
Frimley Park Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	Concerned that the neighbourhood plan precedes the Borough Local Plan – given the decisions to be made in the Borough Local Plan, the neighbourhood plan is premature.
	Concerns about the allocation at Heatherwood in policy SS5, suggesting that it should not identify the potential development area or identify the southern area of the site in advance of a Green Belt review and housing numbers. Supports the identification of the site for housing, but considers that the policy is too specific.
	The requirement for a development brief under draft policy H1 is overly onerous and will delay the planning process and should be deleted from the plan.
	Considers the identification of the southern part of the site as potential SANG is inappropriate.
	Concerns about the SANG identification project referencing the undeveloped area to the south of Heatherwood – a potential future use of this area has yet to be identified and its suitability as a SANG has not been investigated. Recommends removal of this project.
	Concerns about draft policy DG5 which promotes homes being delivered to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. Suggest that this should be reduced to level 3.
	Objects to draft policy EN3.1 as being overly onerous and not in accordance with policy N6 of the Local Plan.
Bracknell Forest Borough Council	Previous concerns about the absence of a Habitats Regulations Assessment have been addressed.
	Concerns about the impact of the neighbourhood plan on local infrastructure, particularly the highways network. Consider there to be a lack of evidence underpinning the plan
	Concerns about the neighbourhood plan coming in advance of the Borough Local Plan as more development may be needed in this area.
Altitude Real Estate LLP	Welcomes the plan as a whole and keen to assist its delivery through providing SANG to facilitate the Ascot High Street rejuvenation, meeting the recreational needs for open space of the plan, and increasing the openness of the identified gap between Ascot and Sunninghill. This is to be achieved through a site at Wells Lane.
	Suggests a number of minor modifications to the wording of policies in the plan.

<b>Name / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of response</b>
<b>Ascot Central Car Parks Ltd</b>	Welcomes the preparation of the plan and are wholly supportive of the aims for their site in draft policy SS1. States that their site can be delivered independently and in advance of the other areas of the High Street rejuvenation area.
	Some minor amendments to the wording of policies in the plan suggested.
	Concerns raised about draft policy EN1 repeating existing policies and defining what would amount to 'very special circumstances' and suggestion of deleting draft policy EN1.1 and amending EN1.2.
	Concern about the wording relating to the SANG project and provides a suggestion to amend the wording to make it more flexible.
<b>Christian Leigh</b>	Objects to draft policy SS1 stating that there is no overwhelming need to make Ascot High Street bigger and more attractive. Concerned by the absence of an appraisal of the impacts of such development on other centres. Disagrees that the High Street is not attractive and that it does not cater for the local population and for visitors. Development being proposed in the Green Belt under this policy would conflict with Green Belt policy in the NPPF. Does not believe that there are exceptional circumstances in the plan to review the Green Belt boundary at this location. Proposals to the north of the High Street are considered to conflict with policy R1 of the adopted Local Plan.
	Considers that there is no assessment of capacity at sites in the plan or at other sites that may not require a Green Belt boundary review. Absence of housing figures also means that requirements for Local Plans in the NPPF are not met.
<b>Hawks Meadow Properties</b>	Do not consider that the plan can be found 'Sound' as it has not been positively prepared, it is not justified, it will be ineffective, and it is not consistent with national policy.
	Support draft policy SS6 in proposing to allocate the Broomhall Car Park site for a mixed-use development, but object to the preclusion of a supermarket on the site.
	Concerns raised about the method of consultation in the production of the plan.
<b>Mr and Mrs Mattinson</b>	Objection to proposals under draft policy SS7 which proposes the double decking of the station car park in Sunningdale. Suggest that it be deleted.
<b>Paul McDonald</b>	Concerns about the consultation undertaken in relation to the plan, in terms of the level of response, the way in which questions were asked, the breadth of respondents, and an absence of demonstration of how comments have been included in the final plan.
	Concerns about draft policy SS6 and states that the area of the site has changed since previous iterations of the plan. States that the draft policy does not clarify how improved access to the A30 will be achieved or that if a medical centre were to be delivered at this site, that it would be a relocation of an existing service not an additional service.
