Ref No*	Comments - (Please specify the EGVNP document and section that your comments refer to)	Response	Changes to NP	Changes to other documents
* see separate sheet (confidential per privacy policy) for cross link to names and addresses of respondant residents				
	RESIDENTS			
1	All	None	None	None
2	Very interesting reading the history of Englefield Green - (a) NB it was Marilyn Monroe not Munroe. (b) Also the Post Code of Crown House is listed incorrectly - it is TW20 0YX . (c) If this is noted specifically as a house of historical importance why is it not Listed to preserve it ?	Comments noted and history report and NP amended accordingly.	Changes to Appendix D	NDHA list
3	Place-making. (a) We need more retail spaces and a coffee shop/cafe with outside seating. (b)We need to use the green for more social events and fairs, where we can support local independent businesses and the products they make. (c) The green itself is also an unattractive square of grass. More needs to be done to make it prettier. More flowers, trees etc to close it off more from the main road. (d)We need more varied restaurants. We have enough pizzas to buy in this area. (e) Demography - we seem to be collecting waifs and strays from various areas who are contributing to antisocial behaviour.	(a) Placemaking Section 3.1 remodeling proposals intend to address this. (b) EGVRA and Cricket Club organising some additional events but please inform EGVRA of your ideas (c) Noted- Please inform the Green Committee of your ideas (d) Noted- proposed remodelling of the Central Area is intended to encourage more and varied shops/ restaurants.(e) Noted	None	None
4	(a) With regrads to ND4 - Coopers Hill Plan my concern is the increased traffic on Coopers Hill Lane. Since the opening of the Magna Carta Park traffic levels have increased and a bus route now comes along the north part of the Lane. The road can just about allow 2 cars to pass slowly but can't easy allow a car to pass a bus. The road has no footpath so pedestrians are forced up on to the grass verge or in to the woods. Having children who walk to school along the road it's becoming increasingly dangerous as the traffic levels increase. More properties on the Kingswood site will only make this worse so i'd ask these points to be raised/addressed as part of any development plans.	(a) The Coopers Hill site is in the very early stages of discussion between RHUL and RBC. Both are aware of the traffic problems that would be created if the property was developed as housing. The masterplan is intended to indicate the issues and restrictions on this site if the decision was made by RHUL to propose further development.	None	None
5		No comment made by resident	None	None
6	Thank you for circulating the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. I read it with interest and agree with the policies overall. However there are two areas of the plan that would benefit from more detail: (a) Car Use and Parking (sections 15.7 - 15.11 and policy TT1) and (b) Recreational Rights of Way (sections 15.20 - 15.21 and policy TT3). Similar to the other maps in Annex B, my recommendation is to prepare maps that give a clearer understanding of existing and future parking facilities and footpaths within the Englefield Green village. In the case of parking, the Steering Committee should set out a plan for future parking in the village. RHUL's planned extension to the elevated car park is moving in the right direction, but it is clear that more must be done to reduce the congestion in the village caused by on-street parking. For example, a solution to this may be to increase resident's only street parking in the village, and work with RHUL to allow the public to park in the RHUL facilities for a fee. More detail on the plan for parking would make the overall Neighbourhood Plan more meaningful. Footpaths should also be given more attention in the plan. Maintaining public right of way and open access to the green belt areas are key to future of Englefield Green. The plan's policy TT3 appears to say that developers will be "encouraged" to expand the footpath network. In my opinion this does not go far enough to assert the right of the public to access the open spaces in the green belt, with footpaths available to cross private property. A map showing existing footpaths, with proposed future pathways is required. The section should also link to Natural Environment (section 11) as pathways also provide wildlife corridors. This is a right of way not only for humans, but the wildlife in Englefield Green. In our policy and future planning, for example, fencing to enclose large open areas of undeveloped land could be discouraged and actively reduced in the village area. The footpaths to access these areas should be treated as a key asset to be expanded within Englefield Green.	(a) The Neighbourhood Plan policies are to be taken into account when planning applications are received by RBC. Other documents are able to address parking issues more appropriately and the Steering Group is aware of concerns regarding this matter. Note Placemaking section 2.4 (Speed Limits) and Section 2.5 (Central Area Parking and Traffic Management) The report ' Parking Standards: Purpose built Student Accomodation and Office Development' (March 2022) Section 3.2 'Managing Existing Issues' specifically addresses point (a). (b) noted and agree the role of Rights of Way is important. However, fencing does not often require planning permission.	Strengthened references to footpaths/ROW in text and Policy TT3	
7	(c) iTransport placemaking and movement section 4.4 I do not think that the double roundabout at junction Bond St/St Jude's Rd/Willow Walk represents an improvement in safety or traffic calming: * Familiarity and overconfidence of local / frequent users combined with hesitancy of unfamiliar double-roundabout users is a recipe for problems. *Traffic reaching 1st mini roundabout from the North will give an impression to pedestrians at the new uncontrolled crossing that they are turning in towards them making it difficult to know when it is safe to cross despite new regulations giving pedestrians priority. * The proposed removal of the grassy verge at the entrance to Willow Walk is undesirable as it is a key feature of this section of the village * Exiting Willow Walk will be more difficult at peak times with the removal of the existing 'KEEP CLEAR' box (not shown on the layout included in document).	Noted, the proposals in this document are preliminary and draft at present.	None	None
8	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Firstly, may I congratulate you on producing a first-class document. It was a pleasure to review. My comments are divided into presentational and specific and are tabled with the aim of making a good document even better. (a) Presentational I am already into this document at page 8 and about to go into the detail and there is no succinct explanation as to why this plan matters to both residents and the Village as a whole. A bold statement of benefits needs to be in the Foreword or as a new para in the introduction. Status of EU regs, if it needs to be included better sits under section 2. (b) Specific Page 3 Para 5. You refer to the Environment Study here. What is this as no previous reference and not referred to in the Appendix. Page 12 Para 4.6. First mention of the Consultation Document needs a cross reference as to where it can be found Page 13 Para 5.3, last sentence. Do you have any firm evidence to support this statement or is it hearsay? If it is the latter, then you need to say "appears" if the former, the quote the traffic data. Also, if one of the two us the A30, then it is slightly misleading as that is a trunk road connecting to a junction on the M25. Page 15 Para 5.7. You need to say where these documents can be found and studied. They are clearly important as they contain supporting information which may be useful once the Plan is live. Page 16 Para 7.1. I have no problems with this, but at what point do we factor in affordability? Page 16 Para 7.2. This definition stems from the UN, 1987 Brundtland if my memory serves me well. You should reference that it is a global definition as it adds impetus to the point you are making. Page 17 Para 7.5. As I said previously doesn't affordability / accessibility come into the equation? Page 17 Box first block. Whose principles are these? Is there not something here about access facilities such as space for waste collection bins and car parking/charging? Page 17 Box second block. "Reduced efficiency" sounds like bureaucratic jargon. "Damage to local businesses through loss of trade and/or increased overheads" Page 24 Para 8.34 bullet 6. There is also the fact that the materials used in construction need to be sustainable too There is no point if materials originate from the use of child labour or have damaged the environment / habitat in their extraction Page 26 Policy ND6 bullet 2. High quality yes but also cost effective. Otherwise, there is no requirement to keep an eye on cost, which then impacts on affordability. Over-engineering of	(a) Noted, text to be added (b)Thank you for the helpful comments. The majority of the comments will be addressed and changes made to the NP doument.	Text added to Introduction and majority of points changed in the NP document	None

	requirement to keep an eye on cost, which then impacts on affordability. Over-engineering of specifications is long standing problem. Page 30 Para 11.5. Can we add “use of insect friendly plants” please? It should be explicit. Page 32 Para 11.12. What about the unnecessary removal of trees, even those with TPO’s? Tree canopies provide a habitat for a huge range of insects, birds and mammals. They are often removed by using the fraudulent claim that they are diseased or an insurance issue. You might wish to consider making explicit references in the policy statement. Page 34 Para 11.13 last line. Where is this report and how can it be accessed – needs a reference. Page 34 Biodiversity policy. This is really good. However, how will the 20% be audited to ensure that it has been delivered, and who by? We need some form of Post Development Benefits review. Page 35 Trees section. It is not just about planting but maintaining until established. Some developers plant them in the summer, and they are dead within weeks. Page 40 Supporting Local Employment. Bullet 1 is rather contradictory to the policy. If you want more people to visit the Village and expand local amenities, then, by definition, it will increase all the factors you have listed. Surely, the way forward is to show that the benefits created elsewhere (employment community enhancement etc) will outweigh the drawbacks. Otherwise, you are encouraging knee jerk, anti-change objections which hold back progress. Page 41. Table. At time of writing, I think the florist is reverting to direct sales again as a new open shop frontage with flowers has appeared. Also, the Pizza House is takeaway only so you might wish to sub-divide restaurants into eat in and take away and take away only. Page 42 Para 13.9. Many metal grills are insurance requirements so the owner may have no choice if they want cover Page 43 Para 13.23. I think this policy is going to be influenced by land values, particularly where the PH is owned by a chain. Where the business has less value than the value of the land if redeveloped, I think you will have problems in maintaining this policy. I am not sure how to tackles this one, but this must be the position of several of the PHs that you have listed. Page 47 /48 Storage of cyclists and mobility scooters. I found this a confusing section. Much will depend on the type of development as to whether this is relevant or just another overhead. Indeed, the type of storage required is likely to depending on the type of development. You a storage section as there is no mention of storage for things such as waste bins, many of which block pavements and/or are left in front gardens. Mobility scooters just require a 13 Amp plug to charge so do they require specific mention? Do you have any stats for usage for such scooters, as in my experience most people tend to move to sheltered accommodation before they require a scooter? I remain concerned about getting the balance between ensuring homes remain affordable and incorporating more design features. There is no evidence that electric vehicles will catch on, given their cost to buy and run. They remain a middle-class fad and may well fall from popularity as the global cost of living challenge bites and more people discover their requirement for consuming scarce natural elements, many of which require destroying habitats in developing nations in order to extract. I draw your attention to your sustainable development commitment on P16 which I fully endorse. There is a major inconsistency here. Page 52 Place-making table. I find this unhelpful as current presented. It comes across as a brain dump which detracts from the professionalism of the document overall. In particular, I have a concern that unless structured and prioritised it will lead to a) the proliferation of uncoordinated street clutter (like Egham and Tolworth) which far from enhancing the centre will have the opposite effect and b) destroy local shops and businesses. Parking restrictions sound great until they deter people from using our facilities in which case, we lose them. I think it is the law of unintended consequences. Page 52 Para 17.3 Bullet 1 – Typo Runnymede. I trust that has been helpful. Please let me know if you require any further clarification of the points listed.			
