

Royal Borough of
Windsor and Maidenhead

Maidenhead Waterways Framework

Consultation Report

June 2009

Planning and Development Unit
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
Town Hall
St Ives Road
Maidenhead
SL6 1RF

CONTENTS

- 1.0 INTRODUCTION
- 2.0 STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION
- 3.0 STATEMENT OF CONFORMITY WITH THE STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

APPENDIX A: LIST OF CONSULTEES FOR SA SCOPING REPORT

APPENDIX B LIST OF CONSULTEES FOR DRAFT SPD AND SA

APPENDIX C DRAFT SPD: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND OUTCOME

APPENDIX D DRAFT SA REPORT: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND OUTCOME

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This consultation report relates to the council's preparation and consultation for the Maidenhead Waterways Framework and associated Sustainability Appraisal. It should be read in conjunction with the consultation draft document.

2.0 STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

- 2.1 A Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for Maidenhead Town Centre was prepared for consultation with appropriate stakeholders over a 5-week period from 25th July to 29th August 2007. The report was sent to statutory consultees and local groups, including those with a particular interest in sustainability and sustainable design. A list of groups is set out in Appendix A.
- 2.2 In addition to the above steps, the report was also:
- ❖ Available to view in the council's receptions and libraries;
 - ❖ Available upon request from the Planning and Development Unit; and
 - ❖ Available to download from the council's website.
- 2.3 Comments were received from 5 respondents, including 2 statutory bodies. General issues were raised in relation to the list of relevant plans, the baseline data and the SA Framework.
- 2.4 All comments were duly considered with amendments reflected within the Revised SA Scoping Report (June 2008).

Draft SPD and Draft SA Report

- 2.5 The Maidenhead Waterways Framework and accompanying Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report were published for a 4-week period of consultation from 9th April to 7th May 2009.
- 2.6 Notifications of the publication of the consultation documents were sent to in excess of 400 statutory and local groups. A full list of those groups specifically invited to comment is set out in Appendix B.
- 2.7 In addition to direct notification, copies of the consultation documents were
- ❖ Available to view in the council's receptions;
 - ❖ Available at Cox Green, Cookham and Maidenhead libraries;
 - ❖ Available to download from the council's website.
- 2.8 Public notices were placed in local newspapers to correspond to the start of the consultation and a press release issued.
- 2.9 Comments on the Draft SPD were received from 35 respondents. A summary of comments and the outcome is provided in Appendix C to this report.
- 2.10 Comments on the Draft SA Report were received from 7 respondents. A summary of comments and the outcome is provided in Appendix D to this report.

3.0 STATEMENT OF CONFORMITY WITH THE STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- 3.1 The preparation of the Maidenhead Waterways Framework conforms to the council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), adopted in June 2006. The SCI can be downloaded from the council's website. While the Maidenhead Waterways Framework is a non-statutory plan and not SPD, the document has been prepared to mimic the SPD process to ensure its overall robustness. The table below summaries the SCI requirements for the preparation of SPD and the actions undertaken.

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Action Taken	Non-Statutory Requirement	Action Taken
Evidence gathering	None	Consultation relating to the SA Scoping was undertaken with a revised SA Scoping subsequently issued.	None	None
Draft SPD	Make documents available in principal council offices	Yes	Make documents available in libraries	Yes
	Display documents available on the internet	Yes	Issue a press release	Yes
	Send documents to specific and general consultation bodies	Yes	Place site notices	Yes
	Place a press notice	Yes	Send neighbour notification letters	Not applicable to a topic based document
			Public display / leaflet	Not applicable to a topic based document
Adoption	Publicise adoption	Yes	Issue a press release	A story on the Maidenhead Waterways Project is to be included within the council publication Around the Royal Borough.
	Send letters confirming adoption to bodies that have asked to be notified	Yes		

APPENDIX A: LIST OF CONSULTEES FOR SA SCOPING REPORT

A2 Housing Association
Berks, Bucks and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust
East Berkshire Ramblers Association
English Heritage
Environment Agency
Government Office for the SE (GOSE)
Lookahead Housing Association
Maidenhead Civic Society
Maidenhead and District Chamber of Commerce
Maidenhead and District Housing Association
Maidenhead Town Partnership
Maidenhead Waterways Restoration Group
Natural England
River Thames Society
South Bucks Council
Sovereign Housing Association
Toynbee Housing Association
Warden Housing Association

APPENDIX B LIST OF CONSULTEES FOR DRAFT SPD AND DRAFT SA REPORT

a) Notification provided with hardcopies of the consultation documents

Access Forum
Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)
Berkshire Archaeology
Borough Church of St Andrew & St Mary Magdalene (The)
Bray Parish Council
Braywick Nature Centre
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)
Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE)
Cookham Parish Council
Cookham Society
Cox Green Parish Council
Desborough Bowling Club
Dorney Parish Council
East Berkshire Ramblers Association
Environment Agency
Friends of the Earth
Government Office For The South East (GOSE)
Guards Club Road Association
Hedsor Parish Meeting
High Street Methodist Church
Highways Agency
Home Builders Federation (The)
Jacobs
London Green Belt Council
Maidenhead & District Chamber of Commerce
Maidenhead Advertiser
Maidenhead and District Friends of the Earth
Maidenhead Archaeological & Historical Society
Maidenhead Centre for the Handicapped
Maidenhead Civic Society
Maidenhead Cyclists Action Group
Maidenhead Heritage Centre
Maidenhead QUAKERS
Maidenhead Riverside Organisation
Maidenhead Town Partnership
Maidenhead United Football Club
Maidenhead United Reformed Church
Maidenhead Volunteer Bureau
Maidenhead Waterways Restoration Group
May, The Right Hon Mrs Teresa
National Cyclists' Organisation (The)
Network Rail
Pannu, Mr Karnail
RBWM - Access Group
Religious Society
River Thames Society (The)
Royal Berkshire Fire & Rescue Services
South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA)
South East England Regional Development Agency
SEEDA
South East Water
St. John's Ambulance
Sustrans
Taplow Parish Council
Thames Properties Ltd.
Thames Reach Residents Association
Thames Valley Police
Thames Velo
Thames Water
The Bray Society
The National Trust
Transition Town Maidenhead
United Reformed Church

b) Notification provided via letter and/or email

A2 Housing Group
Age Concern
Alliance Environment & Planning Ltd
Alsop Verrill
Amberleigh Homes Ltd
Arena Leisure Plc
Arriva
Arts Council England, South East
Arup Economics & Planning
Ashill Developments
Atis Real Wetherals
Atkinson and Keene
AXA Sun Life Plc.
Banner Homes Group
Barton Willmore Planning Partnership
Barwood Land & Estates Ltd.
Beacon Housing Association
Beaulieu Homes
Bellway Homes (South East)
Berkshire East Primary Care Trust
Berkshire Shared Services
Bewley Homes Plc
BG Group
Biffa Waste Services Ltd (2)
Blue Sky Planning Ltd
Brian Smith Consultancy Ltd
British Geological Survey
British Horse Society
British Trust for Conservation Volunteers (BTCV)
Broadway Malyan Planning
Bryant Homes
Bucks County Council
Cala Homes (South) Ltd
Cannon Court Farm Ltd
Carter Planning Ltd
Cass Associates
Castlemore Securities Ltd.
Cemex UK Limited
Central Networks
CgMs Ltd.
Charles Church Developments plc
Chiltern Hundreds Housing Association
Clarendon Properties
Cleanaway Ltd.
Cluttons LLP
Consultant Planning Group
Copas Farms
Copas Partnership (The)

Country Land and Business Association
Crest Nicholson
Croft & Co
CSK Architects
Culture South East
Cunnane Town Planning
Cushman and Wakefield
David Wilson Homes Ltd
Defence Estates
Defence Estates
Derreb Limited
Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd
Development Planning Partnership (The)
Dialogue Communicating Planning
Diamond Trading Company Ltd.
Diocese of Oxford (Finance)
Dis-Course
DPP
DTZ Piedad Consulting
East African Association
East Berks Community NHS Hospital Trust
Edgington Spink and Hyne
English Heritage
English Partnerships
Equal Opportunities Commission
Fairview New Homes
Fairview New Homes plc
Farmglade Ltd
Federation of Small Businesses Thames Valley
First Great Western Link Ltd.
Forestry Commission
Frankham Consultancy Group
Fusion Online Limited
G L Hearn Planning
George Wimpey West London Ltd.
Gleeson Land
Good Estates
Gregory Gray Associates
GVA Grimley
Hallam Land Management Limited
Hanover Housing Association
Haulfryn Group Ltd.
Heatherwood and Wexham Park Hospitals NHS
Trust
Heronsbrook Homes Ltd
Housing Corporation (The)
Housing Solutions Group / Maidenhead and District
Housing Association
Hutley Investments
Indigo Planning Ltd.
Inland Waterways Association (The)
Irish Life Assurance Plc
Januarys Consultant Surveyors
Joint Strategic Planning Unit (JSPU)
Jones Lang LaSalle
Kennet Properties/Thames Water Property Services
Ltd.
Kilmartin Investments
Kings Oak Thames Valley
Knight Frank
Laing Homes
Lambert Smith Hampton
Levvel Consulting Ltd.
Lichfield Planning
Linden Homes
Linden Homes (Chiltern) Ltd
Linden Homes Development Ltd
Lookahead Housing Association
Lovejoy Family Maidenhead & Windsor
Lovell Johns
Maidenhead and District Housing Association
Maidenhead Industrial Estates Ltd
Malcolm Judd & Partners
Martin Grant Homes Ltd
McCarthy & Stone (Dev) Ltd
MDL Developments Ltd
MENCAP
Michael Shanly Group (The)
Millgate Homes
Montagu Evans
National Farmers Union
National Grid
National Grid Properties Ltd.
National Trails Office
Nationwide Planning
NHS South Central Strategic Health Authority
Nicholas King Homes
NuPetra Ltd
Octagon Developments Ltd
Paradigm Housing Association
Parkside Housing Group
Paul Dickinson and Associates
Peacode & Smith
Pendragon Plc
Planning Development Partnership
Planning Perspectives
Prince Gate Estates Plc
Pro Vision Planning & Design
Prudential Property Investment Managers Ltd
Queensgate Homes
Radian Group
Rapleys
Redrow Homes
Rowan Asset Management
Royal Berkshire Ambulance NHS Trust
Royal Mail Group
Royal Society for Protection for Birds (RSPB)
RPS Planning, Transport & Environment Ltd.
Rugby Estates
Rugby Estates
Sainsbury Supermarkets Plc
SAS International
Savills Planning and Regeneration
Scott Brownrigg
Scottish and Southern Electric PLC
Silverstone Group
Smiths Gore
South Bucks District Council
South Central Ambulance Service (Berks Division)
Southern Gas Networks
Southern Tourist Board
Spencer's Farm
Sport England
Stewart Ross Associates
Subway
Summerleaze Ltd
Sunley Estates
Synergy Planning and Property Consultants Ltd
Terrace Hill Developments Ltd
Tesco Stores Ltd.

Tetlow King Planning
Thames Valley Chamber of Commerce
Thames Valley Housing
The Aeos Project
Threadneedle Property Investments
Three Valleys Water
Tourism South East
Toynbee Housing Association Ltd
TPA Design Company (The)
Tribal MJP
Trimount Properties Ltd
Trinity Residential Ltd

Vital Energy
Waitrose Ltd.
Warden Housing Association
White Young Green Planning
Wimpey Homes Holdings Ltd
Windsor & Maidenhead Voluntary Action
Windsor and District Housing Association
Windsor and Maidenhead Voluntary Action Group
Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
Woolf Bond Planning
Workspace Group Plc.

APPENDIX C DRAFT SPD SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND OUTCOME

Please note that all document references relate to the Maidenhead Waterways Framework: Consultation Draft Document April 2009 and may not be correct following the outcome of the consultation.

