

Summary of representations received by Runnymede Borough Council on the Englefield Green Village Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2030 (Submission Plan – January 2023) as part of the Regulation 16 consultation

Consultation dates: Tuesday 28 February – Tuesday 11 April 2023

Please note: The table below is a summary of the representations received, and are not verbatim.

Type of Consultation Body	Consultee	Summary of Comment
Statutory Consultation Bodies	Coal Authority Sport England National Highways Ltd Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Natural England	Several statutory consultees have responded with 'no comments'.
	Surrey County Council	<p>The Minerals and Waste Team welcome various additions to the Neighbourhood Plan in response to their Regulation 14 representation. No further comments as original concerns have been addressed.</p> <p>The Heritage Team would have preferred the Neighbourhood Plan preparation to have been paused to allow for consideration of the Conservation Area Assessment and Management for the Englefield Green area to be concluded, and for the findings to be reflected in the Plan. Raises significant concern about the considerable number of non-designated heritage assets identified in Annex D of the Plan. Of the view that some of the suggested entries do not meet the criteria for designation.</p> <p>The Local Green Spaces Team continue to raise concern about the policy requirements in policy CF2, in relation to playing fields being designated as Local Green Space. Recommend the inclusion of wording similar to that of policy SL27 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan.</p>
	Runnymede Borough Council	Whilst generally supportive of many of the principles of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Council raises several concerns and seeks modifications to several policies, the supporting text, and

		text in the Design Codes and Masterplans documents, to ensure they can be implemented effectively at development management stage, and to ensure they meet the Basic Conditions.
Other Organisations / Businesses	Surrey Gardens Trust	The Surrey Gardens Trust considers that a wider approach to identifying non-designated heritage assets could have been adopted, to include parks and gardens of interest.
	Royal Holloway University London (RHUL)	Whilst RHUL supports the key aim of the Neighbourhood Plan to ensure its development is delivered in harmony with the surrounding built and rural areas, RHUL also raises several issues which, if not addressed, means the University does not support several aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan. RHUL seeks several additions to the supporting text of the Neighbourhood Plan to signpost relevant planning approvals. RHUL raises several concerns regarding policy ND4 and the Masterplans document relating to the Coopers Hill site – including about the indicative quantum of development. RHUL puts forward suggestions for a site-specific policy. RHUL does not support policy ND1 ‘Development within the Settlement Boundary’ as currently worded, and then signposts various sections and paragraphs of the Neighbourhood Plan which could be amended to improve clarity. Suggests minor modifications to ensure accuracy, such as the removal of a Grade II listed building being identified as a non-designated heritage asset.
Residents / Local Community Representatives		<p>Several residents and community representatives have submitted comments to register their support for the EGV NP.</p> <p>Several residents and local community representatives have raised significant concern regarding an indicative scheme identified in the Placemaking & Movement Study (by iTransport, September 2022) which, if pursued as currently designed, would affect a portion of consecrated land, legally protected in perpetuity for burials. Some suggested modifications to the evidence base report have been put forward. All emails from these individuals concerning this matter have been forwarded to the Examiner for completeness.</p>