9	My comments refer to car use and parking and therefore I think they relate to the Placemaking Report. I support the idea of one way routes in the Village. Harvest Road is currently used as a ‘rat run’ by drivers who want to travel through to Priest Hill towards Windsor but do not want to wait at the junction on the A30 (where it meets St Jude’s Road). I strongly believe the short one-way part of Harvest Road should be closed off (where it meets the corner of South Road). Drivers leaving the RHUL car park would have to turn right and join the A30. This would significantly reduce traffic through the residential parts of the Village and make it a much safer and more enjoyable place to live.	Placemaking Report Section 2.5 ‘Central Area Parking and Traffic Management' includes the proposal to make the short section from South Road to the A30 one way exiting only onto the A30. Please note however that the suggestions in the Placemaking Report are intended to highlight problem areas and a definitive solution will only be found in consultation with Surrey Highways and RHUL	None	None
10	My comments refer to car use and parking and therefore I think they relate to the Placemaking Report. I support the idea of one way routes in the Village. Harvest Road is currently used as a ‘rat run’ by drivers who want to travel through to Priest Hill towards Windsor but do not want to wait at the junction on the A30 (where it meets St Jude’s Road). I strongly believe the short one-way part of Harvest Road should be closed off (where it meets the corner of South Road). Drivers leaving the RHUL car park would have to turn right and join the A30. This would significantly reduce traffic through the residential parts of the Village and make it a much safer and more enjoyable place to live.	Noted- this is a repeat of ref 9 comments- see above.	None	None
11	I agree with all the aims of the neighbourhood plan. Areas that affect me the most are Royal Holloway development, present and future. Health facilities Housing for all people especially young residents in Englefield Green who have to leave the green Transport facilities for those who cannot cycle or walk far. Tied to this is Community transport and school buses. Thank you to the Committee and all involved for managing to produce this comprehensive plan over the last few years to make a difference to our village.	Noted and thank you for your support	None	None
12	I have read the Englefield Green Village Neighbourhood Plan and am very appreciative of all the hard work that has gone in to it. I fully endorse it. Areas that affect me most are Royal Holloway and it’s students, walking, cycling, housing, parking and the disappearing amenities like post offices and banks. School buses are an important issue. Lack of buses to Ashford and St.Peters Hospitals (they used to exist). Thank you once again for all the hard work that has gone in to this.	Noted and thank you for your support	None	None
13	Thanks to all those involved in producing the neighbourhood plan. It appears comprehensive and we support it.	Noted and thank you for your support	None	None
14	My comments so far relate to the section covering Listed and Locally listed Non-HRA section. There are a number of buildings which are of heritage interest and should be included in this report. They are: Egham Hill - Sutherland Lodge 1810 in the grounds of Sutherland House - it may be included in Sutherland House Grade II listing if it is I think it should be listed separately, in any case should be included. Egham Hill - The Packhorse Pub C18 or may be earlier. This is one of the oldest pubs which has been a drinking house for many centuries. Chestnut Drive - The Chestnuts 1865 may be earlier. Priest Hill - Priest Hill House C19	The list has been reviewed and where properties have been added to the list, notification letters have been issued.	Changes to Appendix D	Changes to NDHA document

15	This is not a comment but a clarification, concerning St Jude's Church and its listed building status. In some places (for example on p27 of the Masterplan final report section B) it appears as St Simon and St Jude's Church. This was the original intended dedication, and it appears that Royal Mail and the Ordnance Survey were given that and still use it. However at the last minute before the opening in July 1859 it was decided to drop St Simon, and since then it has been St Jude's Church - the registers are from the start just headed St Jude's, when Englefield Green became an independent parish in 1930 the official records are for The Parish Church of St Jude, and at the union with the Methodists in 2004 we became St Jude's United Church. When Listing of buildings came in, St Jude's Church was listed Grade II, but it was upgraded to Grade II* on 17 November 1986; the entry on the definitive list can be found at https://www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1028958 . Runnymede BC's list has not been updated, though their map has. In your documentation I have found I think three cases of each version.	Noted, thank you	No incorrect references in NP	Not correct- no cnange to other documents
16	RHUL1 and HMOs	Noted, the Steering Group and Local Councillors are aware of the concerns and working with RBC. Unfortunately they cannot be directly addressed through the Neighbourhood Plan.	None	None
17	Hi there, I writing in reference to policy rhul1. I do not think RHUL should be allowed to have any further development in the Area. Further, I think that there are too many HMO in the area. I think that an article 4 direction needs be applied to the plan. Kind regards	Noted, the Steering Group and Local Councillors are aware of the concerns and working with RBC. Unfortunately they cannot be directly addressed through the Neighbourhood Plan.	None	None
18	Tried to plough through! Well done everyone involved. I want to address St Judes Road between the Spar and Smiths Supermarket, I live there opposite the church, amongst the students. My concern is the bins on this beautiful stretch of road, the lovely houses opposite the church are blighted by tenants not taking in (or even putting out) their bins. Could we not have big communal bins on the corner of Englehurst, negating the need for bins in the small gardens (or down the stairs in our case as we have a flat). This stretch of the road is known as bin alley and I've seen little school children run into them and in one case hurt themselves quite badly. Nothing we do persuades tenants to take the bins in and the landlords really don't care. Are there any plans to address this issue?	Noted- this is not a matter that the Neighbourhood Plan can resolve. Local councillors and EGVRA are aware of the problems. Remodelling of the street, as suggested in the Placemaking proposals, could provide an opportunity for clever design that discourages this sort of behaviour.	None	None
19	(a) Policy ND4 - Coopers Hill development. This is a large site and given the sloping terrain it is likely that it will be visually intrusive especially when viewed from Runnymede fields, again especially at night when the current 'dark sky' view of the hill near the RAF memorial is a key feature of our village. The traffic issues related to Coopers Hill lane and particularly the junction arrangements leading into the main road to our village are very difficult right now, for the Coopers Hill development to progress this issue will need special attention. (b) Policy ES2 - Local centre commercial facilities, the loss of community shops and facilities over the years is very regrettable. Street wise development has managed the planning restrictions by the introduction of 'pretend' businesses. I strongly support the restriction of Class E application as a device to deliver more student housing. Also the introduction of shutters to the existing shops (maybe due to disruption during busy funerals) is a backward step. Incentives to bring community facilities back like shops and possibly a post office with a good cash machine without charging would be helpful. (c) Policy RHUL1 - The campus masterplan was a useful guide of intentions from the University. At the time they stated that students are not permitted to bring cars but also admitted that they cannot control car use if they are parked in the village so control of this huge disrupter to our streets is difficult. The University also admitted that the growth in student numbers would attract more staff (in the order of 200 plus I recall) and they will be seeking to park. At the time RHUL hade no plans to develop more parking for staff or students. They should be encouraged to build greater onsite parking provision for both groups. (d) As a general comment I think that this is an excellent piece of work - thank you.	(a) See response (4) above (b) The problems are noted in Placemaking Section 1.2 and the remodelling proposed in Section 3.1 Central Area Remodelling is intended to encourage and make more convenient local shopping. The Design Codes should provide a basis for a steady change to a consistent frontage along the shop fronts. (c) Noted (d) Noted and thank you for your support	None	None
20	Section 15 Traffic andTransport	See 21 below	None	None
21	(a)Section 15. I did not see any reference in this section to the traffic impact of the proposed developments on Wick Lane/ Blays Lane and Coopers Hill RHUL (Kingswood). The road access is already dire in both cases, access to the A30 from Wick Lane is poor and using Blays Lane will only add to village congestion. Access to Coopers Hill Lane from A328 (Priest Hill) is becoming increasingly dangerous. Should either of these developments take place, there needs to be serious consideration to traffic safety and traffic calming. In both cases the anticipated development will significantly add to the volume of traffic on these roads. (b) Priest Hill is a speed challenge, and an accident is waiting to happen. (c) The main road through the Village also needs a major rethink with delivery lorries etc, parked cars and bus stops all causing a major hazard. The speed bumps make a difference but in order to preserve and develop the heart of the Village the plan must take this into consideration. (d) Access improvements to Saville Gardens and the Fairmont Hotel also need to be considered as Wick Lane is no longer fit for purpose, especially access out to the A328 and where Wick Lane becomes Wick Road. (e) There are other areas where the road infrastructure urgently needs improving e.g. A328 into Bond Street.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot resolve driver behaviour issues. (a) Both masterplans are intended simply to test the feasability and quantum of the sites. Whoever develops each of these sites will be responsible for producing proposals that are acceptable to RBC and Surrey Highways, and these could deviate considerably from the Masterplans (though we would expect to see justification for those deviations). Note that the the plan for the Wick Road site (already allocate by RBC) includes preventing access directly to Blays Lane except for pedestrians and cyclists. See also the comments at (4) above. (b) Placemaking suggests a 40mph speed limit on this road (see Placemaking P16). (c) See Placemaking sections 2.4 and 3.1.(d) The majority of those who responded to the questionnaire wanted the lanes and byways	None	None
