



Liza Challis  
Clerk to the Council  
Winkfield Parish Council

By email to: [l.challis@winkfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:l.challis@winkfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk)

xx April 2022

Dear Liza

### **WINKFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION**

Thank you for your email dated 11th March 2022, concerning the above. Bracknell Forest Council is generally supportive of the Plan and appreciates all the work invested in the process by those involved.

The Council would like to make some comments on technical issues (including matters that touch on the 'basic conditions') and some additional editorial comments. Whilst the technical issues are outlined below, they are dealt with in more detail in the schedule below. These comments represent a combined response from different service areas across the Council.


Technical comments are as follows:

- Consider changing the plan period to correspond with the Pre-Submission Bracknell Forest Local Plan (BFLP) plan period of 2020-2037.
- References to flood risk should include groundwater emergence to address flood risk from all sources.
- Objective F should be amended to include Windsor Forest and Great Park Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and to refer to no significant negative effects.
- The Spatial Strategy (Policy W1) is a mix of general approach and specific policies. Suggest the specific policy elements are moved into a new policy / added to existing policy.
- The list of Green Belt villages in Policy W1 does not include Cheapside which is identified in the Pre-Submission BFLP as a Green Belt Village.
- The design policy (W2) could be expanded to address design in building terms such as good quality materials, and how to assess proposals on the boundary of Character Areas.
- Consideration should be given to the addition of supporting text to note how the in-principle support of development provided by Policies W5, W6 and W7 relates to wider considerations/constraints.
- The housing mix policy (W4) requirement that at least 80% of the dwellings should be a mix of 1, 2 and 3-bedroom homes is not supported my evidence. Further justification/evidence is needed. In addition, the requirement for starter homes should be deleted as there is no legislation to implement them.

- The exception sites/housing policy (W5) should be amended to require cumulative site size to be taken into account, to require developers to provide the housing needs assessment and to fund independent assessments of viability appraisals. It is also not clear what criterion D iii is seeking to achieve, which could be a basic condition matter. In addition, the rural exceptions policy requirement for the site to be adjacent to a settlement boundary is not a requirement of national policy. This needs to be justified in the context of Winkfield.
- Employment and retail policy (W7) should be amended to support development in appropriate locations as it is not in general conformity with strategic policies in the Development Plan or consistent with national policy and therefore does not meet the basic conditions.
- Biodiversity policy (W8) should be amended to include a percentage for biodiversity net gain.
- Dark skies policy (W10) could be expanded to define areas where the policy applies.
- Martins Heron Station policy (W12) seeks to encourage access to and from Martins Heron station for pedestrians and cyclists. However, one of the proposed measures to achieve this includes “the provision of additional car parking spaces” which seems contrary to the aim of the policy.
- An area of the settlement on Policies Map Inset 2 is unclear and needs amending.
- Consider including a monitoring framework setting out details of what will be monitored and indicators.
- It is confirmed that a full Appropriate Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) are required.
- The SEA Environmental Report (2020) accompanying the Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan requires updating to reflect the current Plan and confirmation should also be provided that the SEA Environmental Report provided fulfils the scope set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2016).
- The SEA concludes the Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan is likely to have a positive effect in relation to the majority of SEA objectives, but it is not clear how this conclusion has been reached.

We welcome the opportunity for on-going discussion relating to the preparation of your Neighbourhood Plan and associated submission documentation.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A.P. Hunter', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Andrew Hunter  
(Director: Place, Planning & Regeneration)

### Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Consultation Response Schedule (April 2022)