<b>Ascot residents at Course Road and Winkfield Road</b>	Welcomes the opportunity to guide the location of future development in the area. Concerns about the possible impact of proposals at Ascot High Street on the existing residents. Concerns about the ambitions of the plan being beyond the remit of a neighbourhood plan and suggests that there is a lack of evidence. Considers that the neighbourhood plan is in conflict with the NPPF.
	Do not agree with the assessment that Ascot centre is failing and that it needs significant investment and considers there is a lack of evidence to support this. Considers that the plan does not take into account the need to accommodate raceday employees and

Name / Organisation	Summary of response
	<p>visitors. Concerned about the impact of proposals in draft policy SS1, specifically regarding the proposed housing development, the impact on highways, traffic and people flows, the impacts on existing residential amenity, the impact on school places. Considers that the proposed extension to retail function at Ascot High Street may be in conflict with the level of protection that the plan places on the protection “individual village identities”.</p> <p>Concerns that St George’s Lane is not suitable for a cycle route and the lack of mechanisms to secure works.</p> <p>Suggests that the residents of Ascot centre have been overlooked in the process. Raises concerns about the level of consultation and other issues raised relating to communication.</p>
Jo James	Concerns about proposals under draft policy SS7 to deck the station car park in Sunningdale because of levels of congestion at the site entrance, safety concerns and additional noise and disturbance.
Heatherwood and Wexham Park NHS Foundation Trust	<p>Suggest that proposals for Heatherwood are incorporated into the general aims of the plan.</p> <p>Concerns about the comments in the plan in relation to a SANG at Heatherwood as potentially not being deliverable or suitable.</p> <p>Supports the allocation of Heatherwood as a strategic site, but considers that the wording needs to be clearer in relation to the site.</p> <p>Supports draft policy EN1.1 but objects to draft policy EN1.2 as an additional requirement for development to consider in demonstrating a case for ‘very special circumstances’.</p> <p>Concerns that draft policy EN3.1 is overly onerous and suggests alternative text, concerns that draft policy EN3.2 does not accord with the Borough Council’s validation checklist.</p> <p>Considers that Map 7 relating to green corridors is unclear about the route of the proposed green corridors and objects if the route is through the Heatherwood Hospital site as it is private land with no public right of way.</p> <p>Considers that the requirement for a development brief in draft policy H1 is unnecessarily restrictive and unjustified.</p> <p>Welcomes changes made to draft policy H2 but considers that policy H2.2 is unnecessary and conflicts with draft policy H2.1 and should be deleted.</p> <p>Concerned that the draft wording of policy DG3 would not be effective on larger sites and therefore the policy should exclude the strategic sites.</p> <p>Considers that the requirement for achievement of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 under draft policy DG5 is unsound as it is in conflict with the Local Plan and suggests amended wording.</p> <p>Concerns raised about the criteria listed in draft policy SS5.4 suggesting that a) should allow for a greater proportion of flats, and b) should not include the word ‘substantial’.</p> <p>Considers that the wording in draft policy SS5 restricts delivery of alternative uses at the site and states that an additional bullet point should be added to the end of SS5.4 to allow for this flexibility.</p>
Berkshire,	Concerns over proposed development at Broomhall Car Park under draft policy SS6, given proximity to SPA and absence of

<b>Name / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of response</b>
<b>Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust</b>	mitigation.
	Suggested that there is an inaccuracy in the wording to Biodiversity Opportunity Area in Silwood Park, provided suggested wording.
	Suggest providing a map of international, national and locally designated wildlife sites in the neighbourhood.
	Suggests that the wording of the glossary is changed in relation to SANG and SPA.
<b>Kebbell Homes, Millgate Homes, Bewley Homes, Cala Homes and Lightwater Management Ltd.</b>	Do not consider it appropriate to produce a neighbourhood plan in advance of the Local Plan. Do not consider that it is possible to ensure that the plan is aligned to the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area, or test whether it is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan at the current point.
	Concerns raised about draft policy EN1.2 as it is considered to define whether cases for 'very special circumstances' are acceptable or not, and as a result does not have regard to national Green Belt policy and fails to contribute towards sustainable development objectives. Suggests this policy is deleted.
