

Wexham Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2024 to 2040



Consultation Statement to accompany the Submission Version Wexham Parish Neighbourhood Plan

May 2025

**Prepared by the Wexham Neighbourhood Plan Steering
Committee on behalf of Wexham Parish Council**

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Summary of engagement and consultation activities, issues and outcomes	4
	Stage I: Preparing the Pre-Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan.....	5
	Stage II: Consulting on the Pre-Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan	10
	Stage III: Finalising the Submission Neighbourhood Plan.....	14
3	Conclusion.....	15
	Appendix A: List of those consulted at Regulation 14 (Pre-Submission stage).....	16
	Appendix B: Summary of comments received at Pre-Submission Regulation 14 consultation and response from the Steering.....	18

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The policies contained in the Wexham Parish Neighbourhood Plan (WNP) have been developed following extensive interaction and consultation with the local community.
- 1.2. This Consultation Statement sets out how the WNP has been developed and contains, in accordance with Regulation 14 of Neighbourhood Development Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended):
 - details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
 - details as to how they were consulted;
 - a summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

The Wexham Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee

- 1.3. Wexham Parish Council is the qualifying body officially responsible for preparing the Neighbourhood Plan. A Steering Committee, comprising local councillors and volunteers from the community, was set up to lead on the development of the WNP with each member take the lead on a particular topic. Additional support was provided by other members of the community during the course of the Plan.

Members of the Steering Committee:

Chair: Melvin Pearce

Members: Colin Austin, Peter Blinco, Jenny Bramby, Aman Dhatt, Angela Galpin, John Phipps, Justin Roux, John Whitby Nicky Yiasoumi

Consultant: Alison Eardley

2 SUMMARY OF ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES, ISSUES AND OUTCOMES

2.1. A high-level summary of the steps involved in development the WNP is shown in *Table 1*:

Table 1: High level summary of the key milestones

Date	Milestone	Key activities
2023	WPC decides to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighbourhood area designated to align with the Parish boundary.
2024	Engagement and evidence gathering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Survey undertaken. Design Guidance and Codes commissioned Audit of potential Local Green Spaces and viewpoints undertaken. Housing Needs Assessment prepared. Public engagement event to consult on options for the WNP. BC screening of the Plan to ascertain environmental impacts
	Pre-Submission Plan prepared and consulted on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First formal consultation undertaken and Submission Plan submitted to BC (continues into 2025)
2025	Submission Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following the second formal consultation, BC organises the independent examination and referendum.
	Examination Referendum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WNP is 'made' (adopted)

2.2. The sections below describe, in fuller detail, the engagement and consultation process which took place during the Plan preparation. This is divided into three stages:

Stage I: Preparing the Pre-Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan

Stage II: Consulting on the Pre-Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan

Stage III: Finalising the Submission Neighbourhood Plan

Stage I: Preparing the Pre-Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan

- 2.3. Wexham Parish Council (WPC) first explored the option of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan in June 2021 and spent the following months talking to neighbouring Parishes, Buckinghamshire Council (BC) Officers and planning experts about their experiences of the process. In November 2022, WPC decided that it would be helpful to issue a brief questionnaire to residents to understand local appetite for such a document and budget was set aside for this. By Spring 2023, the survey had been finalised, to be delivered to every household in the Parish.
- 2.4. WPC allowed some months for surveys to be returned and the response led WPC to agree formally to prepare a neighbourhood plan. In July 2023, WPC applied to BC to designate the Wexham Neighbourhood Area, which would share its boundary with the Parish. The [Decision to Designate](#) was published in September 2023.
- 2.5. WPC applied to the Government Grant programme for consultancy support and Alison Eardley Consultants were engaged in January 2024. A Steering Committee was established, comprising councillors and residents.
- 2.6. At the Steering Committee meeting in January 2024, the consultant gave an initial presentation to the group about neighbourhood planning. This included the sorts of topics that could be included as well as what would fall outside the scope. Examples of policies from other plans were provided to assist the group. A Terms of Reference was agreed and a project plan was drawn up.
- 2.7. To inform the work, a Key Issues Survey was developed seeking resident's views on a range of topics. This had a closing date of 28 February 2024. It was promoted on the Parish Council website, via social media (various local Facebook pages) and a copy was delivered to all households in the Parish.

Front page of the Key Issues Survey

Wexham Neighbourhood Plan Survey

⊞ PAGE TITLE

Wexham Parish Council is now in the early stages of developing a Neighbourhood Plan for the parish. This is a planning and land-use document that, once agreed with the community, will sit alongside the Buckinghamshire's Local Plan and will be used to guide land-use and determine the outcome of planning applications within our parish up to 2033. We can use the plan to have a direct say in what individual development will look like and how it is designed.

An important first step is for us to consider, collectively, the features of our parish that we feel are the most important to safeguard against inappropriate development and also to set out our aspirations for the future of the area.

This short survey is one way that we will be gathering this information over the coming months. Some questions have sub-questions.

To find out more about the Wexham Neighbourhood Plan, please visit the [Wexham Parish Council - Neighbourhood Planning page](#)

- 2.8. To further promote the survey, and to officially launch the project, two public sessions were held on Saturday 17 February in the Harvey Memorial Hall. Residents were given a presentation about neighbourhood planning and were invited to ask questions. There were also opportunities to complete the survey. Approximately 25 residents attended each meeting. The sessions were promoted on the website, social media, with posters and a banner.

Banner promoting the public sessions



- 2.9. In parallel, members of the Steering Committee met with other groups locally, for instance the George Green Ladies Group on 12 February 2024, where 20 members were in attendance.
- 2.10. The Steering Committee had agreed early on that it would not be seeking to allocate sites for housing. This was due to the fact that the Parish lies wholly within Green Belt and whilst neighbourhood plans can amend green belt boundaries, this can only be achieved where there is a 'strategic hook' in the adopted Local Plan to enable this. The adopted Local Plan did not include such a mechanism. Nevertheless, with a national drive for housing, an emerging Local Plan with amended housing targets and potential changes to green belt policy being mooted nationally, it was felt important to prepare for potential development and use the policies of the emerging WNP to influence this as far as possible. In particular, the Steering Committee considered that it would wish to influence the design of any future development and the type of residential development that would be supported locally. To that end, they successfully applied for Locality Technical Support to enable a Design Guidance and Housing Needs Assessment to be prepared for the Parish. Consultants from AECOM commenced work on these in early summer 2024, in partnership with the Steering Committee.
- 2.11. The findings of the Key Issues Survey were compiled and discussed by the Steering Committee. A series of Task Groups were identified based on the findings, with each Committee Member taking overall responsibility for a topic. A detailed list of actions underpinning each Task Group was set out to guide the Committee in understanding the evidence that would need to be compiled. A summary of activities is provided below by Task Area:
- 2.12. **Vision and Objectives:** The Steering Committee undertook a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) exercise. In addition, the Key Issues Survey included a specific question for residents about their aspirations for the future. These were compiled into

a draft vision and objectives, which were shared with the community for comment, before being finalised.

- 2.13. **Housing, Design and Heritage:** The Group commissioned a [Wexham Housing Needs Assessment](#) to inform the type of housing that should be prioritised to meet local housing need. The assessment was prepared by AECOM consultants following the government methodology and drawing on national and local datasets. It identified a need for smaller homes (in terms of number of bedrooms) to appeal to those wishing to downsize and those starting off on the property ladder.
- 2.14. In the absence of housing allocations, and in the context of an out-of-date Local Plan, an important strategic spatial policy was included to set out broad principles that should be adhered to by all developments, notably any major development that might arise following changes to green belt policy and any strategic allocations that might come forward in the emerging Local Plan for Buckinghamshire. This also reflected the strong community desire to retain the identities and separateness of the individual settlements that make up the Parish. There has been a slow encroachment of development to the south and west of the Parish from neighbouring Slough and residents were clear that this should not subsume George Green and other areas.
- 2.15. As noted previously, the design of development was a key issue for the Parish and the [Wexham Design Guidance and Codes](#), prepared by AECOM consultants, was published in September 2024. These were drawn from engagement with the Steering Committee, a walkabout of the Parish, feedback from the Key Issues Survey (which included a specific question on this matter) and findings from the community event held in September 2024 (described later in this document).
- 2.16. The final area pursued by this Task Group related to heritage. There are a number of designated heritage assets in the Parish, including the Grade II Langley Park. In addition, BC has identified some non-designated heritage assets. The Committee, bearing in mind feedback from the community via the Survey and the September event, identified further assets of importance from a local heritage and architectural perspective. These were evaluated against the criteria as advised by Historic England and mapped for inclusion in the WNP.
- 2.17. **Environment and Green Space:** The landscape and environment of the Parish, notably the Country Parks, are much valued by local residents. A description of the Parish was compiled from a biodiversity perspective, drawing on local knowledge from the Steering Committee and local landowners and this informed the proposal for a policy to safeguard important natural features (both formally designated and not) as well as pursuing local gains in biodiversity. This connected to the wider aims of the Colne Valley Regional Park, within which part of the Parish sits. In addition, there are a number of former quarry sites in Wexham, one of which is already set aside for biodiversity. The community strongly endorsed this approach to former quarry sites.
- 2.18. Local residents were asked to identify, through the survey and at the community event, areas of green space that they felt were special to them, with reasons why. A long list of sites was put forward and the Task Group visited each and identified others that might have been

missed. Each was considered against the local green space criteria as set out in the NPPF and a short-list was agreed for inclusion in the WNP.