**Bold underlined** text for additions; **~~bold strikethrough~~** for deletion.

Policy/ Para. Number	Comment Type	Comment
<b>Comments on the Pre-Submission Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan (2022)</b>		
General comment		The Pre-Submission Bracknell Forest Local Plan (BFLP) plan period is 2020-2037. You may wish to revise the Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan period (2021-2037) to cover the same period.
General comment		Where there are overlapping policy designations such as with Local Green Spaces and Local Gaps there is a need to ensure there is no conflict between the policies.
General comment		Need to ensure consistency with the use of the terms 'supply' and 'need' with regards to housing.
Para 1.10	Clarification	<p>Para refers to the Bracknell Forest Council's Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Opinion dated August 2016, which concluded that there was a requirement for an SEA given the content of the plan. At the time, the plan intended to allocate sites for development. The Screening Opinion notes that it is a 'snapshot in time'. The plan has since evolved, whilst the Neighbourhood Plan was not able to identify suitable sites to allocate, it supports development outside of the settlement boundary, including in the Green Belt, in certain circumstances, going beyond the support provided for such development by other applicable policies. As such the outcome of the Screening Opinion is considered to remain valid, therefore an SEA is still required.</p> <p>(Comments on the SEA of the Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan (2020) are available below this table.)</p>
Para 1.13	Clarification	<p>Since 2016 when the last SEA / HRA Screening was undertaken by the Council, the following should be noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In April 2018, in the case <i>People Over Wind &amp; Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta</i> ("People over Wind"), the Court of Justice of the European Union clarified that it is not appropriate to take account of mitigation measures when screening plans and projects for their effects on European protected habitats under the Habitats Directive. In practice this means if a likely significant effect is identified at the screening stage of a habitats assessment, an 'Appropriate Assessment' must be undertaken.</li> <li>• A new basic condition came into force on 28 December 2018 to allow neighbourhood plans and orders in areas where there could be a likely significant effect on a protected habitat to undertake a full 'appropriate assessment' to demonstrate how impacts will be mitigated, in the same way as would happen for a Local Plan.</li> </ul>

## Appendix A

Policy/ Para. Number	Comment Type	Comment
		The Council has discussed the need for a HRA with Natural England who have confirmed that a full Appropriate Assessment of this Neighbourhood Plan is required.
Para. 2.34	Amendment	Since leaving the European Union, Special Protection Areas and Special Areas of Conservation in the UK are no longer part of the Natura 2000 network of sites. These now form part of the national site network. Amend as follows: "...these areas are <del>called Nature 2000 sites</del> <b><u>part of the national site network</u></b> and are internationally important for threatened habitats and species."
Para 2.35	Amendment	<p>References in to flooding are welcomed. Clarification is recommended for the sentence "Nearly the entire Parish is considered a 'Nitrate Vulnerable Zone' for surface water flooding." Nitrate Vulnerable Zones are areas designated as being at risk from agricultural nitrate pollution and whilst surface water flooding of farmland may cause increased nitrate run-off, surface water flood risk is a separate issue and one that is important in the parish. This is repeated within the glossary and abbreviations section of the plan which also need amending.</p> <p>Flood risk from fluvial, surface water and groundwater sources are an important consideration in the Parish. However, it is recommended that references to flood risk are extended to include groundwater emergence. Further information regarding the flood risk from all sources of flooding within the Borough can be found in Bracknell Forest Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)<sup>1</sup>. This recommendation is in line with the July 2021 amendments to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which require consideration of the risk of flooding from 'any source'. Consideration of all sources is relevant in the parish, there are areas of the parish where groundwater levels are either at or very near (within 0.025m) to the ground surface, in some areas this coincides with surface water flood risk. The need to consider all sources of flooding was previously identified within the Council's SEA Scoping Opinion (November 2017).</p>
Para 4.24	Information	The Council has planned for highway improvements on a strategic level over many years. This is reflected in the Urban Traffic Management and Control programme which has introduced MOVA control at major signals to enhance capacity and thus ease traffic pressures. Plans for major highway improvement works across the borough have come to fruition every year, including those on the London Road corridor that pass through the parish.
Para 4.25	Information	With regards to the residents' survey which identified a need for junction improvements, the Council did have a concept scheme for the introduction of signal control at Braziers Lane. However, this would have resulted in a departure from design standards due to the lack of available land as there

<sup>1</sup> See section 9 of the BFLP Evidence Base [Emerging Bracknell Forest Local Plan evidence base | Bracknell Forest Council \(bracknell-forest.gov.uk\)](#)