	Consider that the proposals in the plan for significant development in areas of Green Belt would be inappropriate development and therefore should be released in parallel with or following the Local Plan.
	Concerns about the blanket approach to the gaps between villages where sites have different characteristics. Consider draft policy EN2 to be unnecessary and restrictive and would not contribute towards the delivery of sustainable development and does not have regard to national policy. Suggests deleting this policy.
	Consider that draft policy EN3.1 effectively creates a draft TPO across the neighbourhood area and that this would devalue the presence of a TPO and would restrict the delivery of future development and as such does not accord with national policy or contribute to the delivery of sustainable development. Suggests deleting this policy.
	Concerns on draft policy EN3.2 requiring unnecessary information to accompany many planning applications and as such would not have regard to national policy. Suggest moving the draft policy to supporting text and leave validation requirements to the Borough Council's discretion.
	Concerns that draft policy EN4 is unnecessary and restrictive, that it does not contribute towards the delivery of sustainable development, that it potentially conflicts with strategic Local Plan policy and could artificially constrain the Local Plan process. Considers that applications for development on gardens can sometimes be appropriate and that proposals should be dealt with on a case by case basis. Suggests deleting the policy.
	Considers the requirement under draft policy H1 for a development brief is inconsistent with national policy and is not legally compliant. Suggests deleting the policy or moving the wording to supporting text.
	Considers that draft policy H2 is too prescriptive and should not proceed with a housing mix based solely on community feedback. Suggests the deletion of the policy.
	Considers that draft policy H3 should be deleted as it is unnecessarily restrictive and inappropriate for a blanket approach of this kind and therefore it would threaten the delivery of sustainable development.

Name / Organisation	Summary of response
	<p>Does not consider that the Townscape Assessment has been subject to consultation and therefore should not be elevated to development plan status through the plan. Considers draft policy DG1 is overly prescriptive and should be deleted.</p> <p>Considers that draft policy DG2 would constrain the supply of housing and is overly prescriptive and that it should be deleted.</p> <p>Considers that draft policy DG3 is overly prescriptive and therefore that it should be deleted from the plan.</p> <p>Concerns about the wording used in draft policy DG4 as being too rigid. Provides suggested amendment to the wording to make more flexible.</p> <p>Concerns that the requirements of draft policy DG5 is not justified and is not in general conformity to the Local Plan and that it should be deleted.</p> <p>Considers that the wording of draft policy SV1 is overly prescriptive and does not conform to national policy and does not necessarily contribute towards sustainable development. Suggests deleting the policy.</p> <p>Concerned by the reference to possible SANG at Heatherwood as it could hold other developments to ransom and that draft policy SS5 is not compatible with strategic policies or EU obligations.</p>
English Heritage	<p>Disappointed by the removal of the requirement that design retains all important aspects of the building that make it a heritage asset in draft policy H3.2. Consider the policy to still meet the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>Clarifies that there are two scheduled ancient monuments in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Welcomes addition of a new clause in draft policy DG4.1 and comments that it should refer to Scheduled Monuments and Registered Historic Parks and Gardens as heritage assets.</p> <p>Object to the proposed location of a hotel at Ascot Racecourse under draft policy SS2 as it is in the setting of the Grade II listed Old Tote building.</p> <p>Supports draft policy SS5.4, specifically an additional clause relating to the scheduled ancient monument.</p> <p>Supports draft policy SS9.3 and SS10.3 and welcomes clause b) but would prefer the wording “setting” to “curtilage”.</p> <p>Suggests that there are some errors in the SEA relating to Sunningdale Park and Windsor Great Park.</p>
I & H Brown Ltd and Breckenridge Estates Rental Ltd.	<p>Supports the requirement for Broomhall Car Park to be delivered holistically and the production of a Development Brief under draft policy SS6.1.</p> <p>Supports the need to secure safe access to Broomhall car park site but suggest that this should be accessed from London Road under draft policy SS6.2. Provides suggested amended wording.</p> <p>Supports the importance highlighted in draft policy SS6.4 for a strong and detailed design response and propose some amendments to the policy wording.</p>
Waitrose	Supports the proposed allocation at Broomhall centre and confirm that they believe large scale retail is not required in the centre.