- 2.19. A further piece of work related to views/viewpoints in the Parish. Again, the Committee invited residents to nominate views that were important to them, both in the Survey and using maps at the community event. A shortlist of six viewpoints, taking in both landscape and heritage assets, was included in the WNP.
- 2.20. A final area of work by this Task Group related to the desire to limit light pollution stemming from development. Despite its proximity to Slough, pockets of the Parish still benefit from darker skies and residents were keen to protect this, as an important asset both for local enjoyment of the skies and for a variety of nocturnal animal species. The group took data compiled by the Campaign to Protect Rural England as part of their dark skies project to use as evidence.
- 2.21. **Local economy:** An audit of local businesses was drawn up early on in the process and these were approached directly to complete the Key Issues Survey and also to attend the community events. It was considered that there were no specific issues raised that would be facilitated by a planning policy, but the work has helped to engage local businesses and create a better understanding of who is operating in the Parish and their specific needs.
- 2.22. **Getting Around:** Notwithstanding the fact that strategic transport issues largely fall outside the scope of the neighbourhood plan, there was an appetite to explore ways to encourage more active travel (walking, cycling, equestrian) within the Parish and between the settlements and the country parks and neighbouring areas. The Key Issues Survey included a specific question on this area, which was further engaged on at the community events. The Task Group also undertook an audit of key routes and areas that could be improved. The feedback relating to the area from BC's emerging Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure was considered and the priorities expressed by neighbouring Parishes in their neighbourhood plans, where links could be made. Local residents raised concerns about the lack of public transport (notably buses) and this was included in the WNP with a view to lobbying for additional services.
- 2.23. **Community:** This Task Group undertook an audit of the community facilities in the Parish with a view to identifying where improvements could be made and where new facilities would be needed, which could be delivered through any future major development schemes that might arise. A survey of children and teenagers was undertaken, which revealed their views. Parents of children also provided feedback both through the survey and at the events.
- 2.24. A number of issues arising from the community feedback fell outside the scope of planning policy. These have been collated as 'non-policy actions', which could be pursued by the Parish Council and/or local groups. Some will be prioritised as infrastructure priorities for WPC.
- 2.25. Two members of the community volunteered to take photographs of the Parish, which have been used within the document and have also provided a gallery for WPC.
- 2.26. On 21 September 2024, the Steering Committee held two public sessions at the Harvey Memorial Hall to provide an update on the emerging policies of the plan and to gain feedback before finalising the Pre-Submission Version. The second of the sessions coincided with the Social Library meeting, which helped with numbers attending. It was promoted via posters,

the WNP banner, on Facebook and via email. The event comprised a talk about the plan, progress made and next steps. A series of posters and maps were displayed around the room by policy area, with questions asking attendees for feedback on specific issues. Residents could use post-it notes to provide this or draw directly onto the maps.

- 2.27. The sessions were very well attended, and the feedback received was used to finalise the policies. During this time, the Committee sent a draft version of the Plan to officers at BC to enable them to undertake the screening to ascertain if the policies (individually or collectively) were like to have a significant environmental impact. Following consultation with Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency, it was determined that no significant environmental impacts would arise.

Facebook notice promoting the September 2024 event

Reminder

The Wexham Parish Council Steering Committee invites residents or people who work in Wexham to attend a briefing on our progress with the Wexham Parish Neighbourhood Plan. This would include feedback on the findings of the survey that we conducted earlier in the year. The Wexham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee will also be able to answer any questions in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan.

There will be two opportunities to do this as follows:

11am to 1 pm Saturday, 21st September
2pm to 4pm Saturday, 21st September
Venue: Harvey Memorial Hall, George Green Road, George Green, Wexham, SL3 6BJ

 Like  Comment  Send

Example email sent to the WNP mailing list

There is an opportunity for Wexham residents and those who work in Wexham to provide comments on the vision and objectives, together with draft policies, of the Wexham Parish Neighbourhood Plan, following our public meetings on Saturday, 21st September, 2024.

You can find these on the Wexham Parish website [Wexham Parish Council - Home \(chessck.co.uk\)](http://wexhamparishcouncil.chessck.co.uk) .
<http://wexhamparishcouncil.chessck.co.uk>

Please can you make sure that you send any responses to wexham.parish@gmx.com by Monday 7th October, 2024.

John Phipps,
Councillor,
Wexham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee

Images from the September event



2.28. The comments received from the event were used to fine-tune the policies and evidence base. This included a commentary received from Stantec UK Ltd on behalf of TARMAC Trading Ltd, which has been submitted to BC alongside this Consultation Statement.

Stage II: Consulting on the Pre-Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan

2.29. The Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) consultation took place between Monday 16 December 2024 and Saturday 15 February 2025. It was publicised in the following ways:

- The Parish Council website was updated showing the Plan itself, the Housing Needs Assessment, the Design Guidance, the SEA/HRA Screening Determination Statements and links to other evidence.
- Hard copies of plan were made available to be loaned by individuals wishing to read a hard copy.

The Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan



- A Feedback Survey was provided, both online and paper copy, allowing residents to provide feedback on the individual policies, the design guidance and any other aspects they wished to comment. Paper copies could be returned to various locations around the Parish.
- A consultation event was held at the Harvey Memorial Hall from 11am to 1 pm on Saturday 18 January 2025. Poster displays were in place and residents were given an opportunity ask questions and provide feedback. 30 residents attended the event.
- Regular social media updates were posted on local Facebook pages (George Green, Stoke Poges, Ivers, Iver Heath, South Bucks & South Bucks Matters).
- An email (and later reminder emails) was sent to the WNP residents mailing list, the local business mailing list (35 businesses) and other interested parties (30 organisations).
- A letter about the consultation was sent to all residents (916 houses/flats) in the Parish advising of them of the launch of the Pre-Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan and inviting comments.
- A survey was issued to children and teenagers in the Parish.

Example social media update

To Residents and/or People who work in Wexham

Wexham Parish Council is conducting a survey amongst its residents, or people who work in Wexham, to feed into a Neighbourhood Plan for the parish. The Neighbourhood Plan is a planning and land-use document that, once agreed with the community, will sit alongside the Buckinghamshire's Local Plan and will be used to guide land-use and determine the outcome of planning applications within our parish up to 2033. We can also use the plan to have a direct say in what individual development will look like and how it is designed.

An important first step is for us to consider, collectively, the features of our parish that we feel are the most important to safeguard against inappropriate development and also to set out our aspirations for the future of the area. We are in the process of distributing paper copies of the questionnaire/survey to all residents. You can complete your response online by going to the following link:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/WexhamNDP1>

If you are uncertain that where you live or work is actually in Wexham, please see the Wexham Parish Map through the following link: Wexham Parish Map.pdf (windows.net)

For more information please go to the Wexham Parish Council website through the following link:

Wexham Parish Council - Home (chessck.co.uk)

Many thanks,
John Phipps,
Councillor, Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee Secretary
Wexham Parish Council

- Statutory consultees were written to directly, informed by a list of contacts provided by BC.
 - The owners of the proposed Local Green Spaces and proposed non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs) were written to.
- 2.30. A list of the consultees contacted is contained in Appendix A and responses were received from the following:
- Buckinghamshire Council
 - Historic England
 - Natural England
 - Environment Agency
 - Slough Borough Council

- Bluestone Planning on behalf of the Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance
 - Stoke Poges Parish Council
 - Stantec UK Ltd on behalf of TARMAC Trading Ltd
 - Wexham Golf and Leisure Ltd.
- 2.31. Feedback provided verbally at the consultation event was recorded. Twelve responses were received from residents who responded via email, on paper and via the online survey. Three teenagers responded to the survey aimed at that age group.
- 2.32. Representations received at the Pre-Submission Consultation were recorded by topic/policy and carefully considered by Steering Committee members. A summary of the comments and responses from the Steering Group, are set out in Appendix B. Full copies of the responses are available on the neighbourhood plan website. The following paragraphs provide a summary, by topic area, of the comments received during this process and how these were integrated into the Submission Version WNP.
- 2.33. **General comments:** Overall, the comments were very supportive of the Plan and its scope. A number of factual corrections were submitted by some consultees, which have been addressed. A number of responses were received from residents raising concerns about development generally and notably at the former quarry site. The Steering Committee noted that the decision over this site would be something to be considered at the strategic level, however, Policy WEX1 was felt to set out key principles that should be applied, if a strategic site were to come forward in the future (and in the green belt). A concern was raised about the lack of an up-to-date Local Plan, querying whether the WNP should be delayed until this is adopted. Given the schedule proposed by BC on this matter, it was felt necessary to continue to pursue the WNP so that policies relating to the Parish would be in place as quickly as possible. This approach was endorsed by BC officers.
- 2.34. Some residents raised concerns about the quantum of development taking place in areas near to the Parish. This was noted, however the WNP policies can only carry weight within the Wexham Neighbourhood Area itself.
- 2.35. A number of comments were received, mainly from residents, on issues that sit outside planning policy. Where possible, these were integrated into the Non-Policy section of the plan.
- 2.36. Some statutory consultees commented on the vision and objectives, but as these stemmed directly from the community, they were retained as is, with just some minor amendments for clarity purposes.
- 2.37. The conformity referencing has been updated to accord with the most recent National Planning Policy update (December 2024). This has led to some minor amendments, for instance the references to First Homes.
- 2.38. The WNP has been reviewed to ensure that it meets accessibility requirements.
- 2.39. **Spatial Strategy and housing:** Policy WEX1 (Location of development): Minor amendments were made to the policy wording and supporting text to help strengthen it. For instance, noting that previously developed (brownfield sites) can play a role in supporting priority

habitats. Additional clauses were added to ensure that all aspects of the supporting text in relation to key principles for development were embedded in the policy itself.