Amalgamated Berkshire Holdings Limited (Mr David Denham, Denham and Co)

Paragraph 4.42	Object	The 8m buffer strips should be used for maintenance work and should not be considered available for footpaths, cycle ways and landscaping without prior agreement with riparian owners. Reference to walking and cycling through the 8m buffer strips should be removed.	The delivery of policy objectives such as the creation of public rights of way may be considered In the assessment, negotiation and determination of planning applications. The paragraph outlines the Environment Agency practice to seek a buffer alongside the waterway to allow for maintenance. The cross-reference to continuous walking and cycling draws attention to the opportunity this buffer provides to achieve this objective. No changes are required.
Paragraph 4.42	Object	The 8m buffer strips should not apply to change of use, as this is impractical.	The Environment Agency practice is to seek a buffer alongside the waterway to allow for maintenance. Where a buffer does not exist, one could only be created by the redevelopment of the site allowing for the setting back of buildings. Since change of use applications involve no changes to the built form (operational development) it would be impossible to create a buffer. No changes are required.
Paragraph 4.43	Object	The council cannot prevent permitted development rights within the 8m buffer strips. The paragraph should be amended.	The paragraph refers to situations where planning permission is required and does not refer to permitted development rights where consent to provided directly through national legislation. No changes are required.
Paragraph 4.44	Object	Riparian owners should not be penalised for rubbish dumping by others. Reference to riparian duties to remove debris should be deleted.	The paragraph provides factual information regarding the duties of riparian landowners and where further information may be gained. The duties are outside the scope of the document. No changes are required.
Paragraph 5.4	Object	No financial contributions should be sought to pay for the scheme, as the existing regime is burdensome. The scheme should be self-financing.	The planning system allows for the securing of appropriate contributions towards infrastructure, services and facilities made necessary by that development. The restoration of the waterway is a key rejuvenation project for Maidenhead and would

			contributes to a number of planning objectives such as access to recreational opportunities.
--	--	--	--

Ashford, Mr John

Document	Support	Broadly comfortable with the general content, intentions and design approach of the document.	Support noted.
	Observation	Concern is expressed towards maintaining reasonable cycleways and footpath access to the disabled across areas managed by Summerleaze based on experience.	Comments noted.
	Support	Paragraphs 4.21 – 4.23 on continuous walking and cycling are welcome and well expressed.	Support noted.
	Support	Paragraph 3.15 on design guidance is appropriate and welcomed.	Support noted.
	Object	Paragraph 4.34. The standard for bridges of 1.4m of water and 2m overhead clearances appears not to allow sufficient room for a footway or cycleway to run beside the channel clear of the water surface.	Comments regarding bridge heights are noted. Standard advice on subways for pedestrians and cyclists is that a clearance of 2.4m should be achieved. It is agreed that this should be the aim where new structures are proposed. Notwithstanding this some existing structure do not meet this requirement. The paragraph has been amended to refer to 2.4m clearance
	Observation	Any contribution to better crossing of the A4 would be welcome.	Comments noted.

Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (Rachel Martin)

	Support with conditions	Paragraphs 4.12 - 4.17. Welcome the protection and enhancement of biodiversity as a specific development and design principle. However, the	Support noted. Agree in part that further reference to locally important habitats and species would be beneficial. Reference to the protection of local
--	-------------------------	---	---

		<p>paragraphs should contain more detail on the locally important wildlife features that could be adversely affected. Recommend the following wording be included in paragraph 4.16:</p> <p>“...Additionally, the council will seek to protect and enhance habitats and species which are of local importance to nature conservation within the Maidenhead Waterway Project area and the surrounding area including the Greenway Corridor, Widbrook Common and Summerleaze Gravel Pits Local Wildlife Sites (formerly known as Wildlife Heritage Sites); UK and Berkshire Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitats and species; and the Braywick Park Local Nature Reserve.</p>	<p>important habitats and species is already made in paragraph 4.16. Reference to important species has been inserted into paragraph 4.14 and reference to creating or extending habitats supporting important species inserted into paragraph 4.16.</p>
	Support with conditions	<p>Paragraph 4.17. Welcome the wording that all developments should consider opportunities to include beneficial features for wildlife as endorsed by PPS9. The paragraph should go further to state that enhancement works are particularly relevant in the Bray to Eton Pits and Meadows Conservation Target Area which includes the southern part of the Maidenhead Waterway Project Area. Recommends the following wording be included in paragraph 4.17:</p> <p>“...There will be a presumption in favour of nature conservation enhancement works where development sites fall within the Bray to Eton Pits and Meadows Conservation Target Area. The council will seek to secure contributions to targets within the UK and Berkshire Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) in this area. Conservation Target Areas are evidence-based, mapped areas which contain much of Berkshire’s important wildlife as well as surrounding areas with the greatest potential for successful restoration and biodiversity enhancement.”</p>	<p>Mechanisms for financial contributions fall outside the scope of this document and are addressed in the adopted Planning Obligations and Developer Contributions SPD. This SPD is updated annually. Comments regarding the use of funds for improvements within Conservation Target Areas has been passed to the Planning Implementation Team.</p>
	Object	<p>Figure 2. Local Wildlife Sites, Local Nature Reserves and Conservation Target Areas should be included within Figure 2 on in a separate figure dealing with biodiversity constraints.</p>	<p>Agree. Information on local designations and species has been inserted into Chapter 3: Policy Context.</p>

	Object	Assumptions and Feasibility. Comments that BBOWT have not seen the ecological surveys referred to and consider that this information should be included within the framework document. A minimum should be the inclusion of BAP priority habitat maps and evidence of protected or BAP priority species within the project area.	Comments noted. The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The list of studies undertaken to date by the MWRG is provided for information only. These studies would need to be expanded and supplementary. It is considered unnecessary and potentially misleading to present more detailed information. Notwithstanding the above, information on local designations and species has been inserted into Chapter 3: Policy context.
	Support	Paragraph 4.42. Welcome the inclusion of a green buffer strips to promote ecological value of the watercourse as part of adjacent developments.	Support noted.

Berkshire Archaeology (Ms Fiona MacDonald)

Document	Support	Fully support the objectives of the framework, and in particular the development and design principles.	Support noted.
	Support	The consideration of archaeological remains that may be affected by construction or ground works is an important factor and we are pleased to see that planning applications will require a statement on archaeology when appropriate.	Support noted.
	Support	Preservation of archaeological remains or historically significant features in situ is the preferred option and therefore support the principle "respond to historical features and their setting."	Support noted.

Butler, Mr Robin

Document	Support	Fully support the Maidenhead Waterways Framework. Opening up the waterways through the town is probably the best change of revitalising the	Support noted.
----------	---------	---	----------------

		town centre.	
--	--	--------------	--

CBRE SPUK II (No.7) Ltd (Mr Tom Pike, CB Richard Ellis)

Document	Support	Support the Waterways Project in principle.	Support noted.
Executive summary	Support	Welcome clarification that the purpose of the document is to seek to avoid obstacles to the delivery of the waterway project, and not allocate land for development.	Support noted.
Executive summary	Object	Note that the guidance extends to all forms of development but considers this blanket approach is inappropriate and that the approach should have regard to the scale and type of development being proposed, taking into account site-specific considerations.	Paragraph 1.3 states that the required response will vary depending on the location, type and scale of development. This text has been inserted into the executive summary to ensure consistency.
Executive summary	Object	It is stated that developments within the town centre will be assessed to see whether a financial contribution towards the project would be appropriate. Clarification should be provided as to the mechanisms intended to assess developments. Comments that these must relate to the proposed development, are fair and reasonable inline with Circular 05/05.	The adopted Planning Obligations and Developer Contributions SPD sets out the mechanisms regarding financial contributions. Reference to the SPD is made in paragraph 5.5. The SPD is updated annually to ensure consistency and clarity of advice. Circular 05/05 Planning Obligations includes the test that planning obligations are amongst other matters fairly and reasonably related scale and kind to the proposed development.
Paragraph 1.1	Support	Welcomes clarification that the document does not promote development but provides a framework for development proposals which are acceptable under wider planning policy. It is important to note that the document is not part of the statutory development plan.	Support noted.
Paragraph 1.2	Support	Welcomes recognition that although the guidance extends to all forms of development it will be applied	Support noted.

		in line with the principles of reasonableness and proportionality.	
Paragraph 2.4	Observation	Notes that the detailed route of the waterway is still being finalised. Given design advice for buildings adjacent to the watercourse, it is considered that the route needs to be conformed as soon as possible to provide certainty.	Comments noted. While detailed route information would be beneficial, the document correctly recognises that the emerging nature of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. Notwithstanding this, it should be noted that the focus of local planning policy is towards urban areas with only limited forms of development permitted outside settlements. Within urban areas the existing built form restricts the waterway to its current course. No difficulties are anticipated in applying the design advice.
Paragraph 2.12	Observation	Some dredging and widening of the channel will be required. Comments that the site design for the redevelopment of the former cinema site was informed by technical information from the MWRG on the widening of the York Stream.	Comments noted.
Assumptions and Feasibility	Observation	The document does not consider the feasibility or impacts arising from the details technical design and states these will be considered through the planning application process. Comments that determining the feasibility is critical if financial contributions are to be requested. It would also be useful to understand the MWRG's timescales.	Comments noted. The emerging nature of the Maidenhead Waterway Project limits the ability to provide a detailed timeline within the document.
Design Guidance	Objection	In addition to the publications listed, regard should be had to the context of the site and its function.	The paragraph refers to government backed guides, manuals and handbooks which promote good design. It stands to reason that the implementation of design principles would have regard to the site context. No changes are required.
Paragraph 4.4	Support with conditions	The sentence should be amended to "... complement the waterway setting <u>where possible</u> ."	Support noted. Disagree with suggested amendment. The paragraph refers to development embracing the waterside setting. It stands to reason that the implementation of the design principle would have regard to site context. No changes are required.

Paragraph 4.5	Object	Notes the intention within built up areas to keep one side of the riverbank natural. Would welcome clarification of how this would be assessed. Suggests it would be difficult to enforce and that it be deleted.	Landscaping is an integral part of any Design and Access Statement, and in the case of major developments may be supported by a dedicated statement. The implementation of landscaping would in general be agreed and controlled through the use of planning conditions. No changes are required.
Paragraph 4.9	Object	Notes the intention to avoid buildings dominating the waterway. Issues such as height and massing are detailed design matters and that each proposed building should be assessed on its own merits having regard to site-specific matters and viability.	In stating that where taller buildings are acceptable, the impact of upper floors may need to be set back, the paragraph provides general advice while also allowing an opportunity for individual schemes to be assessed on their merits. No changes are required.
Paragraph 4.14	Object	The intention to incorporate existing biodiversity is too prescriptive. Suggests the following amendment "... early stage in the design process <u>where appropriate; or where this is not feasible measures to enhance biodiversity elsewhere on the site should be investigated.</u> "	Disagree / Agree in part. Paragraph 4.14 requires the identification of on-site habitats and the taking of opportunities to integrate habitats into the design of a development. This reflects best practice and is not considered too prescriptive. Notwithstanding this, the term suitable has been inserted to reflect that it will not be appropriate to incorporate all types of habitat.
Paragraph 4.20	Support with conditions	Welcomes the statement that the restoration and reinstatement of historic features should only be pursued where feasible but considers that reference should be made to viability.	Support noted. Consideration of feasibility may include reference to cost and viability. No changes are required.
Paragraph 4.22	Support with conditions	The paragraph would benefit from amendment. Suggests: "... paths should be a minimum of 3.5m wide <u>unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority</u> excluding any safety borders to the waterway or walls or fences. In locations with an existing access, financial contributions will be sought to upgrade and improve the route, <u>the scale and type of which will be commensurate to the development proposed. Financial contributions will go towards infrastructure including</u> this includes the provision of safe road crossings, new foot bridges and flood proofing measures."	Support noted. It is accepted that a 3.5m path may not be possible in all locations. The paragraph has been amended to refer to feasibility. Disagree. Circular 05/05 Planning Obligations includes the test that planning obligations are amongst other matters fairly and reasonably related scale and kind to the proposed development. No changes are required.