## Appendix A

Policy/ Para. Number	Comment Type	Comment
		was no intervisibility, and vehicle manoeuvres would have required stop-lines to be a considerable distance back from the junction. At Maiden's Green, the Council has a concept roundabout design that is part of the Local Plan Transport Impact Report produced in 2021.
Objective F	Amendment/ clarification	Objective F within the plan refers to ensuring no significant effects on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA). It is recommended this reference is broadened to encompass the Windsor Forest and Great Park Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which is also located within the Parish. It could also be clarified to be clear that the objective relates to no significant negative effects on these sites.
Para 5.7	Suggestion	Consider including a monitoring framework setting out details on what will be monitored and indicators. Locality provide guidance which is available here: <a href="https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/toolkits-and-guidance/how-to-implement-monitor-and-review-your-made-neighbourhood-plan/">https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/toolkits-and-guidance/how-to-implement-monitor-and-review-your-made-neighbourhood-plan/</a>
Policy W1	Suggestion	The policy is a mix of general approach and specific policies. Suggest the specific policy elements (Green Belt villages and strategic gaps) are moved into a new policy (Green Belt villages) and added to the existing gaps policy (strategic gaps).
Policy W1 criterion C 5	Consistency	The policy identifies a strategic gap between Bracknell and North Ascot. This gap follows the same boundaries as the Bracknell – North Ascot strategic gap in the emerging BFLP. The emerging BFLP is currently at examination and the boundary of the gap may change. This would need to be reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan.
Policy W1 C 3	Clarification and consistency	The list of Green Belt villages does not include Cheapside which is identified in the Pre-Submission BFLP as a Green Belt Village. It is noted that Cheapside is identified as a Green Belt Village on the Policies Map, therefore unsure why omitted.
Policy W2	Suggestion	The policy could include some wording setting out how proposals in locations adjacent to the character area boundaries would be expected to follow the design principles of the relevant character area.
Policy W2	Suggestion	The policy does not give any details on how 'high quality of design' is measured in building terms, as it focuses on reference to landscape in the Character Area Assessments. Suggest that 'high quality' should also include good quality materials which are sympathetic to the local built heritage, appropriate storey heights, roof forms, fenestration and architectural detailing.
Policy W2	Suggestion	It would be helpful if the bullets under the policy points were numbered to make it clearer which part of the policy is being referred to when the plan is in use. Also applies to Policy W4.
Para 5.12	Amendment	Amend last sentence as follows: "Other relevant policies include those set out in the Bracknell Forest <del>Borough Local</del> Plan and emerging Local Plan..."

## Appendix A

Policy/ Para. Number	Comment Type	Comment
Para 6.4	Clarification/ consistency	Add the settlements listed in the para (North Ascot, Chavey Down, Winkfield Row, Martins Heron & The Warren and Forest Park) to the policy criterion C1 for consistency with other parts of the policy.
Para 6.5	Clarification	Should be clear that the Green Belt villages boundaries are identified in the emerging Bracknell Forest Development Plan for the purposes of infilling only.
Policy W4 A	Clarification	Criterion A states: "On sites of less than 10 dwellings, at least 80% of the dwellings should be a mix of 1, 2 and 3-bedroom homes." Unclear where the 80% is derived from and what evidence supports this as Table 8.1 in the supporting text states that 32% should be 4+ bedrooms, not 20%. Further justification/evidence is needed to support the 80%.
Policy W4 A	Suggestion	Specify that the requirement for a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroomed homes does not apply to developments of specialist housing for older persons such as housing with support or housing with care.
Policy W4 C	Suggestion	Would be useful to have some supporting text that expands upon and explains criterion C.
Policy W4 C 1st bullet	Suggestion/ amendment	Whilst starter homes feature in the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and NPPF glossary, the funding and relevant legislation required to implement them has never come into force and so there is no likelihood that any starter homes will come forward. Therefore, suggest deleting this requirement.
Policy W4 C 2nd bullet	Clarification	Unsure how the requirement to encourage "homes specifically developed for private rent" can be controlled through the planning system.
Policy W4 C 4th bullet	Suggestion	Sheltered and extra care normally require quite large developments to achieve economies of scale and be viable (e.g. minimum 60 units for an extra care home), therefore they may not be appropriate in Winkfield. Could consider encouraging other forms of accommodation for elderly people if there is a need such as bungalows.
Policy W4	Suggestion	It would be helpful if the bullets under the policy points were numbered to make it clearer which part of the policy is being referred to when the plan is in use.
Policies W5, W6 and W7	Clarification/ amendment	Policies W5, W6 and W7 provide in-principle support to development. Whilst it is understood that the plan should be read as a whole, and with consideration of other policy requirements (such as the NPPF and Bracknell Forest Development Plan), supporting text is needed to note how the in-principle support of development provided by the Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan relates to wider considerations/constraints (such as flood risk, biodiversity, landscape, heritage).
Policy W5	Suggestion	Where there is a difference to national policy on rural exception sites this should be made clear in the policy and supporting text.
Policy W5 A	Amendment/ clarification	The rural exceptions policy requirement for the site to be adjacent to a settlement boundary is not a requirement of the NPPF. This needs to be justified in the context of Winkfield.
Policy W5 A	Amendment	Amend to clarify that the developer needs to undertake the local needs survey.