Thames Water	Suggests that it is important to consider the net increase in water and waste water demand to serve proposed new developments. Suggests the addition of text in relation to water supply and sewerage infrastructure and some wording in relation to SUDS.

<b>Name / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of response</b>
<b>Ascot Racecourse</b>	<b>Suggests the inclusion of explicit support in the plan of the need to amend the Green Belt boundary around the racecourse.</b>
	<b>Concerns about the wording of draft policy EN1 and the possible effect on operational development at the racecourse and suggests the deletion of the additional Green Belt tests in the draft policy.</b>
	<b>Suggests that the plan provides in principle support for operational racecourse development.</b>
	<b>Supports draft policy SS2 but requires greater flexibility for the location of the hotel at the racecourse.</b>
	<b>Supports the proposals under draft policy H1 for development briefs, but note that it may be that a more flexible approach to the delivery of development briefs could be appropriate.</b>
	<b>Supports the amended wording to draft policy H2.</b>
	<b>Concerns raised about draft policy H3 unduly restricting the delivery of mixed and balanced communities. Suggested amended wording provided.</b>
	<b>Concerns raised about the possible restriction to delivery of mixed and balanced communities by draft policy DG1. Suggested amended wording provided.</b>
	<b>Concerns about a cycle route shown on Map 14 across the Ascot Heaths and suggest that it is clarified that this route is not always available.</b>
<b>Slough Borough Council</b>	<b>Concerned by cumulative impact of policies in the NP on housing delivery and concerned about the plan being premature in the absence of a Local Plan.</b>
	<b>Questions the validity of housing numbers quoted in the plan 290-350.</b>
<b>The Crown Estate</b>	<b>Supports draft policy SS1 but would like to see the requirement for one development brief for the entirety of the High Street rejuvenation removed to ensure deliverability.</b>
	<b>Supports draft policy SS2.</b>
	<b>Supports draft policy SS6 but concerned about the resistance to an anchor store which may be necessary to ensure viability and deliverability at the site. Provides suggested solutions of either requiring that evidence is to be presented demonstrating viability without an anchor store or make policy more flexibility</b>
<b>Motor and Allied Trades Benevolent Fund (BEN)</b>	<b>Concerned that draft policy EN2 is unacceptable when judged against national planning policy. Suggests there is a lack of evidence and justification for this. Suggests that the policy should be deleted and provides amended wording to policy if retained.</b>
	<b>Concerned that draft policy EN1.2 is placing additional limitations on development in the Green Belt than in national policy. Suggests there is a lack of evidence and justification for this and that the policy should be deleted.</b>
<b>Network Rail</b>	<b>Supports draft policy SS3, but suggests that other sites should contribute to the wishlist associated with the policy.</b>
<b>Wates Developments Ltd</b>	<b>Objection to the absence of an explanation as to why dual access to the gasholder site in draft policy SS8 is being considered. Considers Bridge Road and Charters Lane to be severely constrained. Considers that the draft policy is not based on a proper transport assessment or an assessment of the amenity implications of access along Bridge Road or Charters Lane.</b>

<b>Name / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of response</b>
	<p>Considers that the question relating to draft policy SS8 in an earlier consultation was flawed as it did not include an option of a single access through Cavendish Meads.</p> <p>Suggests that the preferred option of the Highways Authority is through Cavendish Meads. Promotes this as the only suitable option.</p> <p>Suggests amendment to wording of draft policy SV1 to relate to the wording used in the NPPF.</p> <p>Provides technical information in support of representations.</p>
Andy Hohne	<p>Disagrees that Ascot High Street needs rejuvenation and questions whether additional shops can be supported.</p> <p>Disagrees that greenfield sites should be built on – considers that these areas give Ascot village its character and building on them will destroy this.</p> <p>Suggests that development should be restricted to the area’s large brownfield sites and suggests that building high density development at Ascot High Street will result in increased traffic and congestion. Concerned about the inclusion of a community centre and small cinema.</p>
Natascha Sole	<p>Supports draft policy SS1 and promotes land to be included in the area being considered for development at Ascot centre.</p>