22	(a)I am pleased to see the proposals in the Placemaking and Movement Report produced by i-transport. The central village area would be hugely improved for pedestrians by removing the parking areas which create quite a danger at present during the school runs especially. I would like to see more consideration in the northern part of the village to measures for pedestrians particularly in relation to Barley Mow Road and the route to the infant school. The volume of car traffic for drop offs and pick ups at all the schools in the village is unpleasant and affects the experience for pedestrians and cyclists. If the village was better designed for pedestrians and cyclists, restricting the access for cars to park close to the schools, this would help encourage more people to choose walking or cycling. (b) On a separate note, I frequently use the junction Willow Walk / St Judes Road by foot, cycle and car and I am unsure the double roundabout is necessary.	(a) Noted- but see also I Transport Appendix A, where various pedestrian orientated recommendations are made for the wider area. Still work to do, but the importance of better catering for pedestrian and 'other transport' is noted. (b) Noted- These are only preliminary proposals and there is a long way to go before a final design is agreed.	None	None
23	I want to start by thanking the Forum for all their hard work and time in producing this informative Neighbourhood Plan. I appreciate that it is difficult to understand all aspects of the village and to be totally accurate hence requesting villagers feedback. Here are my additional comments to those made previously.	(a) Noted thank you(b) Fletchers is the only garage. Staines Diesels only manufacture and refurbish diesel pumps now, so is 'manufacturing' or 'engineering' but the front	a) Reference to Students Union running the Packhorse inserted	None

	(a)Paragraph 13.2 - The Packhorse- you state that is owned by RHUL my understanding is that it is not owned by them, it is still owned by the brewery (not sure which one) RHUL Students Union are the licensees. I am sure if you checked the Land Registry the ownership can be confirmed. (b) Paragraph 13.15 - Commercial Properties - Map3 is very small so it is unclear whether the reference to 1 Garage includes Staines Diesel in Victoria Street or Fletchers Garage in Bagshot Road or should it include both? (c) Paragraph 16.1 The sentence states on-going need for the college to grow. This should be amended to confirm that once Proctor and Gamble site has been completed no further student growth should occur. EG is a village and we cannot cope with anymore students living and parking their cars here. (d) Policy RHUL1 - it states that sustainable development as per the Master Plan will be supported. This is not acceptable and goes against what is acceptable and later on in the list of Non-Designated Heritage Assets you quite rightly have list Wettons Terrace. In the Master Plan Wettons Terrace is due to be demolished. Your opening statement needs to be amended. Also eventhough RHUL are currently planning to re-develop THe Chestnuts - which in my previous feedback I said should be on the Non-Designated Heritage Assets Lists. In the Masterplan it states it will be demolished and replaced with two buildings on that site. As the RHUL Masterplan covers will 2030 this could still happen. There may be other similar examples.. Your wording needs to change as you cannot state the RHUL Master Plan will be supported. (e) There is no mention at all about HMOs. This is a huge, huge problem with lots of residents in the village whether it is as a result of excessive noise, rubbish or in appropriate behaviour. Also the inappropriateness of 6 Bed HMOs being built with 2 bed bungalow roads to mention a recent issue many of us residents and EGVRA tried to stop. In order to tackle this real problem you need to include in this plan an Article 4 Direction aimed at HMOs. I look forward to reading your amended Neighbourhood Plan. Best Wishes	area is theirs, where they sell cars, whch presumably is 'car show room'? (c) RHUL cannot be prevented from expanding provided they get planning permission. Further measures, such as a stronger liaison between 'Town and Gown' could help ensure RHUL acts as a responsible neighbour. (d)The site has already been allocated in the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan and its background documents are therefore unable to change this. The Masterplan has therfore been produced as a guidance document. (e) See (notes on 17 above)		
24	(a & b)I live in Middle Hill near pub. We have problems with cars not giving way, arguments on the road. Also HGV lorries squeezing by dont give way my car was damaged as a car had to reverse to let him by and my car was hit. Also the house shakes. I have had 2 cars damaged and people that use the pub park on the road. By just reducing the speed limit in the village will bring more traffic to middle hill. We need humps on the road near the pub as this is where the problem is. As you come down middle hill we are seeing cars parked on the other side of the road too.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot resolve driver behaviour issues. (a) Changes and additions to the public realm can only be undertaken by the relevant authorities. The Neighbourhood Plan can introduce aspirations through the Placemaking Document, but not dictate their implementation. (b) We have now included Middle Hill from Parsonage Road to the A30 in our suggested 20mph zone ((Option 1 p16, Placemaking) have suggested weight restrictions on certainroads, including Middle Hill, and possible Road width restrictions where practical (Placemaking P15). It is acknowledged that parking restrictions elsewhere might affect Middle Hill and that there would need to be countermeasures if	None	Placemaking P16, map, Option 1, altered to include Middle Hill below Parsonage Road in 20mph zone.
25	I've lived in Englefield Green for over 15 years and seen an ever increasing speeding, parking and traffic increase on our road from people passing through. We returned from holiday today to find one of our vehicles had been badly scraped parking on the road. I have asked many times for a parking permit system especially in our road and double yellow lines opposite 59 Harvest Road so the road is not dangerously narrow and cars then cannot pass or damage the resident's cars in the adjacent side. I hope something will come of these requests to avoid anymore damage or potential accidents. Thank you.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot resolve driver behaviour issues.	None	None
26	(a) While we generally support the recommendations, we are concerned that the report focuses on transport/road improvements for the A328 (St Jude's Road). We have concerns about the implications on surrounding roads, with fears it pushes traffic on to smaller, residential roads. (b) However, we are disappointed that road calming measures are not proposed for other key entry/exit points to the village. As residents of Middle Hill, we note that the report highlights the lower half of the hill is typically single lane and therefore problematic. We share these concerns, with vehicles travelling too fast, using pavements as a separate vehicle lane (driving along the pavement for 200-300m instead of waiting for traffic to pass), and a lack of respect to other users (vehicles not waiting for cyclists to pass). Not only does this impact the general vibe of the area, it is a safety issue (our child was nearly hit by a car driving along the pavement). We would therefore like to see the plans extended to consider traffic calming measures along all entry and exit points to the village. We welcome the idea of 20mph limit and installing road calming measures, but feel it should be applied to all residential areas not just the high street area of A328.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot resolve driver behaviour issues. Changes and additions to the public realm can only be undertaken by the relevant authorities. The Neighbourhood Plan can introduce aspirations through the Placemaking Document, but not dictate their implementation. (a) The Placemaking document acknowledges the points made (P17) and the need to monitor and react. (b) See Response 24	None	Placemaking P16, map, Option 1, altered to include Middle Hill below Parsonage Road in 20mph zone.
27	From our understanding, the proposed plan is pushing for 20 miles per hour speed limit for the centre of the village, and a restricted parking zone. However, this significantly fails to cover the whole of Middle Hill! Therefore there is a real danger is that if these speed limits and parking restrictions are enforced just for the centre, excluding Middle Hill, it will make a significantly negative impact on the remainder of Middle Hill as particualrly student parking will then transfer to our road and even more traffic will use Middle Hill. Over the many years that we have lived in this road, due to the closure of the other entry/exit to the A30 plus the traffic calming measures on St Judes road and Tite Hill, the levels of traffic using Middle Hill have dramatically increased as it is seen as a rat and speed run, so this further proposal is really unacceptable.	See Response (24) above	None	Placemaking P16, map, Option 1, altered to include Middle Hill below Parsonage Road in 20mph zone.