## Appendix A

Policy/ Para. Number	Comment Type	Comment
Policy W5 D i	Amendment	Amend to add a requirement that the financial appraisal demonstrating the viability of the scheme is independently assessed and that the assessment will be paid for by the developer.
Policy W5 D iii	Clarification	It is not clear what this criterion is seeking to achieve, as it is not clear how meeting local needs relates to design and visual character. This could be a basic condition matter as the plan may not be considered to meet the NPPF requirement that 'plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals' (para. 16(d)).
Policy W5 E ii	Suggestion	The requirement regarding site size should be amended as follows "sites should not <b><u>cumulatively</u></b> be larger than one hectare in size or exceed 5% of the area of the existing settlement within its boundaries".
Policy W5 supporting text	Suggestion	Exception sites are justified where they very clearly meet local needs (or borough needs in the case of entry-level sites). It would be useful if the supporting text could set out what local needs the Neighbourhood Plan is trying to meet, what types of affordable housing are most needed to meet local need and might therefore justify development on exception sites, plus how cumulative development on Green Belt sites will be avoided.
Policy W7	Suggestion	This policy may not necessarily prevent the loss of economic floorspace, since i, ii, iii are in the context of A which is for employment/ retail proposals, so it does not address loss of economic uses to residential, for example.
Policy W7	Clarification	It would be helpful if the Neighbourhood Plan included a definition of what 'employment' is (see emerging Bracknell Forest Local Plan which defines employment uses as BIDS uses). Similarly, 'small-scale' for both employment and retail should be defined. In the emerging BFLP smaller business units are 500 sqm or less.
Policy W7 and para. 10.1	Amendment	The final sentence of Para 10.1 states that 'these uses' should be located within or adjacent to existing settlement boundaries, noting restrictions on development outside Green Belt villages. Whilst NPPF paras. 84 and 85 relate to a prosperous rural economy, the Neighbourhood Plan reads as if it is supportive of development in the Green Belt and countryside. Retail uses are also subject to a sequential test where town centre uses (such as retail) should be located in town centres, then edge of centre and out of centre should only be considered if no other sites are available. Suggest policy is amended to read "will be supported <b><u>in appropriate locations</u></b> <del>within or on the edge of settlements</del> provided they..." and supporting text updated to say this may include adjacent to existing settlement boundaries where suitable opportunities exist.