Paragraph 4.23	Observation	Clarification should be provided as to whether cycle stores would be proposed as part of the planning application for the waterways scheme. It is essential that provision is made along the length of the waterway.	Agree. The council's Parking Strategy and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPPD require appropriate provision for cyclist in all developments. This provision will include that for occupiers and visitors. The paragraph has been amended to reflect that developments will be expected to make appropriate cycle provision for both occupiers and visitors.
Paragraph 4.25	Observation	It is noted that the Waterway Project proposes a basin and day moorings within the central area. Reserves comments on this to the submission of any planning application.	Comments noted.
Paragraph 4.27	Object	Considers that developments adjacent to the waterway should respect their waterside setting but it may be unreasonable in all instances for a buildings key frontage and entrance to be fronting the waterside.	Disagree in part. The fronting of development on to the waterway and key access routes will help to create an animated and secure environment. It is accepted that in some instances, site-specific considerations may require a degree of variation; however, it is considered that the principle is sound and that no changes are necessary.
Paragraph 4.34	Observation	Comments that a 5-year agreement has been entered into to allow the transfer of land adjacent to the old cinema site identified by MWRG to the council at nil cost to enable the implementation of the Waterway Project.	Comments noted.
Paragraph 4.40	Object	It is stated that developments within the town centre will be assessed to see whether a financial contribution towards the project would be appropriate. Clarification should be provided as to the mechanisms intended to assess developments. Comments that these must relate to the proposed development, are fair and reasonable inline with Circular 05/05.	The adopted Planning Obligations and Developer Contributions SPD sets out the mechanisms regarding financial contributions. Reference to the SPD is made in paragraph 5.5. The SPD is updated annually to ensure consistency and clarity of advice. Circular 05/05 Planning Obligations includes the test that planning obligations are amongst other matters fairly and reasonably related scale and kind to the proposed development.
Paragraph 4.42	Support with	The paragraph would benefit from amendment.	Disagree. The paragraph states the council will

	conditions	Suggests: "... reduction in this buffer strip, <u>unless the EA is in agreement with a reductions to the 8m buffer, having regard to local circumstances.</u> "	generally oppose the reduction in the buffer strip. Any reduction in the buffer strip can be considered on a case-by-case basis, having regard to any advice from the Environment Agency.
Paragraph 4.43	Support with conditions	Flexibility needs to be added. Suggests: "... planning permission will <u>may</u> not be granted for hard development..."	Disagree. The paragraph refers to variation where agreement has been reached with the Environment Agency and the council. No changes are required.
Paragraph 5.3	Support	Welcomes recognition that the response required to the development and design principles will be vary depending on the location, type and scale of development.	Support noted.
Paragraph 5.4	Object	It is stated that developments within the town centre will be assessed to see whether a financial contribution towards the project would be appropriate. Clarification should be provided as to the mechanisms intended to assess developments and the scale of payments that may be sought from developments that do not benefit the waterfront setting.	The adopted Planning Obligations and Developer Contributions SPD sets out the mechanisms regarding financial contributions. Reference to the SPD is made in paragraph 5.5. The SPD is updated annually to ensure consistency and clarity of advice. Circular 05/05 Planning Obligations includes the test that planning obligations are amongst other matters fairly and reasonably related scale and kind to the proposed development.
Paragraph 5.8	Support with conditions	Flexibility needs to be added. Suggests: "Information as set out in the National Validation Requirements will need to be submitted with any planning application. <u>This may</u> include floor plans, site specific sections, street scene elevations, photomontages and existing and proposed ground levels, <u>depending upon what is applied for.</u> "	Agree in Part. It is accepted that not all of the referenced materials will be needed to enable the validation of all types and scale of developments. The paragraph has been amended to reflect the suggested text and direct applicants to the council's pre-application advice service for further information.

Cookham Parish Council (Ms Janet Wheeler)

Document	Object	Support in principle the idea of restoring the waterway, however, the natural, unspoilt character of Widbrook Common remains a major concern.	Comments noted. The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help
----------	--------	---	---

		<p>Continuous navigation would require widening of the channel. The views from Widbrook would make this a popular place to moor and would object to this urbanising effect and impact on amenity and biodiversity.</p>	<p>facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage. Similarly, the document does not conclude on issue of navigation by narrow boats, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments.</p>
Document	Observation	<p>Suggest that design and access statements are made compulsory for major planning applications.</p>	<p>National legislation requires many planning applications to be accompanied by a design and access statement. Major planning applications proposing external alterations are required to submit a statement. For further information please refer to the council's customer guide.</p>
Document	Object	<p>Whilst desirable that the waterway project should not increase flood risk. Given the impacts of climate change no increase oversimplifies what can be achieved. The waterway offers an opportunity to reduce flood risk through improved drainage which should be realised in the detailed design.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism for assessing the impact of developments which come forward along the waterway corridor on the aim of restoring the waterway and the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects of the Maidenhead Waterway Project, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The statement under paragraph 2.16 is a factual statement that the MWRG design objective is for no increased flood risk. The council recognises that national policy on flood risk is to deliver development without increasing flood risk and where possible reduce risk overall.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, a new development and design principle for developments to respond to the risk of flooding has been inserted to ensure</p>

			developments address the causes and consequences of flooding.
--	--	--	---

Cookham Society (Mrs Georgina Kilner)

Document	Support	Tourism and local business benefit from the quality environment along the River Thames. An increase in the attractiveness of the surrounding areas and the improvement of local waterways would be welcomed.	Support noted.
Document	Object	Concerned that any change in the flow of river water could result in an adverse impact on the level of flooding experience within Cookham. The Waterway Project may present an opportunity to reduce flood risk in Cookham, providing this is taken into account in the detailed design. Suggests the approach is strengthened from “no risk to increase flooding” to “additionally providing the areas north of the town centre with additional water dispersal, thereby reducing the flood risk.”	<p>Comments noted. The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism for assessing the impact of developments which come forward along the waterway corridor on the aim of restoring the waterway and the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects of the Maidenhead Waterway Project, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The statement under paragraph 2.16 is a factual statement that the MWRG design objective is for no increased flood risk. The council recognises that national policy on flood risk is to deliver development without increasing flood risk and where possible reduce risk overall.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, a new development and design principle for developments to respond to the risk of flooding has been inserted to ensure developments address the causes and consequences of flooding.</p>
Document	Object	Concerned that the council has not undertaken a flood impact analysis to inform the framework. Note that the MWRG propose dredging the waterway	Comments noted. The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. Notwithstanding this, paragraph

		across Cookham Moor in order to improve water supply.	2.10 notes that the detailed design of the project is being undertaken with the advice of the Environment Agency and paragraph 2.16 notes that a Flood Risk Assessment has been commissioned using Environment Agency modelling. Consideration of flood risk would be a central matter for any future planning application.
Document	Object	Object to any ribbon development along the waterway within the Green Belt and flood plain. Suggest the text includes “any ribbon development along the waterways should only take place in Maidenhead.”	Paragraph 1.1 states that the document provides framework for the assessment of developments which are acceptable in principle by wider planning policy. Inappropriate development in the Green Belt would be contrary to planning policy and not supported by the document. Notwithstanding this, amendments have been made to reinforce this matter.
Document	Object	The framework does not clearly differentiate between the implementation of the waterway project and development alongside the waterway. It should be clearer what the framework embraces or not, e.g. the technical design, the planned route and the clear separation of the council and the MWRG.	Paragraph 1.1 states that the document provides framework for the assessment of developments which are acceptable in principle by wider planning policy. Inappropriate development in the Green Belt would be contrary to planning policy and not supported by the document. Notwithstanding this, amendments have been made to reinforce this matter. Paragraph 2.14 states that the document does not consider the feasibility or the impacts arising from the detailed technical design. The paragraph has been amended to clarify that the document does not support any particular technical approach.
Document	Object	The framework does not clearly differentiate between the different environments of the waterway, e.g. development within the town area and development within the Green Belt. It is unclear if the same criteria would be applied across all stretches of the route. Concerned that the framework could be used to override PPG2 which aims to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.	The development and design principles refer to development along the waterway corridor. There is no differentiation between urban and countryside areas. Paragraph 1.1 states that the document provides framework for the assessment of developments which are acceptable in principle by wider planning policy. Inappropriate development in the Green Belt would be contrary to planning policy and not supported by

			the document. Notwithstanding this, amendments have been made to reinforce this matter.
Paragraph 1.1	Object	As a framework for future planning decisions, there could be impacts on infilling of green space between Cookham and Maidenhead.	Disagree. Paragraph 1.1 states that the document provides framework for the assessment of developments which are acceptable in principle by wider planning policy. Inappropriate development in the Green Belt would be contrary to planning policy and not supported by the document. Notwithstanding this, amendments have been made to reinforce this matter.
The Maidenhead Waterway Project	Object	The first phase of the Waterway Project is not clearly defined within the document whereas on the MWRG website it is set out more extensively. Suggest the description of the route is incorrect with Cookham Moor lying to the north of Strand Water. This part of the route is not represented on the maps supplied. Would have concerns if the waterway connected to the Thames via Cookham Moor.	Section 2: The Maidenhead Waterway Project has been drafted with the assistance and agreement of the MWRG and is considered an accurate reflection of the current position. The Maidenhead Waterway Project does not propose a link to the River Thames across Cookham Moor. It is agreed that reference to Cookham Moor could be misleading. The reference has been deleted.
Document	Object	Cookham's bridges are too low to sustain boat navigation. Substantial dredging would be required to make the watercourse navigable. Construction would have a massive impact on traffic and transport.	The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage. Similarly, the document does not conclude on issue of navigation by narrow boats, nor is it reliant on this aspect, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments. The anticipated first stage of the Maidenhead Waterway Project is to raise and stabilise the waterway within the town centre to enable navigation by small boats from the south and around the town

			centre.
Document	Object	There is very little discussion in the framework on timescales and costs of implementation. It would appear that the council is not directly involved in the financing of the scheme but this should be confirmed.	The costs of the Maidenhead Waterway Project are dependent on the final form of the project and the timeframe for its delivery. The document is independent of these matters. Section 5: Implementation refers to the use of financial contributions from developments, secured by a planning obligation, to be used towards the project.
Paragraph 2.16	Observation	Who has commissioned the flood risk assessment and who will undertake it? There is an opportunity to reduce flood risk.	Black and Veatch have been commissioned to prepare a flood risk assessment for the first stage of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The MWRG have confirmed that the assessment is using Environment Agency flood risk modelling. The comment regarding the opportunity to reduce flood risk is noted.
Paragraph 4.24	Object	There is no mention of car parking at access points / gateways to the waterway and the Green Way. Limited car parking facilities would increase the use of the walkway for leisure.	The document does not consider the detailed design of the Maidenhead Waterway Project, however, it is accepted that improving accessibility may include additional limited parking facilities where alternatives do not exist. Paragraph 4.26 has been amended to refer to car parking.
Paragraph 4.32	Object	There is no recognition of antisocial behaviour. Is there council confident that Secure by Design principles will be sufficient to meet the risk? Believe a stronger statement is needed.	Community safety is a principle that underpins all design matters. Detail of crime reduction measures, including those promoted in the Secure by Design publications, is provided as appropriate under each of the development and design principles within the main body of the document. The design and access statements accompanying individual developments will cover detailed crime reduction measures.
Paragraph 4.41	Object	Insufficient weight or detail has been given to maintenance issues. Maintenance in perpetuity would require considerable finance. Note in paragraph 4.44 that landowners are responsible for maintaining the beds and banks of a watercourse and	Agree in part. While ongoing maintenance issues fall outside the scope of this document, additional text has been added to state that this would be a condition of implementation.

		vegetation. Does the council anticipate an ongoing financial commitment or will this be the landowners' responsibility?	
Appendix A	Support	Welcome the inclusion of relevant policy guidelines, in particular PPG2 and PPS25. Note the inclusion within PPS25 of where possible <u>reduce</u> risk.	Support noted.

Copas Farms

Document	Support	I Confirm support for this valuable initiative.	Support noted.
The Maidenhead Waterway Project	Observation	Suggests extending navigation up to Cookham Moor.	Comments noted. The document does not address the detailed design of the Maidenhead Waterway Project.
The Maidenhead Waterway Project	Observation	Suggests increasing water supply into the network from Marsh Meadow in Cookham which is one lock higher than the Widbrook Stream and could create better flow.	Comments noted. The document does not address the details design of the Maidenhead Waterway Project.