28	Placemaking Report 2.4 (page 15). After reading this, I'm very concerned about your proposal for Middle Hill. Middle Hill is a residential road but since Tite road was closed for a year it is now used as a through road for all vehicles. I regularly see Coaches, HGV and other large vehicles going up and down the road causing blockages. However, even with cars the flow of traffic is awful, there are regular traffic jams, road rage & cars passing each other by driving on the pavement. In the last few months I have had cars crash into our parked cars (didn't leave details) Moreover, Middle Hill by the A30 is like a student car park where they can park for free and be in walking distance of the Uni. The proposed plan is pushing for 20 miles per hour speed limit for the centre of the village, and a restricted parking zone. However, it does not go far enough to cover the whole of Middle Hill. The real danger is that if these speed limits and parking restrictions are enforced just for the centre, excluding Middle Hill, it'll just make the situation much worse as parking pressure and traffic is forced on to Middle Hill. I have spoken to other residents of Middle Hill and many share the same view and will hopefully be commenting further on this. I have also contacted Cllr Andrea Berardi about this and I hope his opinion on this is also considered. Any questions please feel free to contact me	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot resolve driver behaviour issues. Changes and additions to the public realm can only be undertaken by the relevant authorities. The Neighbourhood Plan can introduce aspirations through the Placemaking Document, but not dictate their implementation. See Response (24) above	None	Placemaking P16, map, Option 1, altered to include Middle Hill below Parsonage Road in 20mph zone.

29	EGVNP-REG-14. I wish to raise my concerns regarding parking and speed restrictions being implemented within Englefield Green, but NOT on Middle Hill. YET AGAIN MIDDLE HILL IS BEING IGNORED Middle Hill is frequently used a a cut through road by speeding motorists, taxi drivers, heavy goods vehicles, coaches and erratically rides motorbikes. The level of traffic using Middle Hill has increased dramatically over the past few years, I have indeed contacted the local authorities on numerous occasions raising my concern on the speed of the traffic using the Hill and the fact that due to parked vehicles on the Hill causing pinch points that vehicles including lorries frequently mount the pavements. I frequently feel intimidated while walking with my grandchildren on the pavements due to aggressive drivers. I also frequently find it difficult to drive away from my home due to the amount of traffic racing up and down Middle Hill. To improve safety for all residents of Middle Hill, we need the speed bumps repaired and increased in size as per Tite Hill. In fact since the speed humps have been increased on Tite Hill, speeding cars now choose to use Middle Hill to avoid them. The 20mph speed limit must be implemented on Middle Hill, along with the flashing speed control signs fitted. We also need resident parking or timed parking restrictions as the students and others that park at the bottom of the hill make it difficult to drive up and down the hill due to pinch points. There also needs to be parking restrictions, single yellow lines along the rest of the hill, particularly around Parsonage Road junction. The speed of heavy goods vehicles racing up and down the hill cause our home to shake and pictures move on the wall. We frequently suffer with congestion on the hill due to traffic coming head to head and drivers refusing to give way, as parked vehicles cause narrow passing points. The curves in the hill cause spots were visibility is restricted particularly by The Beehive Pub. Large amounts of money have been spent on Tite Hill, and Alderside Walk on improving road surfaces and safety, yet Middle Hill gets neglected and used as a rat run, with nothing being done to protect the safety of the residents. Will it take a serious road traffic incident on Middle Hill for action to be taken, I hope not. PLEASE IMPLEMENT 20 MPH Speed limit 7 5 TONNE RESTRICTIONS RESIDENT /RESTRICTED PARKING	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot resolve driver behaviour issues. Changes and additions to the public realm can only be undertaken by the relevant authorities. The Neighbourhood Plan can introduce aspirations through the Placemaking Document, but not dictate their implementation. See Response 24 above	None	Placemaking P16, map, Option 1, altered to include Middle Hill below Parsonage Road in 20mph zone.
30	EGVNP-reg-14 As resident on Middle Hill for over 20 years we have seen the traffic increasing to now dangerous levels and speeds, also the increase in student parking. This causes gridlock at times and aggressive driving including driving down the pavement while pedestrians and school children walk to local schools. The parking has also prevented emergency vehicles passage. Large HGV's use the hill and get stuck at parking pinch spots and have to reverse up/down the hill to divert. There should be 3.5 ton weight limit, 20mph speed limit and permit parking on this narrow cut through road. I have pictures showing vehicles driving down the pavement where there is a exit from a pathway from Alderside Walk to Middle Hill opposite to No 37. I suggest that a protective post is installed by the kerb to prevent a possible fatality of pedestrians exiting the restricted view path by vehicles passing parked cars on the pavement. I have sent photographs before to Surry council but as there is no facility to attach files to this document I will send them directly to Andrea Berardi. I hope this information will be used to help with your decision to make our village a safer place for -"	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot resolve driver behaviour issues. Changes and additions to the public realm can only be undertaken by the relevant authorities. The Neighbourhood Plan can introduce aspirations through the Placemaking Document, but not dictate their implementation. See Response 24 above	None	Placemaking P16, map, Option 1, altered to include Middle Hill below Parsonage Road in 20mph zone.
31	(a) We love living in the village however since the expansion of the University the damage to the Village and all it's residents should be addressed and therefore feature in detail in any plans to do with the Village. I imagine the University has in some way sponsored this document? Therefore can it be truly impartial? (b) Depending on where in the village you live we are affected to varying degrees by ASB particularly noise in the early hours, rubbish but also development in the village of what were once lovely homes intended to be 2-3 bedrooms and are now HMOs housing residents whom do not care about the maintenance and exterior (let alone interior) of the properties, Landlords who don't care and are not present, noise and an increased volume of cars. Tell me how your plan manages this?	(a) RHUL did not get involved in developing the Plan. See Communication record published on the website. (b) The Plan cannot deal with ASB and HMOs as these issues are not specifically related to planning permission	None	None
32	I would make the following suggestions: (a) Restrict speed limit to 30mph on the A30 and Middle Hill for safer pedestrian and cycle traffic (b) Introduce segregated cycle paths on the A30, Middle Hill and other key roads throughout the village.	(a) and (b). Already in the Placemaking doc, other than Middle Hill where width would make a segregated cycle way physically impossible. Increased cycling and pedestrian infrastructure is a key part of the Placemaking aspirations.	None	None
33	(a)Re Sections 7 and 8 I think we have reached optimum level of new development and support redevelopment and infill. I support policies ND3 and ND4 as long as the conditions such as attractive buildings , extensive green network are adhered to. (b) Re policy ND6 - presume that solar panels , heat pumps etc would need to be positioned discreetly. (c) Policy CF1 - a variety of village facilities is important , especially for the young of the village and maintenance is important. I remember the long hard fight to obtain discreet overhead lighting for Coopers Hill Tennis courts. A balanced and reasonable view should be applied when providing these facilities. (d) Policy ES2 - important to have a variety of local shops with appropriate shopfronts (e) Section 15/ Policy TT3 I would like to see all speed bumps removed. They are unsightly and dangerous, especially on Tite Hill where if traffic both ways align they are dangerously close. I would strongly prefer speed limits applied on St. Jude's Road, Middle Hill, Tite Hill and particularly Bishopsgate Road. The latter has a very dangerous 'blind' bend and is now used by not only school traffic and cyclists and visitors to Windsor Park but also increased large commercial vehicles for the Fairmont hotel and the Windsor Court build. A cycle lane is desperately needed here. (f) I also dislike the change to free public parking by the Bishopsgate gate, the Bailiwick gate and Savill Garden. (g) I also hope that the university is banned from student double decker buses driving through the village. (h) Policy RHUL 1 The university needs to provide discreet student parking and to discourage students as much as possible from bringing cars. (i) Section 17 Street signs should be kept to a minimum, superfluous ones removed , defunct telegraph poles should be removed and street furniture should be attractive and in keeping with the surrounding village buildings. (j) Finally, many thanks to all of those who worked so hard on this comprehensive plan. The village needs you!	(a) Noted (b) Taken into account in the planning application process. (c) Noted (d) Noted and the proposed Placemaking Central Area remodelling is intended to encourage shopping, whilst the Design Codes should introduce a degree of consistancy in any shopfront redevelopment. (e) Noted. Both Placemaking (eg P25) and I Transport's initial study of the Central Area remodelling propose removal of the humps in St Judes Road and replace them with alternative traffic calming measures. Other areas would require study to ensure that alternatives assist in reducing speed. Placemaking discussed cycling routes on P13 and notes that all routes need improvement.(f) Noted (g) Noted (h) Noted- see Placemaking P17 (i) Noted- one of the main points of the Placemaking Central Area proposals (Section 2.5) is to establish consistancy and continuity in the style of street furniture (j) Noted and thank you for your support	None	None