- 2.40. Additional text was included in Policy WEX 2 (Meeting local housing needs) to embed the proposed housing mix to be prioritised in the policy itself. The clause relating to size of homes was reviewed to clarify how it should be interpreted.
- 2.41. **Character, heritage and design:** Policy WEX3 (Character and design of development) was very much supported. The Wexham Design Guidance and Codes underpinning it forms an integral part of the WNP and this has been made clear in the document. The supporting text has been embellished to include further description of the landscape character. The Design Guidance prepared for the WNP was also amended following the consultation to take into account comments received. It forms an integral part of the Plan and has been embedded into the document.
- 2.42. Policy WEX4 (Energy Efficiency and Design) received support from all parties.
- 2.43. Policy WEX5 (Conserving heritage assets) remains largely as drafted. BC provided detail about additional existing Locally Listed Assets, including archaeological ones, which have been added to the policy, the map and noted in the Appendix. It was agreed that detail on the newly identified Non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs) would be sent to BC for consideration in their Local List, however the policy would apply to these assets regardless of that process.
- 2.44. **Environment and Green Space:** The policies in this section were very much supported. Original policies WEX6 and WEX7, which related to landscape and biodiversity, have been combined in the Submission Version Plan to reduce overlap. Information relating to nutrient neutrality was also added on the advice of BC.
- 2.45. Policy WEX8 (Local Green Space) (now renumbered to WEX7) was supported. The Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance objected to the inclusion of LGS4 (Paddock behind St Mary's Church) as they felt it was adequately protected. The Steering Committee discussed this and were minded to retain the proposal to designate as a local green space as it was strongly supported by the community. TARMAC queried the inclusion of LGS5 (Green space along Uxbridge Road) being close to a dual carriageway. The Steering Group were minded to retain this space as it does form a green entry into the community and is used by residents with a bench on site for such purposes. BC queried the inclusion of LGS6 (George Green Field) and whether it was part of the already protected Langley Park. This was checked by the Steering Committee, and it was confirmed that this parcel did not fall within the park. It was a space strongly supported by the community. Despite a comment from Slough Borough Council questioning the inclusion of LGS11 (Trenches Field), BC (as the owner) supported its inclusion, citing biodiversity value as a core criterion.
- 2.46. The six views identified in Policy WEX9 (Significant Local Views) (now renumbered to WEX8) have been slightly amended following comments received. Notably Views 2, 3 and 4 have been redrawn more accurately on the map and the names of the individual views clarified.
- 2.47. Policy WEX10 (Dark Skies) (now renumbered as WEX9) was supported.

- 2.48. **Transport and Movement:** The two policies in this section were strongly supported. A number of comments were received by residents about the interventions being proposed to the 'movement network' and these have been added into the WNP and mapping. It has been amended slightly on the advice notably of the SDNPA and ESCC to strengthen the wording. The supporting text has been added to, in order to reflect feedback from the community on areas needing to be addressed from an accessibility and safety perspective.
- 2.49. **Community facilities:** The policy in this section was supported with few direct comments.

Stage III: Finalising the Submission Neighbourhood Plan

- 2.50. Following the changes made to the WNP as a result of the Regulation 14 consultation, the Submission Version was formally submitted to BC who, once satisfied that the correct set of documents have been received, will undertake the Regulation 16 consultation. The document will then proceed to Examination and, assuming a favourable outcome, to referendum.

3 CONCLUSION

- 3.1. The Steering Committee has undertaken a very thorough engagement programme in order to develop the Wexham Neighbourhood Plan. It has set out a comprehensive vision and objectives and guiding principles. In developing the policies to achieve the vision and objectives, the Committee has actively engaged with a wide range of stakeholders and the Plan has evolved accordingly.
- 3.2. Feedback from the Regulation 14 consultation has enabled the Plan to be shaped into its final version, to submit to BC.
- 3.3. This report fulfils the requirements for the Consultation Statement, set out in Regulation 15(2) of the Neighbourhood Development Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended).
- 3.4. Gratitude is extended to everybody who has contributed to the Plan's development, either as a valued member of the Steering Committee or as someone who has taken the time to contribute their views and opinions. This has been invaluable in helping to shape the scope and content of the Wexham Neighbourhood Plan.

APPENDIX A: LIST OF THOSE CONSULTED AT REGULATION 14 (PRE-SUBMISSION STAGE)

In addition to residents, the following organisations were contacted by the Committee:

Organisation
Buckinghamshire Council
Slough Borough Council
Homes England
Natural England
Environment Agency
Historic England
Network Rail
National Highways
Mobile network
Clinical Commissioning Group
Primary Care Trust
NHS
UK Power Networks
National Grid
Gas
Sewerage/ water supplier
Local business representative organisation
Organisations locally representing people with disabilities
Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust
Pinewood
TARMAC
Brett
Neighbouring Parish Councils:
Stoke Poges
Langley
Wexham Court

Fulmer
The Ivers

Local Green Space owners:

LGS1	Demonstration Gardens, Wexham Springs	Kennedy Wilson
LGS2	Rowley Lane / Wexham Street green space	Buckinghamshire Council
LGS3	Green space in Grangewood	Private owner
LGS4	Paddock behind St Mary's Church	Diocese of Oxford, Church House, Oxford, Langford Locks, Kidlington, Oxford, OX5 1GF
LGS5	Green space along Uxbridge Road	Buckinghamshire Council
LGS6	George Green Field	Buckinghamshire Council
LGS7	George Green Recreational Field	Wexham Parish Council
LGS8	Green space at Withycroft	Buckinghamshire Council
LGS9	Azalea Way green space	Buckinghamshire Council
LGS10	Wexham Parish Council Notice Board area	Tingdene Parks Ltd, Bradfield Road, Finedon Road Industrial Estate, Wellingborough, Northamptonshire, NN8 4HB
LGS11	Trenches field	Buckinghamshire Council
LG12	The Triangle	Tingdene Parks Ltd, Bradfield Road, Finedon Road Industrial Estate, Wellingborough, Northamptonshire, NN8 4HB
LG13	The Spinney	Tingdene Parks Ltd, Bradfield Road, Finedon Road Industrial Estate, Wellingborough, Northamptonshire, NN8 4HB
LG 14	Green space Trenches Lane/Langley Court Road	Buckinghamshire Council

The owners of the non-publicly owned proposed non-designated assets were also contacted to alert them to the intention to identify them as non-designated heritage assets.

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED AT PRE-SUBMISSION REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION AND RESPONSE FROM THE STEERING

Responses were received from:

1. Buckinghamshire Council
- 1a. Buckinghamshire Council Heritage
2. Historic England
3. Natural England
4. Environment Agency
5. Slough Borough Council
6. Bluestone Planning representing the owner of LGS4 (Paddock behind St Mary's Church and St Mary's Church Hall as NDHA)
7. Stoke Poges Parish Council
8. TARMAC
9. Wexham Golf and Leisure Limited, who operate Wexham Park Golf Centre
10. Feedback from drop in event
11. Resident (footpaths)
12. Resident
13. Survey monkey responses (older residents) x 10
14. Survey monkey responses (children and teens) x 3

There were ten responses to the online survey, with relative support for each policies as per *Table B1*.

In the *Table B2*, the second column (Who?) refers to the numbering of respondents above.