## Appendix A


Policy/ Para. Number	Comment Type	Comment
		This is not in general conformity with strategic policies in the Development Plan or consistent with national policy and therefore does not meet the basic conditions.
Para. 10.1	Clarification/ suggestion	Such proposals will be subject to other considerations and policies and associated tests, such as the sequential test. For clarity, Green Belt villages are not defined as 'settlements' in the emerging BFLP, they have simply been defined for the purposes of infilling, alone.
Policy W8	Suggestion	First 2 paragraphs should be numbered and could be moved to the supporting text beneath the policy.
Policy W8 2 <sup>nd</sup> para	Amendment/ clarification	First sentence states that: "Biodiversity net gain is mandated for developments requiring planning permission". However, biodiversity net gain is not yet mandated. Secondary legislation following on from the Environment Act will make it mandatory in 2023. Text should be amended to reflect this.
Policy W8 A	Amendment	Policy should be clear about what counts as a net gain and include percentage figure otherwise proposals may claim a very small net gain e.g. 0.01%.
Policy W8 B	Amendment	Amend policy to delete "in particular" at the start of the sentence as the wording is not considered necessary.
Policy W8 C	Amendment	First sentence should be amended to refer to ecological rather than habitat. The second sentence should refer to native species, rather than trees, shrubs and grasses so covers all plant forms as follows: "As part of its requirements to demonstrate biodiversity net gain, development should be designed to retain trees, shrubs and hedgerows of arboricultural, <del>habitat</del> <b>ecological</b> and amenity value on-site and to conserve and enhance connectivity to the wider green and blue infrastructure networks. Where this is accompanied by new planting, this should consist of native species <del>of trees, shrubs and grasses</del> acting as stepping stones for wildlife.
Policy W10	Clarification	Suggest amending reference to light to 'artificial light' for clarity.
Figure 11.1	Suggestion	The Council is currently looking at Green Infrastructure (GI) corridors as part of the GI Strategy to support the emerging BFLP. The corridor in Fig11.1 overlaps partially with one of the biodiversity corridors that have been identified. We can share information on GI corridors to help integrate the corridors.
Para 11.4 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet	Suggestion	The policy mentions the use of native species so it may be worth explaining that native species provide foodplants and habitats for a greater range of species than non-natives.
Policy W10	Suggestion	Is there any evidence of particular areas in the parish where dark skies should be protected? Perhaps linked to the character areas assessments? Whilst the glossary states these will be defined and shown on the policies map, they are not currently there. These should be spatially defined on the policies map and the policy amended to specifically protect these areas. Whilst advocating low energy lighting is applicable to all the parish, it is not specifically related to protecting existing dark



## Appendix A

Policy/ Para. Number	Comment Type	Comment
		skies per se, i.e. it would make minimal difference to a development proposal in an already urban area. It would be more helpful if there was a defined area(s) for the policy to apply to.
Policy W11 and para 11.16	Amendment to evidence	There is no evidence document setting out how the Local Green Spaces were assessed as being suitable against the criteria set out in the National Planning Policy Framework paras 101 and 102. This should be provided.
Para 12.2 1st bullet	Clarification	Suggests that the newly reconstructed junctions at A329 junctions with New Forest Ride (Mercedes Garage), Priors Road (The Royal Foresters pub) and Fernbank Road (LVS School) are the problem, as it doesn't acknowledge that they were built to alleviate a greater congestion problem and have reduced the queues and delays along this corridor.
Policy 12.4	Amendment/ Clarification	With regards to safer pedestrian and cycle paths around schools, this infrastructure is something the Council has addressed previously so it would be helpful if the text could be amended to clarify which particular schools or routes need further attention.
Policy W13	Clarification	The policy seeks to encourage access to and from Martins Heron station for pedestrians and cyclists. However, one of the proposed measures to achieve this includes "b. the provision of additional car parking spaces" which may be contrary to the aim of the policy.
Para 13.4.6	Clarification	With regards to the list of potential infrastructure projects for traffic calming some of these routes (Forest Road, London Road, Bagshot Road, Swinley Road and New Forest Ride) are major strategic roads which would not lend themselves to traffic calming schemes as initiatives would push traffic onto less appropriate routes.
Para 13.4	Amendment	Amend text to add in hyperlinks to the evidence documents listed.
Policies Map Inset 2	Amendment/ Clarification	Unclear where the settlement boundary is to the east of Bullbrook - the settlement boundary may need to be brought to the top of the layers to make it clearer. Also there is a dashed line to the west and north of Heathfield School which is not on the legend and may need to be deleted. See yellow highlights on the extract below:

## Appendix A

Policy/ Para. Number	Comment Type	Comment
		
Glossary – Evidence Base	Amendment	The definition for 'Evidence Base' need amending to state that the evidence base is comprised of reports and technical analysis which have helped to shape the plan.
Appendix B – Schedule of evidence	Amendment	Does not list the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan Environmental Report (February 2020). Amend to include reference to the relevant SEA.