34	I write with regard to the ongoing review of the Englefield Green Neighbourhood Plan. I understand this proposes the introduction of a 20mph limit in much of the village, but not on Middle Hill, where we live. I find that astonishing – if there is one road in the village that has serious safety issues and needs better traffic management, it is Middle Hill. Please see below a summary of the issues, from our recent experience. Middle Hill, particularly the lower portion (from Parsonage Road downwards), is a narrow residential road not suited to through traffic. It is also arguably the prettiest and most historic road in the village. However, it is used as a rat run by large numbers of vehicles, including sometimes heavy vehicles, despite good alternative routes on the A30 and Tite Hill. For a good part of the length there is no pavement on one side of the road, so residents walk straight from their drives onto the road. This can be very dangerous – sometimes people walk along the road in the absence of a pavement – e.g. I recently saw a mother and daughter on their way to school picking their way along the roadside as cars whizzed past. Many of the Victorian homes are right next to the road (including ours) and shake significantly when heavier traffic passes, particularly at speed. Most of the older homes also lack off-street parking, so the street below Parsonage Road is lined with parked cars and there is only room for one car to pass. This regularly leads to cars meeting head to head, sometimes with tailbacks resulting. I have seen many instances of confrontations between drivers, aggressive driving, drivers using pavements to pass each other, etc. Parked cars are also at risk of getting scratched (ours was earlier this year). Both Tite Hill and St Jude's Road are wider, less densely residential, not lined with parked cars, and houses are set back from the road. They are suitable for through traffic, whereas Middle Hill isn't. Yet while they both have significant traffic calming measures, Middle Hill does not (save for residents' parked cars, which is far from safe!). Options for reducing and slowing traffic could involve: (i) Blocking the road entirely to all vehicles (except cyclists). This could be done at the bottom at the A30 junction, or higher up, e.g. between Parsonage Road and Lodge Close. I think the latter would probably work best on average for most residents. Those lower down the hill would have access to the A30, but would have to use the A30 and Harvest Road / A328 to access Englefield Green. Consideration could be given to allowing a right turn onto the A30, given the small number of residents that would now be doing this. Those higher up the hill would need to go further up to turn down Tite Hill to head into Egham. I, for one, would consider this a small price to pay for returning Middle Hill to the attractive residential street it should be. (ii) Alternatively, the street could be made one-way at a pinch point (eg with Harvest Road). This	See Response 24 above		
35	(a) Cycling and walking : I regularly cycle across the village from Alderside Walk to the allotments in Bond Street (Access via Northcroft Road) Kings Lane , and the Hub in Larchwood Drive . I would like to cycle to the Great Park gates , but there are no bike racks in any of these places. (b) Traffic calming in Kings Lane and Bishops gate Road and wick Lane please .	(a) Noted (b) Noted	None	None
36	(a) Central Area - Village Heart - Public Realm Scheme Option 1 Englefield Green has always been a quiet and respectful community, that was one of the main reasons for me and my family moving into and remaining in the village. Having studied your proposals for various parts of the village I am very concerned that your traffic and street design has been produced by a company who have little understanding of our community. Quiet, green, open space is at a premium in the center of our village, the Cemetery, green, open space between a) the Cross of Sacrifice, b) the Village War Memorial and c) the footpath from St Jude's Road to the Church is vital and should be retained. The very same area is consecrated land, set aside for burial, and as such it is afforded legal protection in perpetuity. As I understand from your drawings, to enable the introduction of car parking along the west side of St Jude's Road you propose: . to move the cemetery boundary wall from its current position to a line very close to the existing historic graves behind the village memorial. . to move the Village War Memorial forward to facilitate the above. . to block pave over the consecrated land , a green open space. . to Insert a bicycle Stand between the Cross and Memorial. I strongly object to the above for the following reason: . this area is CONCECRATED LAND set aside for burial in perpetuity !! . this is the only green area in the Centre of our village . this area provides a green space away from traffic of all types, where people can sit and contemplate our Village Memorial and those Village People listed on it. In the same proposal, you insert a layby on the now footpath on the west side of St Jude's Road. Then a footpath along the line of the existing cemetery wall and a cycle way across the front of the memorial. This repeats mistakes of the past which places pedestrians at risk, this is a school route, footpaths should be separated from car and cycle routes.	(a) Noted. The purpose of the Central Area Remodelling scheme is explained in the Placemaking document and the I Transport limited study has been carried out to demonstrate, in principle, the feasability of the scheme, highlight the problem areas, and provide an initial costing. There is a long way to go before a scheme is designed or carried out. The concerns are noted and solutions will need to be found.	None	None
37	I would like to congratulate the EG Forum on the Neighbourhood Plan. It is not easy and to have got this far is a real achievement. Well Done! Please can you correct the introduction that says the Magna Carta was "signed" instead of sealed. It is thought it was sealed in beeswax from local hives.	Noted and thank you for your support.	Text changed	None
38	I refer to the draft Village Plan and the Placemaking document dated August 2022 and the preliminary proposals for a dual lane cycle route on St Judes Rd. Although we commend the intent for a defined cycle route through the village we object strongly to any proposal which would move the memorial from its current position. From a purely logistical perspective the proposal to move the memorial backwards and further into the cemetery land would prove very difficult to achieve on the basis that the land on which it is built is consecrated ground and any movement of the memorial would also effect the siting of existing important and historic graves which currently lay around it. We understand that these proposals are only preliminary at this stage but in future the Trustees would appreciate the opportunity to engage directly with the Forum and be consulted on any proposals which may effect it. While writing we are pleased to see that the Memorial has been included in the Forum's proposed list for non-designated heritage sites and the additional responsibility this gives to the designers of adjacent development proposals of any type to respect the siting and setting of this Village asset.	Noted- see Response (36) above. The proposals we have put forward for the Central Area do not involve moving the memorial but to 'Incorporate war memorial into widened public realm creating a focal meeting point' P13, I Transport report- also see P31 of the Placemaking report. We would expect that whoever takes these plans forward would liaise with all stakeholders.	None	None
39	Very thorough and informative. Some thought provoking ideas which will no doubt spark lively debate! I particularly like the plan for the preservation of the Victorian centre of the village	Noted and thank you for your support	None	None
40	I have read the EGVNP and believe it encapsulates sensible and imaginative elements to preserve and enhance life in Englefield Green	Noted and thank you for your support	None	None
41	The whole of middle hill needs to be included in the village speed restrictions and parking restrictions plan as there is already awful traffic and parking issues that will just worsen	See Response 24 above	None	None
42	CCTV in Englefield Green town centre	Noted	None	None
43	Very thorough and informative. Some thought provoking ideas which will no doubt spark lively debate! I particularly like the plan for the preservation of the Victorian centre of the village	Noted and thank you for your support	None	None

44	Neighbourhood Plan & Design Codes Firstly I would like to express my appreciation to all those people involved in preparing and presenting such a good clear and informative documents I have two principle points regarding these reports for the future :- (a) Roads and carparks must be adapted to electric vehicles asap with soft landscaping (b)The Green is the centre of the Village and should be protected for future generations use and pleasure but without any further development than exists at present including the urbanizing effect of car parking on open green spaces Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment	Noted and thank you for your support (1) Noted-if you mean small electric vehicle such as scooters and electric bikes/ trikes etc, then the Placemaking proposals contain substantial remodelling suggestions to adapt to the future. If you mean cars, then we understand RBC are already starting to fit street charging points in Victoria Street, and new developments will be obliged to fit charging points. (2) The Green is owned by The Crown Estate and leased to RBC who manage it under a strict set of rules that will not allow further development.	None	None
45	Regarding the Placemaking Document, I found the ideas as to how the village could be improved for cyclists, pedestrians, traffic flow and improved public transport very forward thinking, especially in the climate crisis that we all face.	Noted and thank you for your support	None	None
46	(a) Section 3.18. Please note there is a nursery not listed on the EGVNP document in this section, this nursery is Shining pandas nursery pre school. Without this establishment I would be unable to remained working during the pandemic as an Occupational Therapist and financially I would have been in great difficulty. It is located on kinds lane off of Bond Street. It is for children aged 2-4 years and is term time only. It's a small nursery. It is one of the more affordable childcare establishments in the area and is exploring opening up to 5:30 for working parents and providing some childcare over summer holidays. (b) 3.25 the site at kings lane which is mentioned is dilapidated and tired looking, often with broken glass and nitrous oxide canisters. Access to it is poorly lit and no accessible paths (often covered) (c) 3.29 as mentioned many do not have access to a car. Especially in these times with higher cost of living, unfortunately the transport links (buses) whilst drivers are courteous, friendly, the bus service is costly compared to London, it costs £2.50 from Englefield green to Egham.. and the timetable is infrequent. This isolates the elderly, disabled and those who do not have the privileged of owning a car who are unable to drive. The walk from Englefield green to Egham is approx 40 minutes at a good pace and is up hill on the return. The need to access Egham or staines is due to the lack of essential needs in the village. Largely an affordable supermarket, no dentist surgery, and no bank or post office.	(a)Noted and text added(b) Noted (c) Noted-a dedicated shuttle bus is suggested in the Placemaking proposals (P33)	a)reference added	None