Darracott, Ms Ann (Maidenhead Civic Society representative on the Green Way Working Group)

Document	Object	Object to the absence of information on the environmental impact of the proposal and excessive expenditure required to make the waterway navigable by narrow boats. An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is required covering flooding and drought. Remove aspiration for narrow boats and confine to punts, canoes and rowing boats. Flooding the ditch should be reconsidered as its needed for flood defence and during low flow it could cause the system to be a muddy puddle.	The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage. Similarly, the document does not conclude on issue of navigation by narrow boats, nor is it reliant on this aspect, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments. The costs of the Maidenhead Waterway Project are dependent on the
----------	--------	---	---

			final form of the project and the timeframe for its delivery. The document is independent of these matters.
Paragraph 2.1	Object	There is no reliable evidence that commercial navigation existed. The large area of water shown in old maps and paintings was an ornamental lake created by a sluice in the grounds of St Ives Place and unlikely to support commercial traffic. The letter dated from 1795 cannot be reliably interpreted as meaning that a barge and wharf were also in North Town.	It is accepted that there is no conclusive evidence on the commercial navigation of the waterways. Chapter 2: The Maidenhead Waterway Project has been amended accordingly. Text has also been inserted to clarify that the project does not seek to replicate a past situation.
Paragraph 4.19	Object	The claim that Willow Wharf was used by barges as recently as the 1940s was discounted by a previous council minute. The term Willow Wharf seems to have arisen from Willow Wharf Cottage located there in 1925.	It is accepted that there is no conclusive evidence on the commercial navigation of the waterways. Chapter 2: The Maidenhead Waterway Project has been amended accordingly. Text has also been inserted to clarify that the project does not seek to replicate a past situation. Paragraph 4.19 refers to the retention of historic features and does not refer to the use of barges.
Paragraph 4.3	Object	Object to the claim that the waterway channel had “fallen into disuse.” There is no evidence that it was navigable other than by punt.	Agree. The text has been deleted.
Paragraph 4.33	Object	Object to the unrealistic aim to achieve a navigable waterway supporting narrow boats. Waterweed would make propelled boats useless. Suggest changing to canoes and punts.	The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not conclude on the issue of navigation by narrow boats, nor is it reliant on this aspect, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments.
Paragraph 4.37	Object	Object to the lock and weir south of the town centre. This is unnecessary for canoes and punts and would require maintenance. Dispute that owners would use boat rollers. The effect of a lock and weir on	The anticipated first stage of the Maidenhead Waterway Project is to raise and stabilise the waterway within the town centre. This would enable navigation by small boats many of which would be

		downstream flow has not been predicted.	<p>capable of utilising boat rollers. Notwithstanding this, the document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project, nor does it endorse a particular technical approach.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.10 notes that the detailed design of the project is being undertaken with the advice of the Environment Agency and paragraph 2.16 notes that a Flood Risk Assessment has been commissioned using Environment Agency modelling. Consideration of flood risk would be a central matter for any future planning application.</p>
Paragraph 4.38	Observation	It is unclear how a slipway will be located south of Chapel Arches. The drop to the water is more than to the north. Object to the moving of a slipway to the north of Chapel Arches as this will result in the loss of the ramp from Crown Lane steps to the pedestrian exit from the car park. Object to any widening of the York Stream next to the Hines Meadow car park due to the loss of the attractive planting scheme. Canoes and punts can use the stream as it exists.	Comments noted. The paragraph makes reference to the MWRG's emerging technical design. The paragraph does not refer to specific sites for slipways or other infrastructure, which would be the subject for any future planning application.
Paragraph 4.44	Observation	Experience shows that riparian owners do not maintain the banks of the waterway. Powered boats will cause the erosion of the banks and require increased maintenance.	Comments noted. The paragraph provides factual reference to a riparian landowner's responsibility. No changes are required.
Paragraph 5.4	Objection	Object to S106 contributions being passed to the Maidenhead Waterways Restoration Group for some aspects of the project.	The Planning Obligations and Developer Contributions SPD identifies the Maidenhead Waterway Project and wider town centre improvements as schemes where funds could and have been collected in association with appropriate development. These funds can correctly be used to deliver aspects of the rejuvenation of the waterway.

English Heritage (Mr Steve Williams)

Document	Observation	Endorse the view that the project has the potential to play a significant part in the rejuvenation of Maidenhead town centre.	Comments noted.
Development and Design Principles	Support with conditions	Note the principle to encourage developments “to respond to historical features and their setting” which is intended to be positive but this is ambiguous compared with that for biodiversity which is to protect and enhance.	Support noted. The term respond is considered appropriate in the context of the waterway corridor. It is recognised that national planning policy is to preserve designated historical features, however, the section also addresses attractive features which do not benefit from policy protection. To aid clarification paragraph 4.19 has been amended to refer to preservation of designated features. The term protect has been amended to conserve to better reflect national policy.
Document	Support	Welcome the emphasis given to creating stronger links between the River Thames and the town centre, and the need for development to embrace the waterway.	Support noted.
Appendix A	Object	Appendix A lists national planning policy but fails to include reference to PPG15 and PPG16.	Agree. The section has been updated to include details of PPG15 and PPG16.

Environment Agency (Ms Marie Martin)

Document	Support	Generally supportive of the framework document as it should provide a useful for future planning decisions regardless of whether the canal obtains approval or not since it seeks to protect the space around the existing watercourse for nature conservation, amenity and recreation.	Support noted.
Document	Object	Groundwater has not been addressed within the document. If the waterway is lined this could dam groundwater as it flows towards the channel,	Comments noted. The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism for

		potentially causing it to rise. An assessment of vulnerable areas should be carried out.	<p>assessing the impact of developments which come forward along the waterway corridor on the aim of restoring the waterway and the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects of the Maidenhead Waterway Project, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, a new development and design principle for developments to respond to the risk of flooding has been inserted to ensure developments address the causes and consequences of flooding, including impacts on groundwater.</p>
Document	Observation	An extraction licence for the increased take off of water from the River Thames will be required. The licence is required even when the abstraction is not consumptive.	Comments noted. The document does not address the details design of the Maidenhead Waterway Project.
Executive Summary	Support	As the navigation authority support the proposal to allow navigation up to narrow boat standard at the final stage, so allowing it to become part of the inland waterway.	Support noted.
Executive Summary	Support	Support development and design principles 3: Protect and enhance biodiversity, 6: Provide and enhance accessibility to and from the waterside, 8: Allow for continuous navigation by craft, 9: Provide or contribute to the provision of waterway infrastructure and 10: Provide for the maintenance of the waterway and associated infrastructure.	Support noted.
Paragraph 2.3	Support	Support the aim to extend the Green Way south to the River Thames. This will increase recreational use and could be designed to provide connectivity of habitats and movement of species.	Support noted.
Paragraph 2.5	Object	The proposal for the canal to cross Widbrook	The document does not assess the feasibility or the

		<p>Common has the potential to destroy aquatic ecology of the White Brook where there are records of European protected species, BAP habitats, species rich wet grasslands, mature trees and in general supports breeding birds. The framework does not make specific reference to the importance of this section. Paragraphs 4.12-4,17 should be amended to highlight the biodiversity of this area.</p>	<p>acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage. Similarly, the document does not conclude on issue of navigation by narrow boats, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments.</p> <p>Agree in part that further reference to locally important habitats and species would be beneficial. Reference to the protection of local important habitats and species is already made in paragraph 4.16. Reference to important species has been inserted into paragraph 4.14 and reference to creating or extending habitats supporting important species inserted into paragraph 4.16.</p> <p>Information on local designations and species has been inserted into Chapter 3: Policy Context.</p>
Paragraph 2.5	Object	<p>Concerned about the route to the north of Maidenhead. The EA maintains the North Maidenhead Flood Bund which is designed to restrict the flow to the Maidenhead Ditch to a maximum of 7 cumecs and does not require maintenance. The document needs to recognise this potential constraint and the need to demonstrate no detriment to the flood defence or increase in maintenance or operation by the EA. Recommend an additional development and design principle on flood risk.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism for assessing the impact of developments which come forward along the waterway corridor on the aim of restoring the waterway and the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects of the Maidenhead Waterway Project, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, a new development and design principle for developments to respond to the risk of flooding has been inserted to ensure developments address the causes and</p>

			consequences of flooding, including impacts on groundwater.
Paragraph 2.9	Object	Whilst the channels within Maidenhead are 'main river' this sentence is misleading as it implies that all main rivers have an inextinguishable right of public access. Suggest the following amendment: "they are side channels of the Thames with a statutory right of public navigation."	Agree. The paragraph has been updated to reflect the suggested text.
Paragraph 2.10	Object	The statement that the EA are providing advisory support implies involvement in the technical design of the project which is misleading. The EA are providing pre-application advice on requirements as an independent regulator and statutory consultee. The paragraph should be amended to state that the EA's consent will be required for the scheme and that technical advice has been sought.	The term used in the draft document was taken from statements previously agreed with the Environment Agency. Notwithstanding this, the text has been updated to reflect the suggested change.
Paragraph 2.11	Object	It is factually incorrect that the minimum depth currently found within the town centre is 0.4m. Suggest the words "currently found" be replaced by "which would be created at the first stage."	Agree. The paragraph has been amended.
Paragraph 2.11	Object	As the navigation authority support the proposal to allow navigation up to narrow boat standard as soon as practicable. The EA has advised the MWRG against installing a lock and weir below the confluence at Green Lane as this will require the raising of the two road bridges before boats could pass by them. This would also require costly alterations to the historic Brunel railway arches. The EA's suggested alternative would deliver narrow boat navigation with less structural work but would require similar canal-sized locks immediately upstream of Stafferton and Forlease Road bridges with (probably) additional shallow locks immediately upstream of the two A4 road crossings. Do not oppose the MWRG lock proposals but feel the alternative approach should be referred to in the framework and	Support for navigation by narrow boats is noted. The anticipated first stage of the Maidenhead Waterway Project is to raise and stabilise the waterway within the town centre. This would enable navigation by small boats many of which would be capable of utilising boat rollers. It is a long-term aspiration of the project that the waterway be navigable by narrow boats. The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project, nor does it endorse a particular technical approach. Amendments have been made within Section 2: The Maidenhead Waterway Project to clarify this position. Paragraph 2.11 has been amended to refer to alternative technical approaches and includes a

		considered in parallel until a final decision is taken.	footnote explaining the outlined multi lock approach.
Paragraph 2.12	Object	The paragraph does not truly reflect the current maintenance regime, navigable state of the channel or that dredging would be required. Suggest the 3 rd and 4 th sentences are amended to: “Nor will it require any channel widening below Green Lane, since the 1960s flood relief works created a channel 13-15m wide. The channel is shallow but suitable for canoes and other small unpowered boats to reach Green Lane from the Thames mainstream at Bray Marina. The channel is maintained by the Environment Agency for flood relief purposes but their budget for expenditure on flood relief maintenance cannot be spent on the increased standard of dredging and maintenance that would be needed to enable motor boats to reach Green Lane safely. As part of the waterway project, the MWRG is in discussions with the Environment Agency about the commissioning of environmentally acceptable channel dredging to allow for safe passage of motorised craft.”	Agree in part. Amendments have been made to the paragraph to reflect the suggested text.
Paragraph 2.15 – 2.16	Object	Additional studies will be required to assess the ecological impacts of the scheme, e.g. invertebrate studies have yet to be carried out on the ring, only the ring has been surveyed for other species and no work has been done up or downstream. An additional paragraph is required to detail work which is still required as the current section implies that only a little further work is required.	Agree in part. Paragraph 2.15 provides details of studies completed to date and expressly states that these will need to be supplemented and expended as the Maidenhead Waterway Project progresses. Notwithstanding this, a new paragraph has been inserted to refer to additional work being necessary to support any future planning application.
Paragraph 4.1	Object	Whilst supporting the development and design principle relating to the enhancement of biodiversity the EA are unsure how the skimming of the silted-up bed and the dredging and widening of the upper channels highlights in 2.12 will contribute to this principle. The document should reflect that off-site mitigation / enhancement works may be required to ensure the achievement of this principle.	Agree. Paragraph 4.15 has been amended to refer to mitigation and compensatory measures.

Paragraph 4.1	Object	<p>There are several aspects of the project which have the potential to increase flood risk. It is important that there is no increase in flood risk. Object to the lack of a development and design principle on flood risk which should be included commitment to managing flood risk. The inclusion of a related principle would accord with PPS25 and the sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism for assessing the impact of developments which come forward along the waterway corridor on the aim of restoring the waterway and the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects of the Maidenhead Waterway Project, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, a new development and design principle for developments to respond to the risk of flooding has been inserted to ensure developments address the causes and consequences of flooding, including impacts on groundwater.</p>
Paragraph 4.4	Support	<p>Support the principle of development embracing the waterside setting. Fronting development onto the waterway will encourage people to use the area, promotes enhancement and reduces potential for antisocial behaviour. Support the provision of open means of enclosure not only for the improved setting but as they are less likely to impede flood flow. Support the clear margin between buildings and hard standing and the riverbank, as this buffer zone is vital for ecological purposes and ensure access for maintenance. Notes that these objectives could be achieved without impounding the existing watercourse. All works within 8m, passing over or under a main river, dredging, changes to the riverbank or the construction of obstructions require EA consent.</p>	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.5	Support	<p>Support the paragraph from a biodiversity perspective. Notes this could be achieved without impounding the existing watercourse.</p>	Support noted.