Millgate Developments	<p>Objection to draft policy EN1 and considers that the policy fails to conform to the NPPF and Local Plan by attempting to define very special circumstances. Concerned that the draft policy is unrealistic and unreasonable by requiring proposals to achieve community support</p> <p>Objection to draft policy EN2 as it is considered that the policy seeks to apply greater protection than national Green Belt policy. Suggests it is an unnecessary repetition of policy and that it does not account for appropriate development in the Green Belt. Concerned about applying Green Belt policies to non Green Belt areas.</p> <p>Objection to draft policy EN4 as it is unclear what is meant by “unacceptable reduction” of gardens and suggests that it should seek to resist development with an unacceptable impact on the character of the area. Suggests that the draft policy does not allow for the evaluation of defining characteristics local to a proposal.</p> <p>Objection to draft policy H2 as it has been produced to adopt a community view in the absence of housing need assessment by the Borough and fails to take account of any objectively assessed needs and demographic trends. Considers that the draft policy does not explain the justification for the preference for small and medium houses.</p> <p>Objection to draft policy H3 as it does not provide proper justification and unrealistically constrains the provision of flats. Considers it to be inconsistent with other plan objectives and the NPPF and does not provide any assessment of the impact of this draft policy on housing provision in the area.</p> <p>Objection to draft policy DG1.2 as it is considered to be inconsistent with national and strategic policy as it is too prescriptive, it is unreasonable and it is unjustified having regard to varying character of the area. Raises concerns that the Townscape Assessment has not been adopted as planning policy and the intended use of it in this draft policy where it has not been the subject of independent examination.</p>



<b>Name / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of response</b>
	<p>Objection to draft policy DG2 on the grounds that it does not conform to the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the NPPF, that it is important to encourage opportunities for more intensive development where this can be accommodated, that the policy would seriously restrict housing supply, even where a development could be appropriate and not harm the character. Suggests revising the policy to be more positive whilst optimising site potential where appropriate.</p> <p>Objection to draft policy DG5 on the grounds that it is not in conformity with Borough policy nor current national standards and that there is no justification for this higher requirement.</p>
<b>Bramble International</b>	<p>Objection to draft policy EN1 and considers that the policy fails to conform to the NPPF and Local Plan by attempting to define very special circumstances. Concerned that the draft policy is unrealistic and unreasonable by requiring proposals to achieve community support</p> <p>Objection to draft policy EN2 as it is considered that the policy seeks to apply greater protection than national Green Belt policy. Suggests it is an unnecessary repetition of policy and that it does not account for appropriate development in the Green Belt. Concerned about applying Green Belt policies to non Green Belt areas.</p> <p>Objection to draft policy EN4 as it is unclear what is meant by “unacceptable reduction” of gardens and suggests that it should seek to resist development with an unacceptable impact on the character of the area. Suggests that the draft policy does not allow for the evaluation of defining characteristics local to a proposal.</p> <p>Objection to draft policy H2 as it has been produced to adopt a community view in the absence of housing need assessment by the Borough and fails to take account of any objectively assessed needs and demographic trends. Considers that the draft policy does not explain the justification for the preference for small and medium houses.</p> <p>Objection to draft policy H3 as it does not provide proper justification and unrealistically constrains the provision of flats. Considers it to be inconsistent with other plan objectives and the NPPF and does not provide any assessment of the impact of this draft policy on housing provision in the area.</p> <p>Objection to draft policy DG1.2 as it is considered to be inconsistent with national and strategic policy as it is too prescriptive, it is unreasonable and it is unjustified having regard to varying character of the area. Raises concerns that the Townscape Assessment has not been adopted as planning policy and the intended use of it in this draft policy where it has not been the subject of independent examination.</p> <p>Objection to draft policy DG2 on the grounds that it does not conform to the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the NPPF, that it is important to encourage opportunities for more intensive development where this can be accommodated, that the policy would seriously restrict housing supply, even where a development could be appropriate and not harm the character. Suggests revising the policy to be more positive whilst optimising site potential where appropriate.</p> <p>Objection to draft policy DG5 on the grounds that it is not in conformity with Borough policy nor current national standards and that there is no justification for this higher requirement.</p>
<b>Halebourne Land and</b>	<p>Objection to draft policy EN1 and considers that the policy fails to conform to the NPPF and Local Plan by attempting to define very</p>

Name / Organisation	Summary of response
Planning	special circumstances. Concerned that the draft policy is unrealistic and unreasonable by requiring proposals to achieve community support
	Objection to draft policy EN2 as it is considered that the policy seeks to apply greater protection than national Green Belt policy. Suggests it is an unnecessary repetition of policy and that it does not account for appropriate development in the Green Belt. Concerned about applying Green Belt policies to non Green Belt areas.