47	(a)In my opinion a NP for EG is long overdue as the village has suffered too long from haphazard unsympathetic development and short term thinking and planning decisions. (b)Policy ND5. The design Codes offer positive guidance to developers and it is desirable that some specific codes apply to different parts of the NP Area. (c) 17.4-17.8. I would suggest close attention is given to CIL money generated in the NP Area to ensure the spend in EG is the expected proportion of the overall monies raised. The NP should set out a formal structure or identify a body responsible for the monitoring this activity on a regular basis and identify who will decide where to allocate the spend over the various projects suggested in the Place-Making study 17.1. (d) 8.6-8.8. RHUL are planning an increase of 20% in student numbers to 12,000 while conveniently stating university accommodation will be built to house the increase (34% of 10,000 to 46% of 12,000). 70% of residents want no further increase in student accommodation in the village and RBC will resist such accommodation unless conditions are met. I am alarmed at the recent high proportion of HMO applications to convert existing properties from family homes. I therefore agree with Policies ND1 and 2 but feel these could be extended and strengthened to cover the HMO problem. (e) Policies HE 1 and 2. I agree wholeheartedly and would encourage the NP to include village car parks to highlight their existence as part of the Community Facilities in Policy CF1. (f) Car parking within the village centre and surrounding roads is a real problem and I agree with Policy TT1, the first paragraph of which should be rigidly applied. (g) RHUL1. I consider this policy should be stronger. The proposed multi-storey car park in the old part of the village should be strongly resisted until the current views relating to future long car parking strategy of RHUL are known. A recent planning application indicates that new structures within the campus are planned to be extended and created using some existing car parking facilities within the campus. (h) Overall, I thank those responsible for their sterling efforts in producing the NP for EG.	(a) Noted (b) Noted (c) The process for CIL money delivery and spent is with RBC and cannot be changed via the Neighbourhood Plan.The Forum are in contact with RBC and local councillors on a regular basis and will endeavour to be involved in such decisions.(d) Regretfully see Response 17 above (e) Noted although village carparks do not come under the definition of community facilities (f) Noted (g) Unfortunately the RHUL master plan, approved by RBC in 2014, includes the car park in Harvest Road. RHUL do undertake car parking requirement studies, but it will be up to residents to hold them to account each time a new building proposal sacrifices existing car park space, or increase in staff and student numbers are planned. (h) Noted and thank you for your support.	None	None
48	(a) The Steering Group should be congratulated on an excellent job with the Village Plan. Of particular note are the focus on Section 7.00 Sustainable Development, The Natural Environment Section 11.00 including the recommendations on replacing trees lost to development which is most welcomed. (b) Section 15.4 could go a stage further in recommending a village speed limit of 20mph in common with many villages and urban areas across the UK. (c) The desire to enhance the commercial centre around St. Jude's and Victoria Street is also welcomed along with the Placemaking Initiative and suggested travel hub in Victoria Street	(a) Noted and thank you for your support (b) Placemaking Section 2.4 'Speed Limits' and map P16 recommends 20mph speed limits in the Village (c) Noted	None	None
49	The Steering Group should be congratulated on an excellent job with the Village Plan. Of particular note are the focus on Section 7.00 Sustainable Development, The Natural Environment Section 11.00 including the recommendations on replacing trees lost to development which is most welcomed. Section 15.4 could go a stage further in recommending a village speed limit of 20mph in common with many villages and urban areas across the UK. The desire to enhance the commercial centre around St. Jude's and Victoria Street is also welcomed along with the Placemaking Initiative and suggested travel hub in Victoria Street	A repeat of Ref 47- see above	None	None
50	(a) I think it's important to protect the Victorian heritage of the village and any new developments should be in sympathy with the Victorian architecture. Flats such as Arista Court cannot be allowed again. (b) It's a shambles that the council has provided so little 106 money to improve the village; this needs to be corrected retrospectively.(c) St Jude's Road could be made more appealing to the eye with more trees and planters, perhaps paved pavements as well. At one stage there was a plan to plant cherry trees just inside the cemetery, this should be reconsidered as well as additional seating on the grassy areas in St Jude's Road. Anything to make the village green more attractive with more plants and Victorian style lampposts. (d) Any further HMOs should not be allowed to go through as RHUL is developing ample accommodation on the old P&G site. (e) Parking continues to be an issue during term time and anything that can be done to discourage students parking in the roads is desirable, however, if they are only offered paid parking on the campus the roads will continue to be their first choice. (f)Anyone who breaks planning permission, retrospective, or otherwise, must be made to adhere to the council's decision and not ignore it.(g) Overall, I support the village plan and what it seeks to achieve.	(a) This is why we have introduced Design Codes (b) Noted, however this is not possible due to the legalities of s106 (c) Included in the Placemaking proposals (d) HMO's are beyond the control of Neighbourhood Plan policies which are relevant to planning applications (e) Controlled parking zones are suggested as the solution in the Placemaking proposals (f) Agree, residents should monitor and inform RBC to ensure they are appropriately applied.(g) Noted and thank you for your support.	None	None

51	(a) With regard to the Village Plan, I note with some concern that there is no on street parking on one side of Alexandra Road. Yesterday I counted 22 vehicles parked on the affected side of the road with only two spaces available on the side designated for parking. Given that Albert Road, Armstrong Road and South Road are usually full with vehicles belonging to their residents, so these roads will not be available to the affected residents of Alexandra Road. Perhaps those responsible for said plan would be kind enough to inform us where we are going to be allowed to park, given that Victoria street has only limited parking with time restrictions and a great length of double yellow lines where parking is prohibited at any time. This also raises a very real and large security concern for lone women who have been forced to park a long distance from where they live and then having to walk back to Alexandra Road. Is putting women at risk a part of the plan. Also, I for one would prefer my car to be nearby for security reasons, rather than left unattended in some remote area where I am sure that thieves of catalytic converters would be happy to see them there. And what of visitors to residents of our road, forced to park some distance from us and in my case having to carry their children and associated paraphernalia too. Sounds a great idea especially if the weather is inclement. (b) May I suggest that Royal Hollway take some long needed actions regarding their students and their parking facilities. The university is constantly looking to increase the number of students attending, yet incessantly fails to provide adequate parking for those currently attending. Any future increase in student numbers will only make this problem worse. In my opinion this is a superbly ridiculous part of the plan, but by making RHUL provide adequate on campus parking for their students would eradicate the need for such crazy suggestions for Alexandra Road and of course allow the residents to park close to home, which is their right. I sincerely hope that this part of the plan is no longer considered viable. Why inflict problems for residents by trying to fix something that could easily be fixed by RHUL taking responsibility for the problems that it causes. Alexandra Road works very well in its current incarnation, and by making Albert and Armstrong one way I can see much more traffic using Alexandra Road, causing added noise and air pollution for its residents.	(a) The Neighbourhood Plan is unable to control drivers behaviour and where they park. The Placemaking proposals are a first point at identifying problem areas and suggesting solutions. All proposals will require development, further study and further consultation, and the points you have raised need to be taken into account. (b) See Response 50 item (5).	None	None
52	Sustainability and sustainable modes of transport. (a) I was not aware of the travel survey otherwise I would have completed it. (b)The pavement/footpath between Englefield Green and Virginia water via Bakeham Lane/Callow Hill is very poor and needs improvement. I did not have time to wade through all 1000 pages of documents, but of the several hundred I did read I found no mention of this footpath. One has to cross Callow Hill several times as the pavement is not continuous. The pavement is very narrow, uneven and in some places overgrown. It is very unsafe yet many people use this footpath. It needs significant improvement. I realise much of the footpath falls within the Virginia Water N plan area, so communication and cooperation with them would be needed. (c) I also feel there needs to be a proper footpath along Wick Road from the A30 junction to the Bailiwick. Thank you	(a) This was part of the Questionnaire . See 'Residents and Businesses Questionnaire' document. (b) Noted however maintenance is not a matter that can be dealt with by Neighbourhood Plan policies (c) Noted	None	None