Paragraph 4.6	Support	Support the aim of landscaping being the creation of a green corridor which is vital to connect habitats and allow the migration of species. Strongly support the use of native species to ensure that biodiversity is maintained and enhanced. The EA objects to landscaping proposals which propose non-native species within buffer zones.	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.8	Support	Support developments embracing their waterway setting. This approach encourages local people to take ownership of the waterway and to use them. One development embracing the waterway and demonstrating amenity benefits will encourage others to do so. Greater use will reduce opportunity for antisocial behaviour.	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.11	Support	Support the promotion of SUDS as a way of improving water quality and reducing flood risk both during and post construction.	Support noted.
Protect and Enhance Biodiversity	Object	Whilst appreciating that the document sets out parameters for development adjacent to the waterways it also assumes the Waterways Project will gain planning permission. Acknowledge the inclusion of the biodiversity principle and its good objectives. However, the document does not detail how the Waterway Project will achieve this objective. The changes to the watercourse will alter the natural channel processes, features and associated species and habitats. The framework must highlight that appropriate off-site mitigation / enhancement may be required. The section does not recognise the existing value of the watercourse and potential alternatives to river restoration in urban areas such as channel planting found at Sainsburys and bank naturalisation. The Maidenhead Ditch with its reed beds are a BAP habitat and overhanging vegetation such as in The Cut provide habitat for invertebrates, which in turn support growing fish stocks. Additional information is required to highlight that enhancements will be	<p>Comments of support noted.</p> <p>Amendments have been made within Section 2: The Maidenhead Waterway Project to clarify the emerging nature of the project.</p> <p>The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, information on local designations and species has been inserted into Chapter 3: Policy Context with associated changes inserted under the development and design principle to protect and enhance biodiversity. Paragraph 4.15 has been specifically amended to refer to mitigation and compensatory measures.</p>

		required to ensure there is no reduction in biodiversity. Enhancement / mitigation works must replace like for like habitat within the same catchment area. Information on the existing ecological value should be included.	
Paragraph 4.12	Object	The river corridor survey confirmed the presence of fish within the channel but this is not mentioned. The importance of fish should be mentioned as the maintenance of higher water levels and the impoundment of flow can be detrimental to wildlife e.g. a shift in the fish community through the replacement of flow-loving with still-water loving species.	Agree in part. The presence of fish has been inserted into the paragraph. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage, however, it is noted that the lock and weir system includes reference to a fish ladder.
Paragraph 4.14 - 4.16	Object	Turning the watercourse into a canal will impact on the existing biodiversity and could impact on the SSSI and WHS. To say that there should not be any adverse effect in the notified species of the SSSI is not sufficient. Acknowledge the points in relation to what new development should be doing are good and will help meet the biodiversity principle. The section should be amended to highlight the current ecological value of the watercourse and state there will be no impact on the SSSI.	PPS9 states that where an adverse effect on the notified features of a SSSIs is likely, planning permission should nor normally be granted. Permission should only be granted where the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the impacts on the SSSI and the wider SSSI network. Paragraph 4.16 states that development should avoid any adverse effect on the notified features of SSSIs. This is consistent with PPS9, however, to reinforce this interpretation, the text has been amended to refer to this being in line with national policy.
Paragraph 4.17	Support	Support the recommendation to create habitats through features such as green and brown roofs and through enhanced landscaping. Green and brown roofs can help reduce flooding risks and improve water quality.	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.34	Object	Strongly object to provisions for 18.3m (60 feet) for the maximum supportable narrow boat length. It has been agreed with MWRG that the project be designed to accommodate standard full length canal boats which have a length of 21.2m (72 feet) to ensure it fits into the inland waterway network. The reduced length conflicts with the executive summary	The MWRG have advised that it is unlikely that navigation by 72ft narrow boats along the entire waterway will be feasible. Notwithstanding this, in advance of any permitted scheme it would be appropriate for infrastructure such as lock and weir systems and winding holes to be capable of providing for this larger craft size.

		and paragraph 4.33 which refers to narrow boat standards. The reference to a water depth of 1.2m implies a consistent water depth around the ring and does not reflect what will happen in reality. The narrow boat length should be amended to 21.2m and the depth text replaced by “minimum navigation depth of 1.2m.”	The reference to the water depth as been amended in line with the suggested text.
Paragraph 4.37	Support	Support the use of boat rollers within any design to allow passage by small boats without the water loss associated with opening a lock and the use of a fish pass to allow the movement of fish and other invertebrates.	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.41	Object	It should be made clear who would undertake the maintenance of the waterway. The EA, although navigation authority, will not be maintaining these structures. The paragraph should be amended to name the body responsible for ongoing maintenance.	Agree in part. While ongoing maintenance issues fall outside the scope of this document, additional text has been added to state that this would be a condition of implementation.
Paragraph 4.42	Object	The first sentence is factually incorrect. Under the Thames Region bye-laws, the EA seek a minimum 8m buffer zone along those watercourses designated as ‘main river’. For non ‘main river’ watercourses a minimum 5m buffer is sought. While the watercourse at Maidenhead is main river, the sentence is misleading. Suggest amendment to: “as part of any development lies close to a main river (such as those in Maidenhead) it is standard practice...”	Agree. The paragraph has been amended in line with the suggested text.
Paragraph 4.42	Support	Pleased that the document seeks the inclusion of a 8m buffer zone to enable maintenance and to enhance biodiversity. Support the intention to oppose the reduction in this strip. In many places along the watercourse, there is no space for such a buffer strip and in some locations, widening of the channel will reduce the buffer area so contradicting the aim.	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.43	Support	Pleased that the document highlights the need for	Support noted

		consent from the EA for works in, under, over or within 8m of the river. Pleased to see that planning permission will not be granted for hard development within the 8m buffer strip unless agreement has been reached with the EA and the council. Support the intention to create a buffer strip where one doesn't currently exist, however, in places there is no such space and in some locations the widening of the channel will reduce any buffer area so contradicting the aim.	
Implementation	Object	The section should include a paragraph about the ongoing maintenance of the scheme's infrastructure. The EA maintain the channels in this area for flood risk purposes only and do not have a liability to take on any liability for new navigation structures. Discussions with the MWRG have envisaged that the navigation works will be carried out and maintained by a permanent Maidenhead Waterways Trust. The MWRG have been advised that the establishment of such a trust would be a prerequisite of any agreement of the EA for the installation of any lock or other major navigation works. Without assurance that another body will maintain the structure, the EA object to the proposals.	Disagree in part. While ongoing maintenance issues fall outside the scope of this document, additional text has been added to paragraph 4.41 that this would be a condition of implementation.
Paragraph 5.6	Object	The statement that the EA are providing advisory support implies involvement in the technical design of the project which is misleading. The EA are providing pre-application advice on requirements as an independent regulator and statutory consultee. The paragraph should be amended to state that the EA's consent will be required for the scheme and that technical advice has been sought.	The term used in the draft document was taken from statements previously agreed with the Environment Agency. Notwithstanding this, the text has been updated to reflect the suggested change.
Annex A	Object	PPS23 should be included within this section. Where the waterway route runs through the industrial areas, there may be potential for contamination to enter the watercourse. There are also a number of sites affected by contamination adjacent to the	Agree. PPS 23 has been added to the list of documents covered within the national planning context.

		watercourse.	
--	--	--------------	--

Highways Agency (Ms Charlotte Barrett)

Document	Observation	No comments to make on the document.	Comment noted.
----------	-------------	--------------------------------------	----------------

Jones, Mr E T

Document	Support	Will bring an improvement to the town centre and add an amenity to the town.	Support noted.
----------	---------	--	----------------

Lamb, Mr Dennis

Document	Support	The waterway will add character to the town.	Support noted.
Document	Observation	The framework only refers to narrow boats but powered boats are very large and so require a size limit. There is potential to attract many boats during peak season and so requires a limit on mooring to stop overnight stays.	<p>The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Similarly, the document does not conclude on issue of navigation by narrow boats, nor is it reliant on this aspect, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments. The costs of the Maidenhead Waterway Project are dependent on the final form of the project and the timeframe for its delivery. The document is independent of these matters.</p> <p>The MWRG have advised that it is unlikely that</p>

			navigation by 72ft narrow boats along the entire waterway will be feasible. The group is also discussing issues regarding mooring controls with the Environment Agency.
Document	Observation	The waterway will require frequent dredging and clearance. The infrastructure will also require maintenance. Riparian owners cannot be relied upon and it will become a council obligation.	<p>The costs of the Maidenhead Waterway Project are dependent on the final form of the project and the timeframe for its delivery. The document is independent of these matters.</p> <p>While ongoing maintenance issues fall outside the scope of this document, additional text has been added to state that this would be a condition of implementation.</p>

Lewington, Mr M E

Document	Object	Historical aspects are incorrect. There are no waterways to restore. There is no evidence of navigation.	It is accepted that there is no conclusive evidence on the commercial navigation of the waterways. Chapter 2: The Maidenhead Waterway Project has been amended accordingly. Text has also been inserted to clarify that the project does not seek to replicate a past situation.
Document	Object	The River Thames and the Jubilee River are both available for boating. There is no need for any change to the waterway.	Comments noted. The document supports the aim of rejuvenating the waterway and avoiding obstacles to the delivery of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. While this current includes a long-term aspiration to achieve navigation by narrow boats, this is not based on any perceived need. The document does not conclude on issue of navigation by narrow boats, nor is it reliant on this aspect, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments.
Document	Object	The increase in water levels of the Ditch would constitute a flood hazard.	The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and

			avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.
Document	Object	With the exception of Green Lane to Bray, the whole route would need enlarging requiring major engineering works and bridge renewal. The route is in varied ownership and there would be considerable problems through the town centre.	The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.
Document	Object	Public safety would be at risk along the length of the waterway with many places being secluded and dangerous. Shallow water would become deep.	Community safety is a principle that underpins all design matters. Detail of crime reduction measures, including those promoted in the Secure by Design publications, is provided as appropriate under each of the development and design principles within the main body of the document.
Document	Object	What is the economic cost compared to benefit? There are no figures available for public scrutiny. The public could end up footing the bill.	The costs of the Maidenhead Waterway Project are dependent on the final form of the project and the timeframe for its delivery. The document is independent of these matters.
Document	Object	The framework suggests a slow urbanisation of the area. The route passes through open countryside, passes SSSI and a nature reserve. The route is a Wildlife Heritage Site and supports an abundant variety of wildlife. All this would be lost with the activity and intrusion of boating and human activity.	The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.

Lucas, Mr Richard

Document	Support	Support the Maidenhead Waterways Framework. The plan will give a focus to the regeneration of Maidenhead, bring employment and raise the standards of Maidenhead above those of comparable towns.	Support noted.
----------	---------	---	----------------

Maidenhead and District Chamber of Commerce (Mr Peter Sands)

Document	Support	Excellent scheme which we promoted some time ago and wish to see the earliest possible completion. Urge financial support from the council.	Support noted.
----------	---------	---	----------------

Maidenhead Civic Society (Mr Martin McNamee)

Document	Observation	Generally supportive of the proposals but believe a more modest scheme could still provide a focal point, whilst offering small leisure craft activities. Would like to see a visionary planning brief to release the full future planning potential offered by opening up the waterways as an asset.	Comments noted. The document provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The implementation of the document is not reliant on the full realisation of the Maidenhead Waterways Project as currently conceived and would be delivering improvements over time.
Paragraph 2.1	Object	Not fully convinced about the use of the waterway for transport and commercial traffic and in any case this is irrelevant. More concerned about the potential to enhance the town.	It is accepted that there is no conclusive evidence on the commercial navigation of the waterways. Chapter 2: The Maidenhead Waterway Project has been amended accordingly. Text has also been inserted to clarify that the project does not seek to replicate a past situation. The Maidenhead Waterway Project does not promote the commercial use of the waterway, however, it is accepted that a navigable channel could provide

			opportunity.
	Observation	The waterway is an element of flood control and alleviation. Need to be mindful of impact arising from increasing current water capacity and levels. Support proposals to use the project as a means of flood alleviation. It is important that water can be released ahead of any anticipated floodwater surge.	Comments noted. The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.
	Observation	The waterways offer a significant potential to enhance the ambience of the town and become a focal point and leisure amenity. There is a deficiency of open space within the town centre. The Old Cinema site represents an ideal open space adjacent to the waterway.	Comments noted.
Document	Observation	Future development should be orientated towards the waterway and it should be a visual and planning focal point in the town centre. Development alongside the waterway should be restricted to the built up area. Concerned about linear development within the Green Belt.	The design principles to provide and enhance the waterway setting and to provide high quality buildings and spaces both refer to developments embracing their waterside setting and presenting a public, active face towards the waterway and key access routes. Paragraph 1.1 states that the document provides framework for the assessment of developments which are acceptable in principle by wider planning policy. Inappropriate development in the Green Belt would be contrary to planning policy and not supported by the document. Notwithstanding this, amendments have been made to the paragraph to reinforce this matter.
	Object	Sceptical about the proposal to accommodate larger craft such as narrow boats. Increased draught and headroom, lock and weir systems significantly increase the cost of the project. Accommodating small craft is the key to readily generating a visual	The anticipated first stage of the Maidenhead Waterway Project is to raise and stabilise the waterway within the town centre. This would enable navigation by small boats. It is a long-term aspiration that the waterway be navigable by narrow boats. The

		leisure focus.	document does not conclude on the issue of navigation by narrow boats, nor is it reliant on this aspect, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments.
Document	Observation	Believe the project should be realistic. There is a disproportionate cost in enabling larger vessels to access the town centre, particularly from Widbrook. Larger boats also increase maintenance costs. There is uncertainty regarding funding.	Comments noted. The costs of the Maidenhead Waterway Project are dependent on the final form of the project and the timeframe for its delivery. The document is independent of these matters.