Table B1: Relative support for each policy (Survey feedback)

Policy number	Strongly agree/ agree	Policy number	Strongly agree/ agree	Policy number	Strongly agree/ agree
WEX1	80%	WEX6	80%	WEX11	90%
WEX2	50% (30% neutral)	WEX7	80%	WEX12	70%
WEX3	70%	WEX8	70%	WEX13	80%
WEX4	70%	WEX9	70%		
WEX5	80%	WEX10	66.66%		

Table B2: Summary of representations received at Regulation 14 and responses

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
1.	2	General	We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan and are pleased to see that the historic environment of your Parish features throughout this draft. Although your neighbourhood area does contain a number of designated heritage assets, at this point we don't consider there is a need for Historic England to be involved in the detailed development of the strategy for your area, but we offer some general advice and guidance below, which may be of assistance. (General advice provided)	Noted.
2.	3	General	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.	Noted.
3.	4	General	We have had to prioritise our limited resource and focus on strategic plans where the environmental risks and opportunities are highest. We attach our advice note which sets out our substantive response to Neighbourhood Plan consultations including Strategic Environmental Assessment screening and scoping. (Advice note attached).	Noted.
4.	7	General	No comment.	Noted.
5.	8	General	Concerned about the timing of the WNP in comparison to the new Local Plan – better to wait for new local plan to be adopted?	There is little information yet on the content of the new local plan. The SG keen to progress the WNP to influence any development in the absence of an up-to-date local plan and while the new local plan is not yet adopted. Can always undertake a light-touch review of the WNP once the new local plan is adopted.
6.	10	General	Usual comments about Buckinghamshire Council neglecting the southern boundary particularly the cars parked around the area near Langley station which are either being dismantled or parking for the station.	Noted. This is something to pick up with BC planning officers and via the elected Parish/ county councillors.
7.	12	General	We strongly object to houses being built on the Tarmac Land. Where there was talk of making it into a Village with shops schools Houses etc for our hospitals	Noted. Any housing on this or other sites would come forward via the Local Plan

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			are at bursting point as it is we want to Keep our green belt land so we can have all the wild birds and other animals to roam over the land	process. The WNP is not allocating sites (as we are in Green Belt, we are not in a position to amend Green Belt boundaries and allocate homes) as there is currently no strategic hook in adopted policy allowing us to do this via the NDP (NPPF, 2024, para 145). As drafted out NDP does seek to retain Green Belt and includes a policy relating to the need to protect and, where possible, enhance and extend our green and blue infrastructure.
8.	13	General	General comment, applying to most of the policies - you mention the eastern part of Wexham Street, without really mentioning the development on the western part (in Stoke Poges Parish). I agree that this isn't your remit, but I do feel that it would make more sense to move the eastern part of Wexham Street and Framewood Road into Stoke Poges, where it is geographically closer to the centre and therefore a consistent approach may be made across the built area. The Wexham Parish boundary could perhaps run North along Galleons Lane and continue north as far as Fulmer Common Road. This would remove some amenities from the Wexham Council remit, but it might make more sense. An alternative would be to include all of Wexham Street and Stoke Green into Wexham, so an area East of Hockley Lane and South of Farthing Green Lane to the B416.	Noted but the moving of boundaries is outside the scope of the neighbourhood plan.
9.	13	General	The proposed policies are designed to encourage and limit change. It is quoted that the objective being to retain its rural character and community spirit of the surrounding settlements. Reality is there is limited to no community spirit and the alleged community spirit is designed to keep the poor status quo.	The Committee would disagree that there is no community spirit. There has been engagement with the community as part of this process, which has gathered pace as it has progressed. There are a number of local groups that exist and

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>The proposed policies do not reflect what the people of Wexham need and want.</p> <p>Wexham needs clear footpaths, good street lighting to encourage walking and reduce crime, good transport links including bus routes & roads and fast internet. In 2025 there is no firm date as to when all houses will have fiber broadband. Number of 3rd world Countries have better infrastructure than Wexham which is a clear indicator of the lack of progress that has been achieved by the current and previous elected representatives.</p> <p>The proposal for smaller houses to facilitate downsizing simply supports and reinforces the financial position of existing large property homeowners who can release equity from the sale of their large houses - how can that be for the benefit of the wider residents of Wexham and therefore a policy proposal!!</p>	<p>who run various local meetings and other activities.</p> <p>There have been many opportunities to engage in the WNP process and the policies have been drafted building on the input received from the community and the volunteers actively taking part on the Steering Group.</p> <p>Footpath improvements are detailed in Section 8 of the plan, reflecting feedback from the community. Street lighting is the responsibility of BC. Whilst safety is paramount, where lighting can be achieved in a way that minimises light pollution, this is supported at Policy WEX10. In terms of broadband, this would sit outside the scope of the WNP. Access to adequate broadband is a national universal obligation now.</p> <p>Policy WEX2 is evidenced by the Housing Needs Assessment prepared for the Parish, which highlights smaller housing as a particular need. This was evidenced anecdotally in the community survey.</p>
10.	13	General	<p>We are concerned with proposed development by Tarmac behind grangewood. We believe this will not only destroy the beautiful greenery, it will also cause</p>	<p>Noted. This is outside our scope however the WNP seeks to provide policies to</p>

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			issues to the wild life and increase noise and general pollution This will also cause privacy issues and the proposed dwellings will have a view inside the grangewood houses. We strongly oppose any developments that are planned in the green areas behind grangewood.	influence and future development in the Parish.
11.	13	General	I understand more housing is needed, though think that disused office buildings and business estates should be utilised wherever possible first. Nature, open green spaces and the environment is important for all of us, not just wildlife, though that should always be taken into consideration. We get a whole lot of relaxation, mental refuge, exercise, fresh air and leaves to less hospital visits if we all utilised it more often.	At national level, brownfield sites are prioritised, but not many in our Parish. Some such sites can have wildlife value too. Noted. See ref. 9. The policies in the Environment section seek to safeguard green spaces and wildlife corridors and habitats where possible.
12.	13	General	You are unlikely to get away with little to no building in the Parish, given the government's rhetoric. Whilst I agree with your desire to preserve the rural landscape, you need to consider the political reality (both at Bucks and national level), where there will be pressure to offer up areas for development. You should therefore consider if there could be scope for building along the southern border, as long as the two parks and ancient woodland were preserved fully. Any building could come with community improvement too (e.g. Doctor's surgery, school perhaps) and could be a higher density and therefore more affordable, meeting some of your other ideals.	Noted. The WNP does not oppose development, rather it seeks to influence it. Noted too the need for adequate infrastructure, which has been strengthened as a clause within Policy WEX1.
13.	13	Public drop in	Good meeting.	Thank you for your comment.
14.	1	Foreword	As the forward is not part of the formal plan these comments are only observations. Following the pre submission version the Parish will need to consider the responses received, modify the plan if necessary and then the next stage is submission to the local planning Authority, Buckinghamshire Council. There will then be another formal consultation period before the plan and any responses received are put forward for independent examination. The forward seems to miss out a stage in the neighbourhood planning process.	

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>‘The examiner may make recommendations to policy modifications to ensure that the Plan was compliant to national and local policy.’ Suggested this would be clearer as follows:</p> <p>‘The examiner may make recommendations and or suggest modifications to policies to ensure that the Plan is compliant to national and local policy.’</p> <p>Third paragraph starts with the following text <i>‘The next step is for the amended plan in the light of further comments from residents to be put forward for a local referendum’</i> this mixes the formal submission stage with the examination stage and is incorrect. Assuming the forward is updated for the submission stage then it is suggested the text is adjusted as follows:</p> <p>‘Following a successful examination the examiner will recommend the plan can proceed to a local referendum. The referendum is a vote by local residents, if the residents vote in favour of the neighbourhood plan then it will be made part of the Development plan for Buckinghamshire and sit alongside the forthcoming Buckinghamshire Local Plan or until then the existing former South Bucks Local Plan and Core Strategy. The neighbourhood plan will help in determining the planning future of the Parish and it is thus very important that it is representative of the views of the Wexham residents. This means that it will become part of the Development Plan for Buckinghamshire Council and that the policies which it contains will be used to determine planning applications and land use in the Parish for the future.’</p>	<p>Happy to amend as suggested.</p> <p>Noted and yes this has been updated in the Submission Version. Suggested text to be used.</p>
15.	1	1.1	<p>In the 3rd line “South Bucks Local Plan” should be ‘South Bucks Local Plan and South Bucks Core Strategy’, or this could instead be changed to ‘current development plan’.</p> <p>In the 4th line change “will replace that Local Plan” to ‘replace the current development plan documents’</p>	<p>Amended.</p> <p>Amended.</p>

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
16.	1	1.2	First line – <i>“The document sets out planning policies only. Issues relating to highways fall beyond this scope,”</i> change to ‘This document sets out planning policies only. Issues relating to highways fall outside its scope’	Amended.
17.	1	1.4	4th line, the 4th word ‘local’ assume this should say ‘locally’ and the 9th word ‘is’ should be ‘are’.	Amended.
18.	1	1.9	The 2nd sentence starts <i>“The current Development Plan for Buckinghamshire currently includes all current Local Plans and Core Strategies”</i> while this is not wrong it might imply all parts of the county still have Core Strategy documents in place – suggest tweaking the wording as follows ‘The current Development Plan for Buckinghamshire currently includes all current Local Plans and the remaining adopted Core Strategies’	Amend.
19.	1	1.10	The Local Plan timetable is being updated so hopefully by submission an up-to-date timetable will be available.	Noted and added in link to latest Local Development Scheme before Submission.
20.	9	Section 1	In setting the Planning Context, the WNP correctly references the fact that the South Bucks Local Plan and South Bucks Core Strategy are out of date. Whilst paragraph 1.12 of the WNP then highlights the need to carefully consider the direction of travel in the emerging Buckinghamshire Local Plan, the key issues set out in paragraph 1.13 are taken only from the adopted Local Plan.	There is very little detail as yet published on the emerging Local Plan. Whilst the adopted Local Plan is out-of-date, it is still the starting point for use in planning decisions does still carry weight in these (where it does not conflict with the NPPF).
21.	9	Section 1	The WNP should recognise the acute housing crisis in the local area as a key issue. Buckinghamshire Council confirmed in January 2025 that in the South Area (the former South Bucks District area) it is only able to demonstrate a 0.89 year supply of housing sites for the five-year period 2024-2029. This is one of the lowest housing land supplies in the Country. The Buckinghamshire Housing Strategy 2024-2029 confirms that there are over 6,600 applicants on the Council’s housing register, and the latest Buckinghamshire Monitoring Report	This is noted, however as the Parish is located wholly within Green Belt, the NDP is not in a position to allocate sites (there is no strategic ‘hook’ in adopted local plan policy to enable this).