53	My comment refers to the section of the plan which deals with Englefield Green Placemaking & Movement Client: Englefield Green Village Neighbourhood Forum i-Transport Ref: PH/MC/ITL17528-001A R Date: 05 September 2022 I applaud the work that the Forum has done in providing such a comprehensive overview of our Village and the hard work that has gone into the production of the plan and its distribution. I simply want to thank everyone involved. However, I write to you as the Vicar of St Jude's Church. The part of the plan which concerns me is that which touches on the Cemetery on St Jude's Road. It appears that the proposals outlined there would involve moving or encroaching on the War Memorials and annexing some of the land for transport purposes. I need to let you know that: a) Much of the land concerned is Consecrated Land. The planners of the newer of the two Memorials had to get the permission of the Ecclesiastical authorities to build on that land this Commemoration of the Dead. This was not, I believe, an easy or straightforward process since it involved engaging with Ecclesiastical Law, even to effect a change which might be considered a fitting and appropriate addition to a space which is Consecrated. In order to change the use, permission would need to be applied for once again and I am reasonably confident that such permission is unlikely to be granted. b) The proposal appears to involve annexing a section of the land which fronts St Jude's Church itself. In this instance I believe the land involved may not be consecrated. It is however, the property of the Church of England and any annexation of it would be subject again to Ecclesiastical Law, requiring a "Faculty" which would need to assess the views of the public regarding a potential change of use. A change in ownership of the land, should it be permitted, would also have financial implications for those acquiring it. c) As a resident of the Village myself, and as someone who greatly appreciates the War Memorials and the tribute they offer to our fallen, sadly I would feel unable to support any proposal which disturbs either the memorials themselves, or the land around them which is integral to their design. Thank you so much for your kind attention.	Your comments are noted- please see Responses 36 and 38 above. Thank you for your kind words regarding the rest of the Plan.	None	None
54	I have studied Regulation 14 (of the Neighbourhood Plan Regulations 2012) Consultation Document and am fully in agreement with the Section 6 'Vision and Aims'. In addition I have reviewed Annex A 'Table of Aims and Policies' and most sincerely thank the Forum Steering Committee for the immense amount of detailed, time-consuming work that has gone into the preparation of the excellent Consultation Document.	Noted and thank you for your support	None	None
55	Ecology report - would be very keen to see the reestablishment of the village pond on the green. Not only for ecology benefits of the pond itself and engagement with ecology at the heart of the village but also to regain part of the history of the village	Noted	None	None
56	My comments apply to all sections Thank you to everyone involved for such a thorough analysis of our local and careful forward thinking about the future of our village. This is an extremely comprehensive piece of work and I am completely supportive of it.	Noted and thank you for your support	None	None

57	My response relates to the Placemaking report and specifically, but not exclusively, to sections 2.4 and 2.5. (a) I was pleased to read that both long-term traffic & parking plans and speed limits were extremely high on issues that Englefield Green wished to be addressed as a matter of urgency, and I would whole heartedly agree. (2) Middle Hill is a major rat run into the Village for those drivers who do not wish to go up to the A30 St Jude's Road junction. This includes buses - especially when there is disruption on the A30, heavy lorries - only this week a car transporter came up Middle Hill, and most frequently taxi/Uber drivers. Few, if any, pay any regard to the speed limit. Many will mount the pavement where, on the blind bend just before the Bee Hive Pub coming up from the A30 but also down the hill, there are parked cars on one side of the road. It is in this stretch that there has been an increase in accidents on Middle Hill in recent months - three cars hit in as many months, including one from my household. I would strongly urge that the Option 1 of a 20 mph speed limit be extended to all entrance routes to the Village, and that would include Middle Hill. The speed limit will of course need to be enforced and I would suggest the provision of signs showing a vehicle's speed and, if necessary, cameras. I do not believe that speed bumps would work as drivers will aim to speed between them which would defeat the object, and would also create more noise and pollution. Knoll Cottage is very close to the road on Middle Hill and the noise, weight disturbance and pollution as heavy vehicles drive past, often at speed, is of concern - see the example of the car transporter above. The proposed weight limit for vehicles on Middle Hill should be introduced as a matter of urgency, and then enforced, perhaps by vehicle width barriers that would prevent anything but a car/small delivery vehicle coming up Middle Hill. Of course access for Emergency Vehicles should in no way be hampered. Many properties, especially the older properties, on Middle Hill do not have the luxury of off-street parking, and what parking there is is often used, some times for longer term parking during academic term times, by people who do not live on Middle Hill. These include students who live in RHUL accommodation which have insufficient parking and those who work at the University where there is also insufficient parking. I would like to see residents' parking introduced on Middle Hill for a reasonable fee. Parking permits should then be properly enforced. (b) The Placemaking report suggests that Tite Hill and Middle should be made one-way traffic. I do not agree with this. I believe it would only increase the speed that vehicles would travel on either Hill. It would also be a huge imposition on residents and householders on those two roads.	(a) Noted. (b) See Response 24.	None	Placemaking P16, map, Option 1, altered to include Middle Hill below Parsonage Road in 20mph zone.
58	Car Use and Parking 15.10 (a) Adequate provision of suitable and compatible on street charging facilities including both Rapid and Fast options. These installations should be 'future proofed' with adequate ducting for extensions.(b) Special attention to be given to a village car club comprising of EVs in dedicated parking bays. Provision of such a club, which are already widespread in other University towns such as Oxford and St. Andrews would reduce pressure on local parking facilities as well as adding to cleaner air. This initiative might also reduce car ownership here as our population ages and their horizons are reducing. I speak as an EV driver of 9 years experience.	(a) Noted see also Response 44 (b) Noted - see also Placemaking p33	None	None
59	I have comments on three points that particularly impact my location in the village that I feel are worthy of further consideration. (a) Traffic congestion (section 15 of plan) - Replace Royal Holloway white buses with a cycle scheme The benefit to the students of the bus service that runs through the village is not worth the cost in terms of traffic congestion and pollution that it creates. A better solution would be for Royal Holloway to incentivise students to use bikes rather than the bus. They could create a cycle scheme, similar to "Boris bikes", that would offer short term cycle hire at less than the cost of a bus fare for students who prefer not to take the short walk from their accommodation, particularly on Coopers Hill Lane, to the university. This aligns with aim 11, "To identify and support measures to encourage walking, cycling, as a means of fulfilling shorter journeys". (b) Traffic speed on Tite Hill (sections 15 and 17) I walk up and down Tite Hill as part of my daily commute from Egham station into London. As a pedestrian I frequently feel at genuine risk of being hit by a speeding vehicle, particularly on the bend at the entrance to Runnymede Park where there is an adverse camber just after the steepest part of the hill. As a cyclist, I have been forced off of the road by a motorist trying to overtake me on the same corner. If it were not for a combination of luck and skill I would have hit the iron railings at around 20mph with just a cycle helmet for protection. Given my experiences, I feel that this is the most dangerous piece of road in the village and therefore should be at the top of the list when considering improvements. I would ideally like to see this addressed more urgently but would at least like to use this opportunity to raise awareness. This aligns with aim 10, "To identify and support measures which improve traffic management including parking and speed control measures". (c) Development of Royal Holloway Kingswood halls of residence (section 8) The redevelopment of the Kingswood halls of residence (referred to in section 8.5 of the plan) needs to be aligned with the questionnaire responses showing 79% of people don't want further development in the green belt around the village. I strongly believe that the best solution is for the site to be returned to woodland to align with the aims of preserving the rural aspects of the village, improving sustainability and creating more open space to balance the growing population. I recognise that this might not be popular with the bursar at the university or a potential buyer of the site but can be a starting point in negotiation that looks to significantly reduce the density of the potential development of the site. This aligns with aims 5 and 6, "To protect the rural aspect of the countryside outside of the urban areas and preserve special views" and "To protect, enhance and	(a) Noted (b) noted (c) Noted- see also Response 21(a). In respect of your remarks regarding returning the area to 'green field', this is unlikely. The site is owned by RHUL, and the developments on it have been carried out legally. Unless they were prepared to devalue the site considerably, which we doubt, containing any further development and improving what is there are the only options.	None	Master Plan edited to simplify and make clearer, but no content change
60	(a) Policy ND4 re the Cooper's Hill site, I am concerned about the Kingswood site being used for a large housing development that will put many more cars on the road. The result would be more traffic travelling down Middle Hill to the A30 Road. Cooper's Hill is a tranquil area in keeping with the RAF Memorial and a large housing development would not enhance or preserve the character of the area and would also have an adverse impact on the wildlife. (b) Policy TT3, I would suggest the imposition of 20mph speed restrictions on the narrow streets to reduce dangerous driving including Middle Hill where speeding vehicles and driving onto the pavement is a problem. This has been done in many London Boroughs. (c)Policy HE1, I would suggest extending the Conservation area in size to assist tree and building protection and perhaps a new conservation area for the A30 end of Middle Hill where there are several Listed buildings. (d) That's my comments otherwise the plan seems ok.	(a) See Responses 4(a), 21(a) and 59(a). (b) See Placemaking P16 and Response 24(b). (c) Currently RBC are conducting a review of the existing Conservation Area. There were also a report ten years ago recommending that a Conservation Area be formed in the Historic Core of the Village, but RBC declined to take this forward. The area at the bottom of Middle Hill has not been considered before but your suggestion is noted. (d) Thank you for your support	None	Placemaking P16, map, Option 1, altered to include Middle Hill below Parsonage Road in 20mph zone.