	Objection to draft policy EN4 as it is unclear what is meant by “unacceptable reduction” of gardens and suggests that it should seek to resist development with an unacceptable impact on the character of the area. Suggests that the draft policy does not allow for the evaluation of defining characteristics local to a proposal.
	Objection to draft policy H2 as it has been produced to adopt a community view in the absence of housing need assessment by the Borough and fails to take account of any objectively assessed needs and demographic trends. Considers that the draft policy does not explain the justification for the preference for small and medium houses.
	Objection to draft policy H3 as it does not provide proper justification and unrealistically constrains the provision of flats. Considers it to be inconsistent with other plan objectives and the NPPF and does not provide any assessment of the impact of this draft policy on housing provision in the area.
	Objection to draft policy DG1.2 as it is considered to be inconsistent with national and strategic policy as it is too prescriptive, it is unreasonable and it is unjustified having regard to varying character of the area. Raises concerns that the Townscape Assessment has not been adopted as planning policy and the intended use of it in this draft policy where it has not been the subject of independent examination.
	Objection to draft policy DG2 on the grounds that it does not conform to the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the NPPF, that it is important to encourage opportunities for more intensive development where this can be accommodated, that the policy would seriously restrict housing supply, even where a development could be appropriate and not harm the character. Suggests revising the policy to be more positive whilst optimising site potential where appropriate.
	Objection to draft policy DG5 on the grounds that it is not in conformity with Borough policy nor current national standards and that there is no justification for this higher requirement.
National Grid Properties	Concerns raised over the age of the Borough’s Local Plan as the document that the Neighbourhood Plan should conform to and about the production of the plan in the absence of housing numbers and a Borough Local Plan. Do not consider that the plan is positively prepared or justified.
	Confirms that the site is being cleared and that National Grid Properties are in discussion with the Council.
	Concerns raised about the lack of weight attributed to previous representations and technical information and about the possible implications of draft policy SS8 on viability at the site, considers the draft policy to be inflexible and suggests that it does not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.
	Provides technical information in support of the representations and in support of proposals for access via Bridge Road and which

<b>Name / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of response</b>
	assesses the technical information submitted by Wates developments.
	Suggests amendments to the policy and the intent.
	Considers the justification of draft policy SS8 to be in direct conflict with draft policy EN3 and to go beyond the requirements of the British Standard. Provides suggested amendment to justification for draft policy SS8.
	Objection to the proposal in draft policy SS8 relating to the relocation of a school to the site as it could displace the housing that the site could deliver and would result in traffic and highway safety impacts. Suggest that a school on this site would not be suitable or viable.
	Considers it premature to require the delivery of 15% of open space and concerned that this places a burden on the site. Suggests that this requirement is amended to be up to 10% if retained.
John Bayliss	Supports new shops on the south side of Ascot High Street, provided that these are tasteful and lettable.
	Concerns about the proposed village square resulting in anti-social behaviour.
	Concerns about the potential risk to the trees which are considered to be important. Suggests that they should be subject to a TPO.
Imperial College London	Suggests some minor text changes to the supporting text of draft policy SS10 and the omission of map 26 to avoid confusion and more accurately reflect the situation.
	Objection to the inclusion of the requirement for a public footpath in draft policy SS10(e) as the experiments undertaken on the site may be incompatible with public use.
	Suggests that draft policy SS10.2 conflicts with the objectives and approach in draft policy SS10.3 and suggest amended wording to account for this conflict.
Helen Knight	Objection to Map 8 on the grounds that it does not cover the entirety of the field to the north of Cedar Drive.
	Objection to increasing parking at Sunningdale station and Waitrose as it will impact on the visual amenity of properties on south side of Cedar Drive. Offers a preference for encouraging people not to use their cars.