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			confirms that in 2021-22 (the most recent period for which data is available), not a single new affordable home was completed in the South Area.	
22.	1	2.14	<p><i>Maintaining and protecting Wexham's built heritage features and reflecting this character in any future developments.</i></p> <p>A more robust comment is needed here that applies specifically to ensuring the appropriate conservation of existing Heritage Assets and the importance of their setting when considering future development.</p>	These are summaries of the main issues and opportunities. Text slightly amended to reflect this wording.
23.	8	Vision and objectives	We consider the draft Objectives are too concerned with safeguarding and potentially restrict the Plan's ability to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as is required by paragraph 16 of the NPPF and Basic Condition (d).	Noted, although this reflects the community feedback. The WNP is not opposed to development, but right now the Parish is within the Green belt and much of the area is protected e.g. by environmental designations. The WNP cannot allocate sites as a result of not meeting para 154 of the NPPF. The policies are concerned with influencing development in the future should it come forward.
24.	9	Section 3 objectives	<p><i>To ensure that the housing crisis and identified key challenges are properly addressed in the WNP,</i></p> <p><i>Objective 5 should be amended to read –</i></p> <p><i>"Objective 5: To support new housing development that meets identified needs, including in terms of size, tenure and affordability."</i></p> <p><i>We would suggest that Objective 4 should be phrased more positively. The Objective could be amended to read –</i></p> <p><i>"Objective 4: To protect and support improvements to existing local facilities and support the provision of new facilities."</i></p>	This was discussed. The Objectives stem from the community engagement and it was felt important to retain them as originally set out.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<i>We would also suggest that there should be a new Objective relating to local businesses. This new Objective could read – “Objective 7: To support local businesses, recognising their important contribution to the local community, in terms of employment and providing locally accessible facilities and services.”</i>	
25.	1	Policy WEX1 4.1	Clause A – this is not really a policy requirement but a statement – this would be better as part of the written justification.	Noted, although in the absence of an up-to-date local plan, this has been retained. It was also something that local residents feel very strongly about.
26.	1	4.5	this mentions ‘The Orchards Park’ whereas the policy refers to ‘The Orchards’ for consistency the references should be the same. Neighbourhood plan could define a settlement boundary for The Orchards if that’s something the neighbourhood plan group wanted to consider at submission stage.	Amended. The Committee was not minded to assign a settlement boundary for the Orchards as this might attract additional development.
27.	1	Policy WEX1	It should be noted that some brownfield sites may support priority habitats (NERC Act Section 41 Habitats of Principal Importance) such as Open Mosaic Habitat on Previously Developed Land (OMHPDL). We recommend noting this as a consideration.	Added this to clause 4.11 first bullet as an extra note.
28.	1	Policy WEX1	The requirements set out in paragraphs 4.12, 4.13 and 4.14 are not reflected in the policy text as such the written justification is attempting to add requirements that are not backed by the policy text. Suggest finding a way to include these points in the policy text.	Added as additional clauses into the policy. That should help to strengthen the policy.
29.	8	WEX1	Criterion i) refers to “the individual settlements within Wexham Parish (Wexham Street, George Green, Middle Green, and The Orchards).” However, Middle Green and the Orchards are not settlements listed in the Settlement Hierarchy of the current South Bucks Core Strategy, instead being considered	Reviewed the use of the word ‘settlement’ in this context – amended to ‘communities’.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			Green Belt and 'outside of settlements' for the purpose of decision making. Clearly the policy as currently drafted is not in conformity with the development plan and could be construed to designate areas of countryside as settlements, contrary to the Spatial Strategy and Core Policy 1 of the South Bucks Core Strategy.	
30.	8	WEX1	<p>Criterion ii) refers to the need for development to “maintain and, where possible, enhance the natural and built appearance and character of the area”. To ensure that Basic Condition (a) is met, which requires regard to national policy, this criterion should be split into two, one for the natural environment and one for the historic environment, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the context of the natural environment, the use of 'maintain' is not consistent with the NPPF which states at para 187 that policies should 'contribute to' and 'enhance' the natural and local environment. • In the context of the built environment, ensuring development is of a scale that is appropriate to the character of the area (including the built environment) is secured by the next WEX1 (d) criterion. <p>We therefore understand the use of 'built' environment in this criterion is focused more on the 'historic' environment. In this context, the wording is inconsistent with the NPPF and should instead refer to sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets as described in paragraph 203(d).</p>	Noted and content to separate these into separate clauses.
31.	8	WEX1	<p>Criterion iii) refers to the need for development to “be of a scale and nature appropriate to the character and function of the area”. It is unclear throughout the WNP what the 'function' of the area is, and the term is therefore rather ambiguous. This makes it unclear how the decision maker should apply the policy, as required by NPPF paragraph 16. We would draw attention to our previous comments which relate to the dynamic character profile of the Parish</p>	Amended.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>and suggest that reference to the ‘function’ of the area is either removed or a different terminology is used such as ‘appropriate to the character of the area and responds well to surrounding land uses’.</p> <p>Furthermore, ‘sympathetic to’ the character of the area would be considerably more consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>Separately, the Council may wish to reconsider whether there is even any value including this policy requirement here when draft Policy WEX3 Part A serves the same purpose and is perhaps more effective through its use of wording and consideration of the changing needs of residents.</p>	
32.	8	WEX1	<p>Criterion iv) states that development must “where appropriate, bring redundant or vacant agricultural/farm buildings or historic buildings of heritage value back into viable use consistent with their conservation in a manner that does not cause harm in terms of additional traffic”.</p> <p>The first part of this criterion is mostly consistent with the NPPF although it is not clear why agricultural buildings with no historic significance should be brought into use. Nonetheless, the latter part introduces a requirement that any optimum viable use does not cause harm in terms of additional traffic. This should instead refer to ‘unacceptable harm on highway safety’ or ‘severe impacts on the road network’ to ensure appropriate regard is given to the NPPF, because the current wording suggests schemes will not be supported if there is any level of harm by nature of additional traffic, regardless of mitigation. If a building is vacant, it will not be generating any traffic, so any new use for the building will result in additional traffic and consequently the policy is counterproductive at present.</p>	Amended to ‘severe’ impact (as per NPPF wording).
33.	9	Policy WEX1	Policy WEX1 relates to the location of new development within the Parish. We would suggest that criterion A adds nothing to the policy, and should be	Noted, however this captures the views of the community, notwithstanding

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>deleted. It is de facto that the WNP as drafted does not propose any changes to the Green Belt boundary in the area.</p> <p>Policy WEX1 and related supporting text should also be reviewed in light of the NPPF December 2024, to ensure the WNP has appropriate regard to national policy. Specifically, the WNP should make reference to the role of “grey belt” land in meeting housing, commercial and other development needs.</p>	<p>changes may be made at the strategic level, but no adopted new local plan as yet.</p> <p>All references amended to conform to NPPF 2024 prior to submission.</p> <p>WEX2 – amended to mention of Green Belt Golden Rules and affordable housing provision.</p>
34.	13	WEX1	The northward expansion of Slough should be resisted, but this might not be possible under the current government’s objectives. You should think about where further development might be appropriate if needed.	The WNP does seek to restrict coalescence in this area, although it only has jurisdiction over our neighbourhood area (the Parish).
35.	13	WEX1	The Parish Council should strongly and robustly object to the proposed gravel extraction from land adjacent to Orchards Residential Estate. Should this extraction be approved the current green space land will be reclassified as "grey belt" which will be open to future development.	Noted. This is outside the scope of the WNP, which cannot ‘stop’ development, merely influence it.
36.	1	Policy WEX2	<p>Clause A i) this is not clear – ‘the delivery of dwellings with three or fewer bedrooms’ a percentage of 3 or fewer bed homes per development or some other criterion would be helpful to the decision maker. As written on a development of any size all the developer would have to do to meet the criterion would be to provide one dwelling of 3 or fewer bedrooms.</p> <p>Clause A ii) it would be clearer if this was altered as follows ‘the provision of affordable housing which meets with the requirements in the...’</p> <p>Clause A iii) 2nd line 4th word ‘works’ assume this should say ‘workers’?</p>	<p>Added in information from para 5.8 which says mix should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30% 1-2 bedroom homes; • 50% 3 bedroom homes; and • 20% 4+ bedroom homes. <p>Amended.</p> <p>Amended.</p>