**Comments on the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan (2020)**

Policy/ Para. Number	Comment Type	Comment
<b>Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan (2020)</b>		
General		The SEA Environmental Report submitted with the Pre-Submission Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan is dated February 2020; the plan itself is dated March 2022. Therefore, in these comments, consideration is given to the scope of the plan that was originally assessed by the SEA, and the current scope of the plan.
General		Confirmation should be provided that the SEA Environmental Report provided fulfils the scope set out in the (typically broader) Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report on which the consultees were consulted.
General		The SEA concludes the Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan is likely to have a positive effect in relation to the majority of SEA objectives, but, it is not clear how this conclusion has been reached.
Section 9	Clarification/ amendment	Section 9 of the SEA identifies 14 policies within the draft Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan which were considered through the SEA. A review of the 13 policy titles contained within the current Pre-Submission NP shows the current policies to have either the same or similar titles to the version assessed through the SEA, with some minor changes, such as 'Promoting Dark Skies' is now 'Dark Skies'. A policy is now included on Local Green Spaces (W11) which was not assessed through the SEA. This policy designates spaces as Local Green Spaces which affords them protection from development except in very special circumstances. As such, this increase in scope of the Neighbourhood Plan since the SEA was undertaken is unlikely to give rise to significant environmental effects and therefore does not warrant further SEA of this new policy. However, it has not been possible to compare the unpublished policy wording that was assessed through the SEA and confirmation is needed that the SEA remains appropriate given the evolving nature of the Plan.
Alternative options	Amendment	<p>The reasonable alternatives considered within the SEA are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option 1: No allocations within the Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan, the Parish Council opting to work closely with Bracknell Forest Council to influence the direction and level of growth within the Neighbourhood area.</li> <li>• Option 2: Allocate sites for development within the Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan - one site having been identified as having the potential for the development of six dwellings (Land South of Claverton, Long Hill Road).<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> Table 5.1 of the SEA provides an initial screening of eight identified site options, seven of which are in the Green Belt and screened out from further assessment.

## Appendix A

Policy/ Para. Number	Comment Type	Comment
		<p>Section 6 of the SEA found Option 1 (no allocations) to perform better than the potential allocation within Option 2, which is within a deciduous woodland, although in a relatively accessible location.</p> <p>A more detailed appraisal of the alternatives is provided in Appendix III of the SEA. However, the in-principle support for development provided by the Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan is not considered. Most of the SEA themes state 'Option 1 will not lead to any development', and consideration under the economy SEA theme states 'neither option seeks to deliver employment land'. As such the alternative taken forward has not been fully assessed through the SEA.</p> <p>Several policies within the Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan provide in-principle support for certain types of development, beyond that supported by other applicable policies (such as the NPPF and the Bracknell Forest Development Plan).</p> <p>Policy W5 Rural Exception Sites and Entry-Level Exception Housing supports (text summarised):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small scale rural exception sites adjacent to the settlement boundary to meet a local housing need.</li> <li>• Entry level exception sites on land that is not already allocated for housing, adjacent to an existing settlement boundary and proportionate in size to the existing settlement (up to one hectare or 5% of the existing settlement size).</li> </ul> <p>Policy W6 Community facilities supports (text summarised) (was policy W7 at the time of writing the SEA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expansion of existing and development of new community facilities.</li> <li>• Establishment of a new doctor's surgery and/or dentist facility provided they are located outside of the Green Belt.</li> </ul> <p>Policy W7 Employment &amp; Retail supports (was policy W9 at the time of writing the SEA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of new small-scale employment and retail uses, including on the edge of settlements</li> </ul>

## Appendix A

Policy/ Para. Number	Comment Type	Comment
		<p>The SEA (section 7.1) assessed a preferred approach within the Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan of being permissive of non-strategic small development sites less than 0.5 hectares (i.e. smaller quantum than is now included in the plan).</p> <p>The plan is assessed in chapter 9 of the SEA. Within this chapter, policies W5 and W6 are only considered in relation to the population and community SEA objective; policy W7 is only considered within the SEA in relation to the economy SEA objective – in each case they assess positively. No consideration is given in relation to the broader environmental objectives or constraints which may be present on such sites, as such these policies have not been fully assessed through the SEA. Further, the Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan provides no supporting text as to how such considerations will be dealt with in relation to this in-principle support. The SEA Environmental Report should be updated to reflect the current proposals within the Winkfield Neighbourhood Plan and to take into account the in-principle support for development.</p>