Maidenhead Cyclists Action Group (Mr David Layzell)

Paragraph 2.11	Object	Object to mechanically propelled boats which cause noise and pollution. Manually propelled boats, cyclists and pedestrians will cause no noise or pollution. Moorings could be on the bank and a basin unnecessary. Exclude mechanically propelled boats and delete requirement fore a mooring basin.	<p>The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Similarly, the document does not conclude on issue of navigation by narrow boats, nor is it reliant on this aspect, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments.</p>
Paragraph 4.25	Object	Object to mechanically propelled boats which cause noise and pollution. Manually propelled boats, cyclists and pedestrians will cause no noise or pollution. Moorings could be on the bank and a basin unnecessary. Exclude mechanically propelled boats and delete requirement fore a mooring basin.	<p>The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.</p>

			Similarly, the document does not conclude on issue of navigation by narrow boats, nor is it reliant on this aspect, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments.
Paragraph 5.9	Object	Object to mechanically propelled boats which cause noise and pollution. Manually propelled boats, cyclists and pedestrians will cause no noise or pollution. Moorings could be on the bank and a basin unnecessary. Exclude mechanically propelled boats and delete requirement for a mooring basin.	<p>The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Similarly, the document does not conclude on issue of navigation by narrow boats, nor is it reliant on this aspect, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments.</p>

Maidenhead Waterways Restoration Group (Richard Davenport)

Document	Support	Confirms full support for the draft Maidenhead Waterway Framework and the Sustainability Appraisal.	Support noted.
----------	---------	---	----------------

May, The Rt Hon Mrs Theresa

Document	Observation	Comments that canals and rivers are part of the heritage and provide pleasure to leisure seekers, particularly in Maidenhead. Support the work done to restore the waterways and projects such as the works to the York Stream.	Comments noted.
Introduction	Support	Pleased to see that the framework will have a substantial influence on planning decisions for development near the waterway. Support the	Support noted.

		proposal to bring the Thames into the town to create a navigable waterway. Pleased to see joined up approach between the LDF and PRoM led masterplan.	
Document	Support	Broadly welcoming of the document.	Support noted.
Phases and Priorities	Observation	Would like to see a detailed timetable for the dredging and widening of the upper channel needed for Phase 1.	Comments noted. It is agreed that information on timescales would be beneficial, however, detailed information is not yet available. Timescale information could be provided as it becomes available via the council's and the MWRG's websites.
Document	Observation	Would like to see more clarification of how strong links to and from the town centre will be created. Would like to see specific plans for the form of the basin and dry moorings.	The document does not address detailed design issues but seeks to provide a framework for assessing the impacts of developments which come forward along the waterway corridor on the restoration of the waterway and on the delivery of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. Notwithstanding this, the council is in the initial stages of preparing the Maidenhead Town Centre Area Action Plan. Key parts of this project will the relationship between places and the ability to travel between them. The AAP will look at linkages within the town centre to and from the waterway.

Moody, Mr Alan

Document	Object	Object to the proposed lock at Green Lane. A Moor Cut lock should be upstream of the A4 bridge and moorings in the Town Moor. Moor Cut lock should take two boats side by side.	The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.
----------	--------	---	---

			Similarly, the document does not conclude on issue of navigation by narrow boats, nor is it reliant on this aspect, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments.
Document	Observation	The York Stream may need a lock or just a weir and boat rollers. Boats will only use this route if they can turn. Unlikely to achieve the 8'6" clearance specified by British Waterways for new bridges.	<p>The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Comments regarding bridge heights are noted. It is agreed that the retention of historic features such as Chapel Arches will restrict clearance heights. The retention of historic features needs to be balanced against accessibility by larger craft. Standard advice on subways for pedestrians and cyclists is that a clearance of 2.4m should be achieved. It is agreed that this should be the aim where new structures are proposed.</p>
Document	Object	Bridges should be a minimum of 8'6" as specified by British Waterways for new bridges. Unlikely to be achieved at the High Street bridge.	<p>It is agreed that the retention of historic features such as Chapel Arches will restrict clearance heights. The retention of historic features needs to be balanced against accessibility by larger craft.</p> <p>Standard advice on subways for pedestrians and cyclists is that a clearance of 2.4m should be achieved. It is agreed that this should be the aim where new structures are proposed.</p>
Document	Object	Winding holes for large boats should be at the separation and confluence of the two streams with allowance for 70' 6" to 72' 6" long not 60' as proposed by the Maidenhead Waterways Restoration Group.	The MWRG have advised that it is unlikely that navigation by 72ft narrow boats along the entire waterway will be feasible. Notwithstanding this, in advance of any permitted scheme it would be

			appropriate for infrastructure such as lock and weir systems and winding holes to be capable of providing for this larger craft size.
--	--	--	---

Natural England (Marc Turner)

Document	Support	Overall commends the production of the Waterways Framework to ensure the development is undertaken in a sustainable manner.	Support noted.
Paragraphs 3.4, 4.13 and 4.16	Observation	Details provided of Natural England's response to the scoping opinion for the first stage of the Maidenhead Waterway Project.	Comments noted.
Development and Design Principles	Support	Generally supportive of the ten general development and design principles.	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.15	Observation	The paragraph should also refer to biodiversity data from Berkshire Buckinghamshire and Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT).	Comments noted. Reference to BBOWT has been inserted into the paragraph.
	Support	Pleased to see the inclusion of green infrastructure and landscaping. Green roofs offer a number of environmental benefits including improving air quality, reducing flood risk and supporting wildlife.	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.33	Support	Welcome the reference to enhancing opportunities for improving pedestrian and cycle access.	Support noted.

Neal, Mr Phillip

Document	Support	Expresses support for the Waterways Framework which will have tremendous benefits for Maidenhead.	Support noted.
----------	---------	---	----------------

Pettigrew, Mr Andrew

Document	Support	Support the Maidenhead Waterways Framework. Expresses distress over the current state of the town but buoyed and optimistic that bringing the river into the town will regain character and charm. Will encourage residents and visitors to spend time and money in and around the town centre. Also supporting recreational benefits.	Support noted.
----------	---------	--	----------------

Ramblers Association Berkshire Area (Gordon Marrs)

Document	Support	Support the creation of an attractive, landscaped waterway corridor through the town and the creation of a waterside footpath from Maidenhead to Bray.	Support noted.
Paragraph 2.1	Observation	This is no real evidence that commercial navigation existed in the past.	It is accepted that there is no conclusive evidence on the commercial navigation of the waterways. Chapter 2: The Maidenhead Waterway Project has been amended accordingly. Text has also been inserted to clarify that the project does not seek to replicate a past situation.
Paragraph 2.2	Object	It is not necessary or desirable that the waterway should be navigable by powered craft.	The anticipated first stage of the Maidenhead Waterway Project is to raise and stabilise the waterway within the town centre. This would enable navigation by small boats. It is a long-term aspiration that the waterway be navigable by narrow boats. The document does not conclude on the issue of navigation by narrow boats, nor is it reliant on this aspect, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments.
Paragraph 2.3	Observation	Any extension to the Green Way needs to be a definitive right of way to guarantee public benefit. Examples provided where access has been restricted via non-definitive rights of way.	Comments noted.

Paragraph 2.5	Observation	Reference to Cookham Moor needs to be deleted. Widbrook Common National Trust lies on both sides of the A4094.	The Maidenhead Waterway Project does not propose a link to the River Thames across Cookham Moor. It is agreed that reference to Cookham Moor could be misleading. The reference has been deleted.
Paragraph 2.9	Observation	Question the right of navigation citing the Jubilee River.	The right of navigation has been confirmed by the Environment Agency, the navigation authority for rivers.
Paragraph 2.11	Support	Support the proposed first stage supporting the use of small boats.	Support noted.
Paragraph 2.13	Object	Strongly oppose any provision for larger craft. Object to the widening of the west waterway channel as this will require the diversion of the Green Way away from the waterway corridor to Crown Lane. The construction of a ramp up to Crown Lane would require the removal of the landscaped bank beside the Green Way. A ramped access was rejected on engineering grounds when the Green Way was being designed.	<p>The document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Similarly, the document does not conclude on issue of navigation by narrow boats, nor is it reliant on this aspect, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments.</p>
Paragraph 3.9	Support	Support all the strategic objectives.	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.1	Support / Object	Support the development and design principles with the exception of principle 8: allow continuous navigation by craft which should be amended to apply only to non-powered, small craft.	The anticipated first stage of the Maidenhead Waterway Project is to raise and stabilise the waterway within the town centre. This would enable navigation by small boats. It is a long-term aspiration that the waterway be navigable by narrow boats. The document does not conclude on the issue of navigation by narrow boats, nor is it reliant on this aspect, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments.
Paragraph 4.5	Support	Support the principles but note they are not being	Community safety and access to the Maidenhead

		applied by the council in the case of Town Moor.	Ditch has been taken into account in the planting improvements to Town Moor. The planting will be managed to ensure good line of sight for visitors. In addition to new planting, clearance and the raising of canopies have occurred to remove blind corners and improve sightlines.
Paragraph 4.10	Support	Strongly support.	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.21	Support	Support the extension of the Green Way and the upgrading of sections subject to flooding. Comments that the section under the A4 should be a priority.	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.22	Support	Support the minimum 3.5m width for paths with shared cycle and pedestrian use.	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.26	Support	Support the aim. Comments there is no signposting of Sustrans Cycle Route 50 south of Ray Mill Road West.	Support noted. Comments on obstructions passed to the Transport Policy Team.
Paragraph 4.27	Support	Support the implementation of this aim by the removal of the unnecessary obstructions on Sustrans Cycle Route 50 between Cookham and Maidenhead.	Support noted. Comments on obstructions passed to the Transport Policy Team.
Paragraph 4.28	Support	Support the aims for the provision of safe access on surfaced paths for disabled and for people with children. Comments that the existing earth paths between Blackamoor Lane and the waterway at Evenlodge Footbridge is a good example of need. Existing barriers to Evenlodge Bridge need to be removed to allow wheelchair access.	Support noted. Comments on barriers passed to the Transport Policy Team
Paragraph 4.32	Support	Support the aim of promoting a safe environment. Comments that current planting on Town Moor in proximity to footpaths and on the banks is contrary to these aims. The planting of thorny species within 1m of a path of antisocial.	Community safety and access to the Maidenhead Ditch has been taken into account in the planting improvements to Town Moor. The planting will be managed to ensure good line of sight for visitors. In addition to new planting, clearance and the raising of canopies have occurred to remove blind corners and improve sightlines.