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
37.	1	WEX2	<p>Clause B seems somewhat difficult to enforce – who decides if development could reasonably be expected to meet needs of older people. Developers planning to provide elderly people accommodation might expect to meet the requirements of the policy. Those providing small units, ground floor flats as a part of a larger scheme may not specifically intend their use for elderly and wouldn't expect to meet the criteria in the policy.</p> <p>As written the policy is not clear on how a decision maker would enforce this requirement. It would be good to consider how to meet the aims of this clause in policy terms better.</p>	<p>The emphasis is that housing should be meeting lifetime needs – which can be achieved by utilising the guidance suggested in the policy. Perhaps explicitly talk about Lifetime needs (lifetime homes was a specific concept but isn't a thing anymore so just need a way to rephrase that).</p> <p>Reviewed supporting text.</p>
38.	13	WEX2	The local housing needs are largely met, given the census results. Affordable housing is readily available in Slough, just a short distance away, which also has better transport links for working along the Thames Valley.	Noted. Should there ever be development in the Parish, however, this policy would be an important one for applicants to address.
39.	13	WEX 2 (and WEX1)	The Parish Council should ensure that as part of any proposed sizable development there must be the necessary infrastructure improvements (improved drainage/sewage capacity, increased number of local health facilities, provision of local shops and amenities).	Noted – this has been added to WEX1 as per BC comments.
40.	8	WEX3	This policy is very well drafted and is supported by Tarmac because it should achieve sensitive and appropriate designs for new development in the Parish.	Noted.
41.	9	Policy WEX3	Wexham Golf and Leisure Limited welcome the aspirations of Policy WEX3, which seeks high-quality design, and a landscape led approach to development proposals. However, given the range of land uses and sites within the NP area, the policy should allow for appropriately scaled functional buildings to be erected, to support the continued use and development of sites such as the Wexham Park Golf Centre.	Noted – the Guidance would not prevent this. Development should be in keeping with local character but the policy allows for 'innovative design' as per national policy.
42.	13	WEX4	I consider how I treat my home, including energy efficiency, to be a personal choice and not one to be mandated by government. I disagree with the imposition of energy efficiency requirements, such as heat pumps or solar panels, where they may not offer an economic advantage (i.e. cost of	Noted, although this policy will largely apply to new development, which does need to be considering its energy efficiency/water usage etc.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			installation / running is greater than any energy savings). The environmental cost of manufacturing these items is also considerable.	
43.	1	WEX5	<i>Clause B:</i> Non-designated Heritage Assets Please pass on details of these and the assessment notes for nomination for the Local heritage List (LHL) to ensure consistency.	Noted and details to be passed on to BC.
44.	1	WEX 5	Clause C – 1st line “ <i>Development proposals in the Framewood Road Conservation Area Character Appraisal...</i> ” the relevant area is the designated conservation area so the words ‘Character Appraisal’ should be removed. Clause C sub clause v - as written this clause does not make sense, what is ‘the enhancement measure’?	Amended. Deleted.
45.	1	WEX5	Clause A. We welcome the inclusion of archaeology in policy WEX5 but would recommend that Figure 7: Heritage Assets includes the Archaeological Notification Areas and Locally Listed archaeological sites within the NP area. For more information please see Map - Buckinghamshire's Heritage Portal Clause B: Buckinghamshire Council has indeed compiled a local list of heritage assets, which includes archaeological sites. New nominations to this list will need to be reviewed by an expert panel, to avoid confusion between NDHA’s which are locally listed and those identified in the neighbourhood plan it is recommended to use an alternative term rather than ‘non designated heritage asset’ for those which are not on Buckinghamshire’s local list. Any archaeological sites confirmed on the local list will be taken into consideration in the planning process. The NP area includes two Locally Listed archaeological sites, which should be included on this list. For further information, see Home - Buckinghamshire's Local Heritage List (local-heritage-list.org.uk)	Layers requested, but unavailable to us. The text has been amended to signpost to the Heritage Portal. The Committee consider that the correct terminology (as per Planning Guidance) is ‘non-designated heritage asset’ and reference to this has been retained. Additional locally listed assets (including the archaeological ones) have been added.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
46.	1a	NDHAs	Harvey Memorial Hall has now been put onto the Local List.	This has been included in the WNP.
47.	6	St Mary's Church Hall	Support for Non-Designated Heritage Asset Status – Our client fully supports the proposal to identify the Church Hall as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA). This demonstrates their commitment to preserving genuine heritage assets while maintaining reasonable flexibility in land management.	Noted and added in detail provided into the Appendix B.
48.	1	6.17	<i>"There are 35 listed heritage assets in the Parish"</i> Insert 'statutory' between 35 and listed	Amended.
49.	1	6.19	Great to see a link to the Buckinghamshire Local Heritage List!	Noted.
50.	1	6.20	<i>However, the inclusion of any building or structure on such a register is not necessary for the application of this policy.</i> But it would be great to nominate them with objective of consistency.	Noted.
51.	1	Section 7 (Environment)	Somewhere in this section it would be good to mention placing emphasis on the historical significance of certain green spaces and landscapes, and ensuring any future development or changes in these areas respect their heritage value.	Noted and added into the justification (para 7.5).
52.	1	7.2	4th word 'too' is not necessary.	Amended.
53.	1	WEX6(b)	It is stated that <i>"B. Measures to achieve biodiversity net gain, mitigation or compensation involving the creation of habitat and/or relocation of species, should include sufficient funding to support at least 30 years of post-development habitat management or land use change"</i> . It is not clear if the statement relating to 'relocation of species' refers only to plant species/plant communities. As this statement relates to biodiversity net gain it would be better to remove the statement 'relocation of species', as it may be interpreted as animal species translocations.	Policy WEX6 and WEX7 have now been merged.
54.	1	WEX6 (F) and 7.9-7.11	It is welcomed that disused quarry workings are included in the policy. Ideally it should be clearly stated that no housing or other development will be supported if these quarries are subject to a restoration plan. Perhaps the	This is a helpful addition and has been included in the policy.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			statement “Proposals for any residential development will only be supported if it demonstrates nutrient neutrality, both in relation to phosphorus and nitrogen” should be rephrased in the policy in line with the justification included in paragraph 7.11 (quarries ‘not set aside for biodiversity’).	
55.	1	7.7	This paragraph is almost the same wording as NPPF paragraph 193a, it is therefore not clear if this paragraph is needed, it may be better to reference the NPPF paragraph instead.	This has been retained.
56.	1	7.5 and Figure 9	<p>Although there is reference in the paragraph 7.5 to ‘Biodiversity Opportunity Areas’ there is no reference or map of the Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA) that partly lies within the boundaries of the Parish (BOA South Bucks Heaths and Parklands). A map would be useful to illustrate the area that the BOA covers and further information on the habitats to be targeted for creation, restoration and enhancement: https://bucks.mknep.co.uk/boa/south-bucks-heaths-and-parklands/</p> <p>Figure 9 can also include the priority habitats (habitats that are listed in Section 41 of the NERC Act as Habitats of Principal Importance for conservation and enhancement), such as parcels of Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland, Wood Pasture and Parkland, and Traditional Orchard.</p> <p>The BMERC (Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Environmental Records Centre) can be contacted for priority site records and Magic Maps (https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx) can be also used.</p>	<p>The link to this work has been included in the justification. The actual mapping layer was not available to the Committee.</p> <p>The Magic Map link has been included in the text.</p>
57.	1	WEX6 and WEX7	There is some repetition between WEX6 and WEX7 policies – Please note there is a typo in the table under Policy WEX7 (it is stated Policy WEX6: Landscape and Environment instead WEX7).	The policies have been merged.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>WEX7(B) refers to Local Wildlife Sites, other designated sites and wildlife areas thus it may be better these sites to be included in policy WEX6 (C), and habitat connectivity is overall covered in a single policy.</p> <p>Similarly, this applies to WEX6(A) and WEX7(C) – biodiversity net gain and prioritising offsetting can be covered in a single policy.</p>	
58.	9	Policy WEX6 and 7	The Policy itself is incorrectly titled as Policy WEX6.	Noted.
59.	5	WEX6	<p>WEX 6 Landscape and Environment and para 7.29</p> <p>In relation to flooding and biodiversity enhancement please consider inclusion of opportunities for introduction of flood alleviation measures i.e. indication of areas and works that could help reduce flood risk of existing or proposed development areas downstream. Ideally suitable sites could be mapped but in the absence of technical studies to identify those the Plan could include the principle of identification of flood alleviation measures. And in particular, from Slough Borough Council point of view, refer to the two watercourses that flow into the Borough and for which their flood plains overlap with existing and potential sustainable development sites within Slough. The Buckinghamshire Local Plan may of course include a relevant policy in association with cross boundary matters.</p> <p>The two watercourses of interest to Slough in terms of land to hold flood water are as below and see extract of plan: Datchet Common Brook – flows east of the Hospital and Church Lane</p> <p>Horton Brook – flows around George Green, next to Middlegreen and next to the Orchards.</p>	Flooding in the Parish has not been raised as a particular issue.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			And re WEX 6 F – disused quarry – part of this site might be useful as a future flood water storage area.	
60.	8	WEX6	Our only comment on this draft policy is that the phrase ‘maintaining and improving’ should be replaced with ‘contributing to and enhancing’ to ensure consistency / due regard to paragraph 187 of the NPPF.	Amended.
61.	10	WEX 6	<p>National Framework Proposed Changes to the Quarries: We mentioned that everything was green belt however the Gov is proposing to allow building on the quarry sites, not sure if or how it will affect us.</p> <p>Tarmac Quarry site. There were folk from the Grangewood who were expressing concern about Tarmac getting permission to build houses. People mentioned that Tarmac had advised them that they had granted a 5-year lease to the Whitby Farms. The Design Code would hopefully stipulate the style of houses being built if planning permission is granted.</p> <p>Bretts intended quarry north of the Orchards. There seemed to be some concern that we were not mentioning this proposed new quarry site. We explained that there was no planning permission for this quarry. There are two meetings in the next couple of weeks hosted by Bretts giving their proposals and gaining local people's reaction.</p>	Noted.
62.	1	WEX 7 (D)	<p>It is not clear why there is reference to ancient woodland to which its protection is covered by the NPPF and Natural England and Forestry Commission Standing Advice.</p> <p>‘Exceptional circumstances’ may be misinterpreted in the statement: <i>“i There is no unacceptable loss of, or damage to, existing trees or woodlands during or as a result of development. Ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees must not be removed except in exceptional circumstances and in that case, they should be replaced with trees of a similar potential size and native species</i></p>	<p>Noted and replaced the reference to ancient woodland here to:</p> <p>i there should be no unacceptable loss of, or damage to, existing trees or woodlands during or as a result of development. If</p>