David Chapman	Objection to the plan as a whole as it is considered to lack proposals to the benefit of North Ascot, and suggests that other areas were the focus of publicity. Suggests that the plan should not be used for the entire area.
	Objection to the inclusion of cycle and pedestrian routes as the proposed routes do not include North Ascot. Provides a number of views about cycle paths in and around Ascot.
	Objection to the development on either side of the A class road running through Ascot, suggesting that it is preferable to focus attention on smaller centres across the area.
	Objection to the plan as a whole on the basis that the consultation and proposed utilisation of the plan are flawed. Concerned that the plan could get voted in on certain items and residents will experience unwanted consequences.
George Thurling	Supports redevelopment of Ascot centre, green corridors and gaps between villages.

<b>Name / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of response</b>
	Raises concerns about policing and anti-social behaviour, the reduction in hospital facilities and parking in the entire neighbourhood area.
Frank Zecca	Objection to the Ascot High Street proposals and raises a number of concerns, including that none of the body involved in drawing up these plans live in Ascot centre. Disagrees with suggestion that the High Street is failing.
Maureen Bone	Objection to proposals to increase parking at Sunningdale Station, providing a number of reasons for this objection including traffic and number of commuters on trains to London. Suggests deletion of draft policy SS7.
	Raises concerns about the level of consultation on the plan and the number of responses.
Samantha Pennell	Support given for the letter of objection to the Ascot High Street Proposals submitted on behalf of Ascot centre residents.
Banner Home Central Ltd	Suggests that collectively the policies in the plan would seriously impair home building.
	Objection to draft policy EN1 on the grounds that it is unduly restrictive and that the rules around 'very special circumstances' are well established in national policy.
	Objection to draft policy EN4 on the grounds that it is vague and could be used simply to restrict housing delivery across the area.
	Objection to draft policy H1 on the grounds that it would result in an unreasonable burden that is disproportionate to the size of some schemes resulting in unnecessary delays in the planning system.
	Objection to draft policy H2 suggesting that it is not supported by justification and would see schemes that are acceptable in all other respects frustrated.
	Objection to draft policy H3 as a zoning policy with a widespread embargo on flats irrespective of the suitability of flats on a site.
Paul McGrath	Supports the plan and the benefits it will bring to the area and congratulates the group on producing it.
SPAE	Supports the plan and considers that it is aligned with the objectives of SPAE, notably to ensure that development is consistent with the existing character of the area. Considers that the draft plan is consistent with government policies.
St John's College, Cambridge	Supports the principle of a neighbourhood plan and inclusion of Broomhall centre as a site capable of accommodating retail and residential development.
	Concerned that the draft plan does not contain information on viability and potentially therefore deliverability. Concerned that draft policy SS6 precludes a large retail anchor store at Broomhall centre, which is considered to be appropriate at this location and this could impact on viability. Concerns about the prescriptive nature of the draft policy. Suggests amended wording to the draft policy.
	Raises concern about the evidence behind the draft plan and suggests that the wording of the options consultation was misleading. Suggests that the public should be re-consulted on the approach for Broomhall Centre.
	Keen to engage the community on other areas of land to help meet future need.
	Suggests that the college are in principle able to provide land for SANG, subject to meeting the college's objectives.
Natural England	Supports the clear reference to the SPA, the associated policies and work and recognition that additional SANG will be required.

<b>Name / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of response</b>
	Observes that the strategic sites present limited issues for the natural environment and that the development briefs requirement presents opportunities to address issues and opportunities.
	Welcomes the emphasis on biodiversity, the response to Local Wildlife Sites and key species and draft policy EN5.
	Recognises the value of the development of green corridors.
	Welcomes the statement about joint working to identify additional SANG.
<b>Cala Homes</b>	Concerns about the lack of strategic framework for the plan in the form of a Borough Local Plan and consider this to be a fundamental flaw.
	Considers draft policy EN2 to be a repetition of Green Belt policy. Concerned by the proposed gap between Sunningdale and Old Sunningdale as not representing the true area of gap and suggest there is an absence of an appraisal of the gaps.
<b>Pete Browitt</b>	No comments submitted.