Paragraph 4.33	Object	Object to making provision for powered craft.	The anticipated first stage of the Maidenhead Waterway Project is to raise and stabilise the waterway within the town centre. This would enable navigation by small boats. It is a long-term aspiration that the waterway be navigable by narrow boats. The document does not conclude on the issue of navigation by narrow boats, nor is it reliant on this aspect, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments.
Paragraph 4.34	Object	Object to the need to provide for craft up to 18.3m long.	The anticipated first stage of the Maidenhead Waterway Project is to raise and stabilise the waterway within the town centre. This would enable navigation by small boats. It is a long-term aspiration that the waterway be navigable by narrow boats. The document does not conclude on the issue of navigation by narrow boats, nor is it reliant on this aspect, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments.
Paragraph 4.41	Object	The high cost of repairing erosion damage by powered craft is a reason why the waterway should be restricted to non-powered craft. There is currently insufficient money available to keep The waterway clear of rubbish and fallen objects.	The costs of the Maidenhead Waterway Project are dependent on the final form of the project and the timeframe for its delivery. The document is independent of these matters. While ongoing maintenance issues fall outside the scope of this document, additional text has been added to state that this would be a condition of implementation.
Paragraph 4.43	Support	Support the retention of 8m buffer strips. Comments that the council has disregarded this on Town Moor with regard to new planting.	Community safety and access to the Maidenhead Ditch has been taken into account in the planting improvements to Town Moor. The planting will be managed to ensure good line of sight for visitors. In addition to new planting, clearance and the raising of canopies have occurred to remove blind corners and improve sightlines.
Paragraph 4.44	Support	Support the statement including the requirement for	Support noted.

		riparian landowners to clear debris from the waterway.	
--	--	--	--

Silverstone Group (Mr Roger Clarke)

	Object	Paragraph 5.3 – 5.5 and Figure 5. The defined waterway zone is an unnecessary and potentially confusing complication. It includes land with no direct relationship with the waterway. Each development proposal should be judged on its individual merits. Judgements can be made without reference to the suggested zone. Delete all references to a Maidenhead Town Centre Zone, including Figure 5.	Agree. It is agreed that the purpose of the town centre zone could be misinterpreted. Figure 5 has been deleted with text amended to refer to a particular focus for physical improvements where buildings have a direct locational relationship with the waterway or offer the opportunity to improve linkages.
--	--------	--	--

South East England Development Agency (SEEDA) (Samantha Coates)

Document	Observation	No comments to make on the document.	Comments noted.
----------	-------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------

South East England Partnership Board (formerly the South East England Regional Assembly) (Greg Pitt)

Document	Observation	No comments to make on the document.	Comments noted.
----------	-------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------

Spurr, Mr J H

Document	Support	Fully support the Waterways Framework and Sustainability Appraisal. Maidenhead need a scheme of this sort which would deliver diverse benefits to the community. The redevelopment of Chapel Arches would add a welcome new focal point to the town centre.	Support noted.
----------	---------	---	----------------

Thames Reach Residents Association (Mrs Patricia Fairbairn)

Paragraph 4.2 – 4.32	Support	The Waterways Project together with PRoM provides improvement to Maidenhead.	Support noted.
----------------------	---------	--	----------------

Thames Valley Police (Mr Michael Clare, Crime Prevention Design Advisor)

Executive Summary	Object	Executive Summary Design Principle Statements. There is no mention of community safety. Suggests adding, “address community safety so that it is safe to use by legitimate members of the public and this encourage use of the waterway setting.”	Disagree. Community safety is a principle that underpins all design matters. Detail of crime reduction measures, including those promoted in the Secure by Design publications, is provided as appropriate under each of the development and design principles within the main body of the document.
Paragraph 1.3	Support with conditions	Suggests adding, “...and visitors wish to spend time <u>in safety.</u> ”	Agree. The paragraph has been amended in line with the suggested text.
Figure 4	Observation	The employment area should be amended to reflect the near completion of the Bridge Road / Oldfield Road residential redevelopment.	Agree in part. Figure 4 shows the Local Plan policy context. Notwithstanding this it is accepted that some parts of the designated employment area have been redeveloped for housing. While it is not possible to change the context away from the Local Plan Proposals Map, a footnote has been inserted to explain that some redevelopment has since occurred.
Paragraph 3.9	Object	There is no mention of community safety. Suggests adding, “Suggests adding, “address community safety so that it is safe to use by legitimate members of the public and this encourage use of the waterway setting.”	Paragraph 3.9 is taken from A Vision for Maidenhead Town Centre. Amending the vision is outside the scope of this document.
Paragraph 3.15	Support	Pleased to see reference to the range of design documents which incorporate guidance on designing for community safety.	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.1	Object	Design Principle Statements. There is no mention of community safety. Suggests adding the following to	Disagree. Community safety is a principle that underpins all design matters. Notwithstanding this,

		principle 1, "...waterside setting, <u>including planning for community safety.</u> "	the text supporting the development and design principle to provide and enhance the waterside setting has been expended to make greater reference to aspects of community safety.
Paragraph 4.4 – 4.6	Support with conditions	<p>Support references to public / private space relationship and treatments to enhance setting. Would like to add the following:</p> <p>a) Where walls and fences are used, consideration should be given to whether walls are wanted as informal seating, or if in an inappropriate setting they could cause an opportunity for public nuisance or antisocial behaviour. Castellated or dragon tooth features can be used to discourage use as seating.</p> <p>b) The preferred treatment against wooden or chain link fences is welded mesh or railings. These help stop damage to weaker forms, stop graffiti as a result of being more open and are more resistant to damage during floods.</p> <p>c) Care needs to be taken that sculptural designs for walls and fences are not flimsy. Anti graffiti treatment may be necessary.</p> <p>d) Providing an open aspect towards the riverbank will help enhance the setting and prevent a sense of enclosure which can create a fear of crime. Good sightlines with no hiding places will help to improve community safety.</p> <p>e) In places where private amenity abuts the riverbank it will be necessary to help create defensible space in keeping with the open aspect. Suggests the use of bulrushes or low prickly shrubs along the edge of the riverbank.</p> <p>f) Within the town centre there is a need for additional community safety. The use of CCTV, appropriate lighting columns and trees should be planned at the same time to avoid conflicts.</p>	Support noted. The text supporting the development and design principle to provide and enhance the waterside setting has been expended to make reference to the use of durable materials and designs and consideration of the use of walls as informal seating.
Paragraph 4.7	Support with conditions	Suggests adding "...unattractive to use <u>and create a fear of crime.</u> "	Agree. The paragraph has been amended in line with the suggested text.

Paragraph 4.9	Support	Support buildings being designed to have an active face towards the waterway as well as the street behind. Active fronts and regular use help create safety.	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.21 – 4.23	Support	Support the minimum width of 3.5m as this will help cyclists pass one another easily while providing room for pedestrians. The path through the town will need a CCTV strategy. Cycle storage will need to be in clear open areas with good natural surveillance and/or cover by CCTV.	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.24	Observation	<p>a) With regard to optimising town centre accessibility and reducing vehicle / pedestrian conflicts it will be important to have a CCTV coverage. Would encourage a review of existing and what would be needed within the town centre and the waterside setting.</p> <p>b) Consideration should be given to not creating too many additional connections. Too much permeability makes controlling crime very difficult. All routes should be needed, well used, well overlooked and well integrated.</p> <p>c) Whilst old-fashioned ginnels and alleyways can be thought of as picturesque, well-designed modern centres can still create a sense of place with long vistas and surprises without compromising safety.</p>	Comments noted.
Paragraph 4.28	Observation	While there is a need to provide seating along such a facility, seating can be a contentious issue in some areas. Secure by Design gives several points which should be considered based on an understanding of the context. These include: who is most likely to use the footpath, will it encourage loiterers, is vandal resistance needed, should placement be on the path or set back, is the seat presenting its back to nearby dwellings, can single seats or separated single seats be used?	Comments noted. The paragraph has been expended to refer to siting and design considerations for formal and informal seating.
Paragraph 4.31	Observation	Queries the planned art form. Comments that a	Detailed matters such as the design of any art

		successful approach might be robust statues of local industry. It is important art does not have elements that stick out or can be broken off.	features are outside the scope of the document. The comment for robust design is noted.
Paragraph 4.38	Observation	CCTV coverage or warden security may be needed with regard to moored boats close to the town centre.	Comments noted.
Paragraph 4.41	Support	Support requiring maintenance contributions to ensure quality and safety. This reflects guidance in Safer Places.	Support noted.
Paragraph 5.2	Support with conditions	No mention is made within the extract from the vision and action plan to community safety. Suggests adding, “ensure the centre is a vibrant and attractive <u>safe</u> destination for all.”	Paragraph 5.2 is taken from A Vision for Maidenhead Town Centre. Amending the vision is outside the scope of this document.
Paragraph 5.9	Object	There is no mention of community safety and crime prevention within the contents for design and access statements. Suggests this is added. This is supported by DCLG Circular 01/2006 and CABE guidance “Design and Access Statements – how to write, read and use them.”	Paragraph 5.9 states that design and access statements will be expected to provide details of how a proposal has responded to embracing the waterway, associated infrastructure and future works. It goes on to list a number of areas where the design and access statement may need to be supplemented by dedicated statements, e.g. air quality issues. The paragraph does not list matters which should be covered in a design and access statement. Notwithstanding this, a footnote has been added directing readers to the council’s customer guide and standard template.

Thames Water Property Service (Ms Carmelle Bell)

Paragraph 4.11	Support with conditions	Support the aims of the paragraph on water quality, however it should take into account flooding from sewers. Utility companies have limited powers to prevent connection ahead of infrastructure upgrades. Support the use of well-managed Sustainable Drainage Systems, however, it should be recognised that such techniques are not appropriate in all areas,	Support noted. The paragraph has been amended to cross-refer to sewerage systems. When statutory providers raise capacity issues, and arrangements are not in place for their resolution, the council could consider replacing restrictions on the implementation of the development or, when necessary, refuse planning permission.
----------------	-------------------------	---	--

		e.g. where there are high ground water levels or clay soils.	
Document	Observation	Thames Water operates the Maidenhead Sewage Treatment works near Stafferton Way which discharges into the waterway. It is important that the Core Strategy makes specific reference to the provision of sewerage infrastructure to service development so avoiding unacceptable impacts on the environment. The emerging South East Plan Policies NRM1 and NRM2 list a number of water and sewerage infrastructure issues which should be taken into account when preparing LDFs.	Comments noted.

Threadneedle Property Investors Ltd (David Denham, Denham and Co)

Paragraph 4.42	Object	The 8m buffer strips should be used for maintenance work and should not be considered available for footpaths, cycle ways and landscaping without prior agreement with riparian owners. Reference to walking and cycling through the 8m buffer strips should be removed.	The delivery of policy objectives such as the creation of public rights of way may be considered In the assessment, negotiation and determination of planning applications. The paragraph outlines the Environment Agency practice to seek a buffer alongside the waterway to allow for maintenance. The cross-reference to continuous walking and cycling draws attention to the opportunity this buffer provides to achieve this objective. No changes are required.
Paragraph 4.42	Object	The 8m buffer strips should not apply to change of use, as this is impractical.	The Environment Agency practice is to seek a buffer alongside the waterway to allow for maintenance. Where a buffer does not exist, one could only be created by the redevelopment of the site allowing for the setting back of buildings. Since change of use applications involve no changes to the built form (operational development) it would be impossible to create a buffer. No changes are required.
Paragraph 4.43	Object	The council cannot prevent permitted development	The paragraph refers to situations where planning

		rights within the 8m buffer strips. The paragraph should be amended.	permission is required and does not refer to permitted development rights where consent is provided directly through national legislation. No changes are required.
Paragraph 4.44	Object	Riparian owners should not be penalised for rubbish dumping by others. Reference to riparian duties to remove debris should be deleted.	The paragraph provides factual information regarding the duties of riparian landowners and where further information may be gained. The duties are outside the scope of the document. No changes are required.
Paragraph 5.4	Object	No financial contributions should be sought to pay for the scheme, as the existing regime is burdensome. The scheme should be self-financing.	The planning system allows for the securing of appropriate contributions towards infrastructure, services and facilities made necessary by that development. The restoration of the waterway is a key rejuvenation project for Maidenhead and would contribute to a number of planning objectives such as access to recreational opportunities.