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p><i>elsewhere on the site, unless this is clearly not possible</i>". NPPF para 193c clearly states the exceptional circumstances e.g. large infrastructure projects. Perhaps if this statement is kept it should be more detailed and perhaps rephrased with <i>'they should be re-placed... in consultation with Forestry Commission and Natural England'</i>.</p> <p>The policy relating to the protection of hedgerows is welcomed, however it may be too generic to indicate that loss will be allowed for the removal for vehicular access provided that there are trees either side of the access. There may be other constraints e.g. hedgerow containing veteran trees, a hedgerow being Important according to the Hedgerow Regulations and already there is other existing gap that can provide access, or the hedgerow being an important bat commuting corridor (i.e. for Bechstein's bats) and lighting will be installed so an access will result to impacts on European Protected Species (regardless of trees retained either side of the access). Perhaps the statement 'iv' should be rephrased to <i>"with the exception of removal for vehicular access (provided this is supported by a hedgerow survey and a detailed assessment of impacts on protected species)..."</i>.</p> <p>We welcome the policy references to species enhancements 'v to vii'. We would recommend that in line with the revision of the NPPF paragraph 187d: <i>"Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ... minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs"</i> that the statement 'vi' is expanded to include that new buildings and existing buildings subject to development works should incorporate integrated bat and bird boxes (such as swift boxes).</p>	<p>notable trees must be removed, they should be replaced with trees of a similar potential size and native species elsewhere on the site, unless this is clearly not possible.</p> <p>Noted. The statement 'iv' has been rephrased to <i>"with the exception of removal for vehicular access (provided this is supported by a hedgerow survey and a detailed assessment of impacts on protected species)..."</i>.</p>

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			Additional biodiversity enhancements can be stated following consideration of existing species records within the Parish. The Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Environmental Records Centre should be consulted for records of protected, priority and locally notable species records.	Noted and added into the supporting text.
63.	1	WEX7	Policy section on Trees and Woodland – clause i) as written this would be difficult to determine, it is suggested further clarity is provided on what is considered as an unacceptable loss.	The wording has been amended in the policy to remove ‘unacceptable’.
64.	8	WEX7	Our only comment on this draft policy is that part D criterion (iv) does not allow for appropriate mitigation or compensation to be delivered which could appropriately offset any loss of, or deterioration of the quality of, hedgerows. For example, development may result in some negligible loss of hedgerow but ultimately deliver a significant net gain in hedgerow ‘units’ and therefore result in a net gain for biodiversity. As the policy is currently drafted, any proposal which included such a net gain would conflict with the policy and we do not expect that is the aim of the criterion. The Council may wish to introduce wording to the following effect: ‘development that would result in the loss of, or the deterioration in the quality of, hedgerows without appropriate mitigation or compensation will not be supported...’	This has been amended.
65.	1	7.13	The last sentence <i>“This is particularly important as Wexham has an area of an Alder Carr Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a local nature reserve amongst over 500 acres of Black Park”</i> As written this is a bit repetitive – I assume the SSSI area is called Alder Carr? It is suggested this sentence is re-written to improve clarity, suggestion as follows: ‘This is particularly important as Wexham has an area of an Alder Carr Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Alder Carr and a local nature reserve amongst over 500 acres of Black Park.’	Amended as suggested.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
66.	1	7.14	Not sure the word 'bucolic' is a well-known term therefore suggest using more user-friendly wording.	This has been rephrased.
67.	1	7.17	<p>It is stated that <i>"According to the SSS1 2018 report shows sightings within the area of a variety of protected species including eighteen species of butterfly including the Purple Hairstreak, Silver-washed Fritillary, White Admiral, and Purple Emperor, birds including hobbies and nightjars, and snakes, such as adders, slow-worm and grass snakes and lizards, badgers, roe and muntjac deer, fox and various bats. In the ponds and lake, they have found Starfruit Damasonium alisma, a critically endangered aquatic plant, the great crested newts, dragon flies as well as pike, perch, carp, roach, rudd, bream, and tench"</i>.</p> <p>We would advise that ideally references to adder and badger are removed from this publicly available document. In line with Natural England advice badger records should remain confidential to avoid the ill treatment of badgers. In addition, as there was massive decline in the UK's adder population (the adder faces extinction risk in the next ten years) and the species is still persecuted, it would be better to avoid references to adder.</p> <p>Please note typo space in 'dragon flies'(it should be dragonflies).</p>	<p>The report itself is not to be made publicly available. Reference to certain species has been removed as advised.</p> <p>Amended.</p>
68.	1	7.22	It may be added that hedgerows comprising at least of 80% native species are priority habitats, listed in Section 41 of the NERC Act As Habitats of Principal Importance (Reference: https://data.jncc.gov.uk/data/ca179c55-3e9d-4e95-abd9-4edb2347c3b6/UKBAP-BAPHabitats-17-Hedgerows.pdf)	Add in.
69.	1	7.25	We welcome the inclusion of ponds in the policy as a vital habitat to target for creation and enhancement within the Parish, tackling also the impacts of	Add in a clause in the policy about ponds – similar to trees and hedgerows.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			climate change. It may be beneficial to include wording how ponds will be supported in the policy, similarly to the statements about trees and hedgerows.	
70.	1	7.27	Perhaps more information should be added relating to this statement <i>“Enhancements should involve the planting of new trees and hedgerows of native species around ponds in communal areas and near roadsides”</i> . Ponds that are surrounded by dense trees often have less diversity owing to heavy leaf litter in the pond and no natural light. This can be rephrased to include ‘provided there is enough natural light entering the pond and only part of the pond is shaded’ .	Amended.
71.	1	7.38 and Figure 10	It is stated that <i>“Several green spaces that are considered important to the local community, for instance the Country Parks, have not been proposed for designation as Local Green Space. This is because they are already adequately protected from inappropriate development by other mechanisms”</i> , however it is not clear if an existing area of Langley Park is proposed as Local Green Space (parcel 6).	The Steering Committee reviewed this piece of land with the land manager and it is not part of the park. The space has been retained.
72.	1	Local Green Spaces Figure 12	We welcome the proposed Local Green Space parcel 11, to be added in the designated Local Green Spaces so it can be protected from development. From aerial photography it appears that the site supports an assemblage of habitats and likely to support a range of protected and priority species. It would be ideal if this proposal is informed by an ecological survey in the case that designating the site as Local Green Space will increase recreational pressure on the site.	Noted that BC support this space as an LGS. Added in extra detail on the wildlife – an ecological survey would need to be an associated action.
73.	5	WEX8 (Local Green Space)	Re proposed policy WEX8 Local Green Space The policy does not appear to tie in fully with the NPPF paras 106-108. Regarding the justification for suitability of LGS sites for inclusion in the Plan reference is made to a local survey and decisions of a Steering Group. Whilst Appendix C is noted there appears to be no information on how decisions were	Additional information has been included about how the spaces were identified. Site 11 is supported by the landowner (BC) for wildlife value.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			made for example what criteria were used to select the 'demonstrably special' reasons in Appendix C and what judgements were made when making decisions. Furthermore where wildlife is a stated reason there appears to be no information to back up why the site is special re 'richness of its wildlife'. And it is not clear how designation of LGS addresses the NPPF para 106 requirement for 'complement investment in sufficient homes etc'. Local Green Space site 11 Trenches Field appears to be a very large area to serve just the 210 adjacent homes referred to in Appendix C LGS11. The NPPF states, in terms of closeness to community served, sites should not be an extensive tract.	It was noted by the Steering Committee that that Slough BC's responses does not registered an interest here in that they have previously sought to develop this site.
74.	10	WEX8	Church paddock. Oxford Diocese have visited the site in the last couple of weeks stating that they are considering renovating the stables and building houses on the paddock to fund it. The graveyard contains various rare fungi and they are in the process gaining protection through the wildlife legalisation.	Noted.
75.	1	LGS4	<p>Object to the space being designated.</p> <p>The proposed site already benefits from multiple layers of stringent statutory protections that render an additional Local Green Space (LGS) designation both superfluous and potentially counterproductive:</p> <p>Adding a Local Green Space designation to this already well-protected site would create unnecessary administrative complexity. The current protective framework already encompasses multiple layers of statutory and environmental protections, carefully crafted to address the site's unique characteristics. Introducing an additional Local Green Space designation would create unnecessary bureaucratic layers, potentially generating conflicting administrative requirements. This complexity could lead to increased administrative burden, reduced operational efficiency, and potentially create procedural challenges that complicate rather than enhance the site's management.</p>	This was discussed by the Steering Committee in depth. Whilst it is appreciated that the owner objects to the designation. This particular space was cited by many residents as being of importance to them and to safeguard as a local green space. It is not considered that the designation would apply additional burdens on the management of the site.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			See letter for full detail.	
76.	8	WEX8	We question whether Local Green Space 5 is demonstrably special given its proximity to a busy dual carriageway, which results in noise and air pollution as well as vibrations.	The Steering Committee reviewed the site and determined that it should be retained. It is a spot where many residents sit to rest, despite its proximity to the road network.
77.	13	WEX8	The Parish Council should designate Langley Park and Black Park as Green Spaces due to their importance to the community as they met the necessary reasons. They also have particularly significant views from various locations within these Parks	These are considered to be adequately protected and are therefore not included.
78.	1	WEX9	Clause A sub clauses V 3, 4 and 5 - assume the intention is to add grid references for the locations in the policy before submission? Paragraph 7.42/figure 13 view 6 does not appear in figure 13.	The view names have been amended. Added in View 6 to the map.
79.	9	WEX9	Policy WEX9 proposes protection of locally significant views. There is no technical evidence supporting the Policy, and it is not clear from the WNP supporting text how the views were put forward by members of the community, or indeed how many people suggested each of the proposed locally significant views. Three of the six proposed locally significant views are from the footpath that crosses the Golf Centre. Wexham Golf and Leisure Limited welcome visitors that pass through the site on the footpath, and indeed, would be happy to work with the Parish Council in considering opportunities to improve this footpath link (in accordance with draft WNP Policy WEX11). However, Wexham Golf and Leisure Limited do not support the proposed locally significant views from the footpath that crosses the Golf Centre.	The views have been identified in consultation with the community. The view arcs on the map have been amended as suggested.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			<p>The Wexham Park Golf Centre and associated facilities are well maintained, but there is nothing special or exceptional about the views. The views are typical of a functioning golf course, and are nowhere near as expansive as indicated on WNP Figure 13.</p> <p>See response for comments on the views.</p> <p>The strong preference is for Views 2, 3 and 4 to be removed from the WNP.</p> <p>If the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Parish Council disagree, at the very least, the view cones shown on WNP Figure 13 need to be amended, to extend only over the land that is actually visible from the public footpath.</p>	
80.	10	WEX9	Comments were made about further views from the Langley Hotel lake eastwards etc. They were told to put in their comments.	Noted. The views would extend largely outside the Parish.
81.	1	WEX10	We welcome the Dark Skies policy and the reference to the 'Guidance Note 8 Bats and Artificial Lighting'.	Noted.
82.	1	WEX10	The opening sentence of the policy is not clear, suggest re-writing as follows: 'Proposals for otherwise acceptable development will be supported where it is demonstrated that, if external-lighting is required, will be supported provided it protects the night sky from light pollution, where:'	Amended.
83.	13	WEX8, 9, 10	This is a semi-rural area, without significant green space (outside the Parks or some farms), views or dark skies. Fewer policies would be better, but I am neutral on whether these remain or not.	Noted.
84.	1	WEX11	It is great to see that there are plans to maintain and enhance your existing sustainable transport network to facilitate short journeys, within the Parish and to nearby settlements and other key facilities. We are supportive of the provision of safe, accessible, and attractive walking and cycling infrastructure through development where appropriate.	Noted.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
85.	1	WEX11	<p>The paragraph numbering needs amending in the justification.</p> <p>In paragraph 8.8 walking bullet points – 13th bullet -8th word ‘o’ should be ‘to’ 14th bullet point initials ‘MG’ should be set out in full.</p>	<p>Amended.</p> <p>Amended.</p>
86.	9	WEX11	<p>Wexham Golf and Leisure Limited would be happy to work with the Parish Council in considering opportunities to improve this footpath link. It will be necessary to ensure that any improvements do not adversely impact on the operation of the Golf Centre.</p>	<p>Noted – the Parish Council will progress this.</p>
87.	10	WEX11	<p>Footpath along the A412: respondent claims that the map in the NP doesn't seem to cover the east side from where the existing footpath stops and Billet Lane. They have completed the attached sheet.</p>	<p>Noted – amend the map and description to include this?</p>
88.	11	WEX11	<p>Pathway needed from George Green to the Crooked Billet roundabout on the A413 so that residents and especially our children can safely walk to Iver Heath where the Infant School is, the Junior School, local shops, library and doctors are.</p> <p>The pathway needs to be on the George Green (east) side of the A413 – a <u>continuous</u> path.</p> <p>At the moment it is too dangerous to walk to Iver Heath as you have to actually walk on the dual carriage way.</p> <p>(comment also made in the online survey):</p> <p>I came to the meeting in September and said that a safe path on both sides of the dual carriageway A412 from the George Green pub to the Crooked Billet roundabout was needed as a walking link to Iver Heath is of the utmost importance as our children all go to the Iver Heath Infant and Junior schools and we need to get safely to our doctors and library which are also both in Iver Heath. From reading this latest document , I can't see this being mentioned. I</p>	<p>Noted – amended the map and description to include this.</p>