61	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the ENGLEFIELD GREEN VILLAGE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PLACEMAKING; A PRELIMINARY STUDY My response relates to the Placemaking report and specifically, but not exclusively, to sections 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5. I welcome this examination of the factors affecting the lives of residents in Englefield Green but you cannot ignore the surrounding areas that give access to the central village itself. The issues of responsible road use, including parking, speed limits and access by larger vehicles has been a perennial problem. However, we have been residents on Middle Hill for almost five years and in that time, we have seen multiple road traffic accidents and many near misses. In the last three months or so, these incidents have increased and indeed my own car was hit as it was parked legally on the road. Not outside my house, I might add, because your planners thought it in the best interests of safety to take away the option to park on the road outside my house a couple of years ago. We now have to fight for parking spaces further up Middle Hill during the hours of 9-5 if we are working from home. It was in one of these spaces that my car was hit. The cars that used to park along the lower part of Middle Hill acted as a necessary brake on the speed of drivers in both directions. Having removed them, drivers now race to get to the part of the road reduced to a single lane by parked cars, or having been frustrated by giving way, they accelerate to the junction with the A30 so they can make up time. ACTION 1: I would welcome - in the interests of homeowners, pedestrians and other drivers that a lower speed limit of 20 mph is introduced and enforced on the entirety of Middle Hill. Parking on Middle Hill has always been an issue, since there is so much demand for it and so little supply. Students and employees of Holloway College as well as an increasing number of Uber drivers and home deliveries are reducing the capacity for homeowners to legitimately park on the street in which they live. ACTION2: INTRODUCE RESIDENTS' PARKING on MIDDLE HILL - at least from the A30 up to the Beehive pub ACTION 3: improve pedestrian safety on the lower end of MIDDLE Hill, where cars mount the kerb to get past the parked cars on a daily basis. Thank you	See Response (24) above	None	Placemaking P16, map, Option 1, altered to include Middle Hill below Parsonage Road in 20mph zone.

BUSINESSES

63a	Royal Holloway, University of London RHUL would like to respond to the Englefield Green Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) as follows: Royal Holloway welcomes the work that has been carried out by the steering group in preparing the Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan for Englefield Green. Perceived Neighbourhood Development Plan context as presented by the Forum: The NDP is a conservative document with the focus on “little room for further development” based upon a perceived position that “the urban area is almost fully developed” and surrounded by “important and essential” Green Belt. The NDP does not allocate defined or opportunity sites for housing. It identifies that any new development will be restricted to “redevelopments of sites, infill between or behind existing buildings and some increased development in the already-developed” Royal Holloway operational sites.	Noted, the Neighbourhood Area is within the Metropolitan Green Belt with various parts of it (namely the built up area) excluded from it. This is accurately reflected in the NP. There is no requirement for the NP to allocate new housing sites within the Area.	None	
63b	In section 13.22 of the draft NDP, the list of public houses in the area excludes The Packhorse.	The Packhorse is referenced in paragraph 13.21	None	None
63c	Royal Holloway would like it noted that the site boundary identified on the AECOM Masterplan is incorrect and does not accurately represent the parameters of the site.	The boundaries show the extent of the land owned by RHUL. This may not coincide with the boundaries that RHUL or their planners designate as site boundaries in any planning application	None	None
63d	Section 14.4 states that Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charge is non-negotiable and applied to residential and office developments. It would be clear to all if reference was made within the NDP to the fact that there is a £0 CIL charge levied in relation to student accommodation across the Borough.	Noted	Reference to student accomodation added.	None
63e	Response in relation to Parking issues: (general observations relating to multiple references throughout the Draft) The university rebuts the findings of the evidence gathering in respect of parking in Englefield Green and the responsibility for parking issues in the village falling to the university. Several attempts to introduce parking management schemes in Englefield Green have been met with reluctance from the local community. Recent parking data gathered by Surrey County Council did not identify Royal Holloway as a primary cause of the parking concerns in the village. The s106 agreement drafted in connection with the Student Village at Rusham Park has allocated £46,703.50 as a fifty percent university contribution towards the creation of controlled parking zones. The Neighbourhood Development Group will need to negotiate with Runnymede Borough Council in relation to the distribution of these funds.	Parking issues will always be contentious to residents who are affected adversely by them. The Neighbourhood Forum continues to liaise with RBC.	None	None
63f	Response in relation to NDP evidence base (Para 8.5):The evidence for housing need in the designated area has not been collated, due to the NDP Forum taking a position that that the results of any local survey covering housing need would be skewed by input from students living in Englefield Green. Students form an integral part of the community of Englefield Green, and their opinion and housing needs should be considered, rather than excluded from evidence gathering for the Neighbourhood Development Plan. The NDP consultation was shaped to engage staff and students from Royal Holloway including, most recently, the deposit of a copy of the draft NDP on campus. The College feel that the subsequent exclusion of students from the opportunity to participate in housing need evidence gathering is not considered sound.	There has been no 'exclusion' of students from a housing needs survey because there was no survey carried out and the policy relating to housing need (ND2) only serves to include First Homes in the affordable housing provided by the requirements of the Local Plan. By its very nature, the student population is transient and it is the RHUL's responsibility to provide for their housing needs.	None	None
63g	Response in relation to provision of specialist housing (Student Accommodation): As stated in Runnymede Local Plan 2030, Royal Holloway is committed to minimise the pressure on the existing housing stock in the Borough through the provision of new plan compliant purpose built, as well as improved existing, student accommodation to meet the proposed growth in student numbers. This policy objective should be acknowledged within the Development Plan.	The Local Plan does reference student housing and should be added to the NP.	Additonal paragraph added to section 16 regarding RBC Local Plan.	None
63h	Response in relation to RHUL owned sites in the plan area (including but not limited to para 16.4): Royal Holloway holds significant land assets within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. Notwithstanding the preference expressed within the NDP for no further development by the university north of the A30, there may be operational benefits to bringing these sites forward to realise the ambitions and obligations of the university. Any development will, of course, be subject to the normal public engagement processes expected of major development proposals ahead of formal planning application / reserved matters submissions.	Noted	None	None

63i	Response in relation to Kingswood Hall site specific references (including but not limited to Draft Policy ND4: Coopers Hill Site):The Kingswood Hall site is owned by Royal Holloway. The site has a total capacity to accommodate c413 students, though only 352 students currently reside on site. The site has been discussed within the emerging Englefield Green Neighbourhood Development Plan as a site with potential for limited redevelopment as residential accommodation. This redevelopment has been explored within the AECOM Masterplan. The AECOM Masterplan is conservative in its plans for the redevelopment of the site. The Masterplan is extremely limited in its exploration of the potential capacity of the site through reconfiguration, infilling and/or complete redevelopment as advocated by para 149 of the NPPF/Policy EE17 Local Plan 2030. The Masterplan proposes redevelopment of the site to create 84 new Use Class C3 residential dwellings. However, taking into account the total capacity of the site (413 study bedrooms), this equates to an equivalent of 133 residential units (student bedrooms divided by 3.1 to achieve a Use Class C3 equivalence). The NDP is therefore suggesting a net loss of housing. The university challenges the NDP in this regard and suggests that the future capacity of the site in a residential redevelopment / repurposing scenario should be far higher than currently advocated by the draft Neighbourhood Plan. The NDP does not allocate the site for housing nor does the plan endorse any Green Belt boundary or other adjustment to accommodate development. A NPD can devise policy that recommends land for housing in the Green Belt, should the Local Planning Authority be so minded in their emerging local plan. Royal Holloway will be retaining the option of redevelopment or repurposing of the Kingswood Hall site. Whilst the need at present is to develop student accommodation to meet the changing needs of the College, this need could be realised through disposal, a third-party provider, or as owner/occupier. The reduction in the number of student study bedrooms at Rusham Park (1,400 beds now consented in Phase 1 compared to the initial planning application submission in January 2020 of 2,000 beds) influences the demand for ongoing student accommodation. Intensification of student accommodation use across the Kingswood site may also offer long term resilience to the university. Royal Holloway may also consider the site for disposal for other (specialist) residential use if this was considered appropriate in the future. The university is currently engaged in discussions with commercial property consultants to help inform its strategy for the site.	The NP acknowledges that the site is owned by RHUL. It was considered very important by the Steering Group to address the site in the NP so that residents became aware of the future redevelopment of the site. Aecom were commissioned to produce an indicative masterplan so that the constraints and opportunities of the site could be explored in the public domain. Despite many attempts to have talks with RHUL prior to the publication of the Draft NP, RHUL did not engage. The NP is not required to allocate the site and it would not be appropriate to propose changes to Green Belt boundaries, that is a strategic matter for the Local Plan. We have shown one way in which the site could be developed, that we think is appropriate and sensitive, given its Green Belt status and wooded, rural setting. It is acknowledged that RHUL is in discussions with commercial agents and the Steering Group and residents look forward to having proposals to discuss prior to any planning application being made.	Policy and text has been changed for ND4	Design Code changes; site context has been updated
63j	Closing remarks:Whilst the University welcomes the progress made in developing the NDP in Englefield Green, and reference within the plan to a site specific Masterplan, Royal Holloway believes that any Masterplan for the Kingswood Hall site would be best prepared by the university, who have close insight into the needs of the student body, the future of the university, understanding of the wider estate strategy, project interdependences and experience in devising and delivery phased Estate plans.		None	None
64	Congratulations on producing a most comprehensive and thoughtful work in consideration of all aspects of our village life across the ages of all the residents. Many thanks are extended to all those involved for giving up their time to acquire and assimilate all the information. Very well done!	Noted, thank you	None	None
65	A very thorough and clearly presented plan. Englefield Green is a lovely village and its historic buildings and green spaces must be protected. My hope is that the Plan will be able to address the imbalance between the needs and aspirations of its residents and the ambitions of RHUL. RHUL has been allowed to dominate the area. Student parking, housing for student use, and anti-social behaviour are issues that need to be tackled, primarily by RHUL.	Noted	None	None