APPENDIX D DRAFT SA REPORT: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND OUTCOME

Berks, Bucks and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)

6. Conclusions	Observation	We have some concerns arising from the conclusions of the SA which indicate that there are potential negative effects on biodiversity from the Framework.	Noted. The SA Report has been amended to state that more work needs to be carried out to assess the impact of the project on the whole channel's ecology.
----------------	-------------	---	---

CBRE Richard Ellis

Paragraph 3.3.	Observation	States that " <i>current development plan policy does not expressly cover the full range of measures necessary to achieve the Maidenhead Water Project</i> ". Should note that the draft Maidenhead Waterway Framework planning brief will not form part of the development plan but will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications within the borough.	Agree. A sentence has been added to the background section to state the planning brief is not part of the Local Development Framework but has been prepared in the context of key national, regional and local planning policy.
Document	Observation	The Draft SA Report has highlighted negative effects of the Waterways Framework objectives as well as positive ones, particularly with regard to biodiversity. It will be necessary to mitigate against these effects and monitor the effectiveness of the mitigation measures. Appropriate conditions should be attached to the granting of any planning permission to protect biodiversity.	Noted. Mitigation and monitoring measures have been included in the SA Report. No changes made to the SA Report.

Cookham Parish Council

Paragraph 4.2	Support	Negative effects - trees and disturbance to river banks, flora and fauna. Support the borough's concern about this.	Support noted.
Table 3	Support	Support table 3.	Support noted.
Appendix 1	Support	Support comments against SA objective 14.	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.2 and appendix 1.	Object	Negative effects fail to include the disruption of construction works on recreational use of footpaths	Partly agree. In the Maidenhead Waterways Framework under the second design principle,

		on Widbrook Common and the potential for eutrophication from construction work and pollution via backflow of water into The Fleet and Strand Water.	'Provide High Quality Buildings and Spaces', it already states that water quality should not be harmed as a result of impacts during construction. Regarding disruption to recreation, the Framework document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage. No changes made to the SA Report.
Table 3.	Object	Object to the lack of flood risk and drainage monitoring in the implementation plan. Waterway flow rates should be monitored to ensure that SA objective 14 is achieved. Ditches should be kept clear to keep a good flow of water.	Partly agree. 'The number of properties at risk of flooding' has been added to table 3 – the monitoring framework.
Table 3.	Object	Biodiversity in Fleet and Strand Water should be monitored.	Agree. Table 3 already covers this and has been strengthened to show that work still needs to be carried out on collecting baseline biodiversity.
Document	Observation	Recognise the important benefit of improved flood relief which should be a high priority for this project. EA advice should be sought on more accurate articulation of the flood risk.	Agree. The EA are statutory consultees for the SA Report. Their comments are set out below.

Cookham Society

Paragraph 4.3.	Object	Need to change this to 'aim to reduce flood risk'.	Comments noted. The Waterways Framework does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism for assessing the impact of developments which come forward along the waterway corridor on the aim of restoring the waterway and the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects of the Maidenhead Waterway Project, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.
----------------	--------	--	---

			Notwithstanding the above, the paragraph has been changed to respond to flood risk in line with the new development and design principles added to the final Waterways Framework document.
Appendix 1, objective 14.	Object	Amend the description to achieve compliance with the objective (reduce flood risk).	<p>Comments noted. The Waterways Framework does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism for assessing the impact of developments which come forward along the waterway corridor on the aim of restoring the waterway and the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects of the Maidenhead Waterway Project, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the paragraph has been changed to respond to flood risk in line with the new development and design principles added to the final Waterways Framework document.</p>

Darracott, Ms Ann (Maidenhead Civic Society representative on the Green Way Working Group)

Paragraph 1.2.	Object	Maidenhead's commercial centre developed to the west of the Thames because the ground was higher and so businesses and homes would not flood. It is inaccurate to imply that the waterways were involved in commerce " <i>and over time fell into disuse</i> ". Evidence back to the 19 th century shows that the waterways were constantly in need of maintenance.	Agree. The text has been deleted.
Paragraph 1.4	Object	Object to the raising of the water level when no environmental impact assessment has been carried out. What effect will raising levels have on discharge from the storm drains in the town centre? Object to aim to make the waterway navigable by narrow boats as unrealistic and too expensive. Support use by canoes and punts.	The Framework document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only

			capable of assessment at the planning application stage. Similarly, the document does not conclude on issue of navigation by narrow boats, nor is it reliant on this aspect, but seeks to ensure this possibility is recognised by developments. The costs of the Maidenhead Waterway Project are dependent on the final form of the project and the timeframe for its delivery. The document is independent of these matters. No changes made to the SA Report.
Paragraph 1.5	Object	Object to term “ <i>restoration of original waterways to navigable standard</i> ”. No evidence they were ever navigable.	It is accepted that there is no conclusive evidence on the commercial navigation of the waterways. Text has been amended accordingly.
Paragraph 4.2	Object	A positive effect is noted as “increasing the amount of sunlight reaching the waterway”, presumably by the removal of trees.	Disagree. This refers to the use of sympathetic building design. No changes made to the SA Report.
Paragraph 4.2	Object	Included in the negative effects is the impact on trees as some will need to be removed. Once trees are removed reed growth increases. Maintenance will be required either to remove fallen trees or control excessive reed growth.	The section has been amended to reflect that work still needs to be carried out to assess impact of the project on the channel’s ecology.
Paragraph 4.2	Object	What is likely to happen to a widened waterway if the supply of water from the north decreases? At the end of the 1980’s water flow into the town centre ceased, mainly due to a series of dry winters that failed to recharge the groundwater. In 2002 water flow again ceased in the town centre this time due to blockage of the White Brook on Widbrook Common caused by lack of maintenance. Dredging of the Brook for five years has restored flow. If in the future flow ceases again for either of these reasons, then the waterway would deteriorate to a series of smelly pools as can be seen at present alongside Waitrose near to Moor Arches. Presumably phase 2 of the project aims to ensure water flow from the north but this is not mentioned in the current proposal. The map used to illustrate the waterway shows only the	The Framework document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage. No changes made to the SA Report.

		existing stream system, which has in the past failed to deliver water to Maidenhead own centre.	
Paragraph 5.1	Object	The following report was not referenced: WALKER A 2000 White Brook, Maidenhead Ditch and York Stream – a river corridor survey carried out for the Environment Agency Thames Region. If the aim is to improve the waterway suggest the management recommendations in this report should be implemented.	Partly agree. A reference to the report has been included. Whether the management recommendations in this report are implemented lie outside the scope of the SA Report.
Section 6	Object	Suggest if the water flow decreased there will be considerable adverse effect on biodiversity as, in a widened waterway, levels will drop more rapidly.	The Framework document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage. No changes made to the SA Report.
Appendix 1	Object	Suggest sustainability objectives are unrealistic. The existing waterway does not get adequate maintenance. There is no reason to believe a larger version will be any different.	The Sustainability Appraisal objectives were published following the Scoping Report consultation and serve to test whether the Waterway Framework Principles are the best ones for sustainability. No changes made to the SA Report.

Environment Agency

Table 1.	Support	Support the inclusion of SA objectives 14, 17 and 22.	Support noted.
Paragraph 2.2.	Object	Recommend that SA objective 21 (waste) is included within table 1. Potentially a significant volume of waste will be generated by the proposal due to dredging required through the ring and also downstream and upstream.	Disagree. The Framework document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application

			stage. No changes made to the SA Report.
Table 1.	Support	Under SA objective 14, we are pleased that the indicator <i>'the number of properties at risk of flooding'</i> will be very useful for demonstrating any change in flood risk to properties in Maidenhead as a result of the Waterways scheme.	Support noted.
Paragraph 4.2.	Observation	We acknowledge that some of the supporting text for design principles will have a positive impact on development along the watercourses. However we still have significant concerns that the scheme as a whole will detrimentally impact on the channel's ecology. The statement about <i>'positive effect on the historic and natural environment'</i> is misleading and recommend that references to biodiversity are removed from the positive effects section. Currently, you cannot say whether the scheme will have a positive or a negative impact on biodiversity, as there has been no impact assessment at all. The list of negative impacts should be expanded to consider the impact of the scheme on ecology e.g. on fish communities, invertebrates, wetland habitat.	Agree. References to biodiversity have been removed from the positive effects list.
Paragraph 4.3.	Object	<i>'On-Going Monitoring of Flora and Fauna'</i> is included in a section entitled mitigation. Monitoring is not mitigation and this measure should be removed. The mitigation should be strengthened to ensure that the negative effects identified on page 9 are off-set. An appropriate mitigation objective would be: <i>'Enhancement measures included for biodiversity'</i>	Agree. <i>'On-going monitoring of flora and fauna'</i> has been removed and <i>'Enhancement measures included for biodiversity'</i> has been added to the list.
Paragraph 4.3.	Object	Mitigation is identified as <i>'Requiring consent and advice from the EA then designing for no increase in flood risk'</i> . This does not meet the objective of the SA for the borough or the requirements of PPS25 which is to reduce flood risk. Alter to <i>'Designing for a reduction in flood risk'</i> .	Comments noted. The Waterways Framework does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism for assessing the impact of developments which come forward along the waterway corridor on the aim of restoring the waterway and the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects

			<p>of the Maidenhead Waterway Project, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the paragraph has been changed to respond to flood risk in line with the new development and design principles added to the final Waterways Framework document.</p>
Paragraph 4.3.	Object	<p>We support the inclusion of mitigation measure 6 which promotes the planting of native trees appropriate to the waterside. However, all planting within the river corridor should be of native species which have been sourced locally, this is to enhance the value of the watercourse as a wildlife corridor and to ensure that native species survive. We recommend that the wording of mitigation measure 6 is strengthened to recognise the importance of locally native species not just the value of native trees, for example: <i>'Replanting of native flora appropriate to the waterside setting'</i></p>	<p>Agree. Paragraph 4.3. has been amended to <i>'Replanting of native flora appropriate to the waterside setting'</i>.</p>
Paragraph 4.3.	Support	<p>We support the inclusion of the mitigation measure which seeks to protect certain species.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
Table 3.	Object	<p>The list of baseline surveys is currently inadequate in content, and extent. Fish and invertebrate surveys have yet to be carried out and no surveys have been carried out on the entire length of the proposed route, only in the built up section of Maidenhead. The conclusion reached in this section is misleading as it implies that monitoring against the baseline identified in certain (listed) documents will be sufficient when this is not the case as a full baseline has not yet been obtained. Amend the data sources and references to reflect that work still needs to be carried out.</p>	<p>Agree. The data sources and references have been amended to reflect that work still needs to be carried out to assess impact of the project on the channel's ecology.</p>
Page 14, Appendix 1.	Object	<p>For SA objective 22 we have identified another potential effect - a change in the direction of groundwater flow, or a rise in the level of</p>	<p>The Framework document does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism to help</p>

		groundwater could result in an unacceptable level of risk associated with contamination. Recommend that you add an additional indicator to Table 1 objective 22 recording the number of sites where site use (historical and current) indicates a potential source of contamination against those that have already been investigated and remediated if necessary.	facilitate the improvement of the waterway corridor in general and avoid obstacles to the overall achievement of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage. No changes made to the SA Report.
Page 14, Appendix 1 (also listed on page 9).	Object	For SA objective 14, in the ' <i>Description of the Effect and Comments</i> ' ' <i>design for no increase in flood risk</i> ' has been identified. This does not meet the SA objective or the requirements of PPS25, which is to reduce flood risk. It should read ' <i>Design for a reduction in flood risk</i> '. If the wording is altered to be a 'reduction in flood risk' then we would agree that this is a positive effect. However, if you choose to leave it as 'no increase' then we would recommend that the table is altered to have a (-) sign for no effect in the short, medium and long term.	Comments noted. The Waterways Framework does not assess the feasibility or the acceptability of the Maidenhead Waterway Project. It provides a mechanism for assessing the impact of developments which come forward along the waterway corridor on the aim of restoring the waterway and the Maidenhead Waterway Project. The document does not address detailed design issues or the full environmental effects of the Maidenhead Waterway Project, which are only capable of assessment at the planning application stage. Notwithstanding the above, the paragraph has been changed to respond to flood risk in line with the new development and design principles added to the final Waterways Framework document.
Appendix 1.	Object	We support SA Objective 17 however, an adequate ecological assessment of the scheme has not been carried out and we are unable to identify any potential negative or positive ecological impacts, nor suggest suitable mitigation for any negative impacts. The fact that natural watercourses will be canalised indicates that there will be negative impacts. The appropriate surveys should be undertaken along the whole route of the scheme and schedule for these should be included in the SA. Appropriate enhancements should be proposed to ensure that the positives significantly outweigh the negatives.	Agree. The report has been amended to reflect that work still needs to be carried out to assess impact of the project on the whole channel's ecology.

Document	Support	Support the Draft SA Report.	Noted.
----------	---------	------------------------------	--------