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
			can see it mentions creating a path to the local Black Park and even to Slough(even though there already exists a good pathway to Slough). Please could this pathway to Iver Heath be mentioned in the plan as this is far more important than a path to the park.)	
89.	13	WEX11	There are adequate paths in the parks, and although I use the footpath networks in the Parish outside the parks, I rarely see anyone else on them. An admirable objective, but focus on maintaining what you have already and see if there are simple improvements Todo. There needs to be a cost-benefit analysis here.	Noted.
90.	1	WEX12	<p>We are pleased to see that parking considerations have also taken into account the provision for sustainable travel infrastructure, such as cycle racks and EV charging points. These Parking provisions should be in line with Buckinghamshire Council policies:</p> <p>Parking Guidance https://www.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/local-development-plans-and-guidance/local-planning-guidance/parking-guidance-for-new-developments/</p> <p>The Buckinghamshire EV Action Plan: https://buckinghamshire.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s43677/Appendix%20%20Electric%20Vehicle%20EV%20Action%20Plan.pdf</p>	<p>Noted and amended.</p> <p>This has been added.</p>
91.	13	WEX12	<p>Provision of "local help hubs" where the community can obtain information, guidance and advice (examples: The Bridge in Datchet)</p> <p>https://www.datchet.org/amenities-general.html</p> <p>https://www.communities1st.org.uk/community-hub</p>	The Committee support this idea and consider that the Memorial Hall is already used as a depository for local information.
92.	1	9.3	<p>Re. Harvey Memorial Hall and the Church:</p> <p>Use of these buildings for additional community events helps preserve these structures and the reuse is low in embodied carbon.</p>	Added in.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
93.	1	Traffic issues	We understand the challenges presented by traffic and we are encouraged by the Parish taking potential solutions into consideration. We would suggest that you also get in touch with your Community Board to consider whether any smaller scale interventions for easing or managing the traffic and parking issues, might be considered a local priority. Where appropriate, the council can make recommendations regarding enforcement and traffic mitigation.	Noted and PC to pursue.
94.	13	Traffic issue	A412 should be a NSL limit as it is dual carriageway outside of the built up area. The reduction from 60 to 50 was an error; it should in fact be 70 outside of Slough/ Middle Green(i.e. 40 to NSL). Then enforce speeding over 70. There are few crossings, perhaps pedestrian bridge if one is needed between Black Park and Langley Park, although I don't believe this expense would be justified. There are community sports facilities in Wexham Street, just on the Stoke Poges side.	Noted, although this sits outside the scope of the WNP.
95.	13	Design Guide	In a separate document and therefore may not be seen by some. Perhaps consolidate the Neighbourhood Plan and all supporting documents into one for download?	The Design Guidance is a large document prepared by external consultants and has been saved separately. It does, however, form an integral part of the WNP and this is acknowledged in the WNP.
96.	1	Appendix B (NDHAs)	NDHAs identified in addition to the CA. Please provide assessment details so that these may be nominated for the LHL	Noted the assets have been described in terms of the local heritage significance.
97.	1	Design Guidance	More photographic examples would be useful, especially of heritage assets, to assist with conformity of style, form and materials.	Noted. This document was produced externally and could be further updated in future.
98.	13	Design Guidance	Generally, this makes sense - your challenge is to enforce compliance with the design guidance and look favourably on developments which improve the built landscape towards this. Figure 5 supports my general comment above, Wexham Street is very separate to the rest of the civil Parish.	Noted.

Ref	Who?	Page/para/ policy	Comments/ Proposed change	SG response
99.	1	Glossary	<p>Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL): the wording suggests that a CIL charging schedule is not in place – in fact a CIL charging schedule is in place across the former South Bucks District Council area of the Buckinghamshire Council.</p> <p>Conservation Area – the definition is slightly incorrect it is not an environmental designation. A conservation area is an area of special architectural or historic interest, the character of which is considered worthy of preservation or enhancement.</p>	<p>Amended.</p> <p>Amended.</p>

