

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
1	Member of public	Received at consultation event	Suggestion to add a policy preferring the use of hedging to fences or walls as a boundary or any new developments (and changes to existing developments) - benefits to wildlife, biodiversity, CO2 reduction		New policy	Needs more investigation	Wording reviewed and improved.
2	Member of public	Received at consultation event	Could we strengthen provision and as importantly protection of trees in grass verges?		Modify existing policy	Needs more investigation	No change to NDP but something to take up with WBDC Highways
3	Member of public	Received at consultation event	Include requirements for insulation levels in new houses. Add another bullet point to E11 page 67/11 " hold on A Energy Efficiency rating	Appendix E	Change to content other than project or policy	Update plan	This is inferred in the Village Design Statement at Appendix E but could add a separate bullet point
4	Member of public	Received at consultation event	Can we influence the speed limit on Sulham hill? National speed limit of 60mph applies to all except a short stretch of 30mph currently - should be lower in its full length specially with increased traffic expected due to care home etc.		Outside scope of NDP	No change to plan	Contact WBDC Highways
5	Member of public	Received at consultation event	The footway/bridleway map needs a legend to differentiate the short and long dashes, and one of the other maps does not make it clear that there is any differentiation.		Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	New maps added with clearer legend
6	Member of public	Received at consultation event	Good discussions with a governor at Calcot primary school - not all of it relevant to the NDP, unfortunately, but highlighting issue that schools are feeling pressure with numbers of children continuing to rise whilst number of classes are being reduced.		Outside scope of NDP	No change to plan	
7	Member of public	Received at consultation event	Out of hours school child care provision is insufficient (After-school and Breakfast Club)		Outside scope of NDP	No change to plan	Follow up with Education Department
8	Member of public	Received at consultation event	Quite a bit of confusion about the self-driving pods. This slide/paragraph and picture are distracting from the main message and we should remove or de-emphasize this suggestion.		Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	We agreed to remove or de-emphasize this section, but not implemented in final document.
9	Member of public	Received at consultation event	Zip car hire availability. Zip cars/rent-by-the hour cars - should this replace the taxi-pods which I feel may be somewhat unrealistic within a reasonable time frame?	Executive Summary, Vision, Project T3	Modify existing project	Update plan	<del>Remotely driven vehicles are getting closer and certainly will be available within the timeframe of this NDP.</del> Nothing wrong with Zip-car concept and could be added to the NDP: Suggested change not implemented in final document.

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
10	Member of public	Received at consultation event	Great idea to join up the two green spaces with a biodiversity corridor for pollinators and wildlife, making use of existing ancient woodland, grass verges/hedges also a possible now LGS in the area between houses on Nabbs Hill Close and Bay Tree Rise (not sure I have this captured correctly, but it looks like it could be this green space.		Change to content other than project or policy	Needs more investigation	Good idea, but finding suitable corridors would be a challenge and needs a project in its own right- not included in this first NDP but a candidate for inclusion in future updates.
11	Member of public	Received at consultation event	Need to check the status of land off Yew Tree Rise believed to be owned by developer (Taylor Wimpey or Taylor Woodrow) but administered by WBDC as a wildlife corridor. Consider for LGS as resident feels important to retain this green space.		Change to content other than project or policy	Needs more investigation	Outside scope of NDP. Investigated by TPC.
12	Member of public	Received at consultation event	Add a proviso/project to plant x thousand new trees in the parish by a set date. However, not sure how we determine the number of trees, where they will be planted or a date for completion. Food for thought.		New project	Needs more investigation	Outside scope of NDP.
13	Jenny Allen	Received at consultation event	To provide more info on the 'green corridors/pollination corridors' and tree planting but she may need some prompting - which I can do if nothing heard say within a couple of weeks!		New project	Needs more investigation	Chased up with Jenny Allen and the BOW Wildlife Trust. No change to NDP needed.
14	Member of public	Received at consultation event	Parking on Birchwoods, off Littleheath Road, for Little Heath School when school closes in the afternoon. Existing yellow lines should be extended say two residents. The schools parking congestion is already covered in the draft NDP, but not for all schools as they may not have such a problem		Outside scope of NDP	No change to plan	Advised to contact district councillors and WBDC Highways
15	Member of public	Received at consultation event	Poppy Way Garages regularly used for fly-tipping – is there anything we could do? WBDC councillors advised but nothing ever done.		Outside scope of NDP	No change to plan	Follow up with WBDC
16	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	The front cover is bright, bold, and creative. It immediately stands out and sets a positive impression of the document.	Front Cover	Support existing content	No change to plan	
17	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Suggest including a photograph of the movement of residents in Tilehurst as one of the 5 images already used e.g. walking or cycling in a prominent part of the Parish, such as in the park, a busy part of the Parish or engaged in physical activity, such as a sport.	Front Cover	Improve document presentation or readability	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
18	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	It is however noted from the document that there is no single centre that is recognisable in the Parish today however the community is likely to engage with the document if they feel they have been encapsulated from the beginning.	Front Cover	Improve document presentation or readability	No change to plan	
19	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	It is also suggested that the image on the front cover fits-to-page i.e. expand it to full A4 size to show no white borders.	Front Cover	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Cover image improved and extended to fill page.
20	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	This is a good opening to the NDP however suggest rewording the first sentence to this paragraph: 'This document is the Tilehurst Parish Council Neighbourhood Development Plan (TPCNDP)' and then write about how it will shape the growth of the Parish ...'.	Section 1: Introduction, page 3. Paragraph's 1.1-1.3	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	No change to NDP needed.
21	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Note: Neighbourhood Planning (NP) is an umbrella term that includes a Neighbourhood Development Order (NDO), Community Right to Build Order (CRtBO) or a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).	Section 1: Introduction, page 3. Paragraph's 1.1-1.3	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Definition of NDP in plan and glossary to remove any confusion.
22	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Reference to the Tilehurst NDP Steering Group could be placed in an acknowledgements section along with the names of additional volunteers, such as the community for public engagement, the consultant(s), the Parish Clerk and/or GIS Technician. This is done at the end of the document and it is minimalistic. Bring it to the front of the document.	Section 1: Introduction, page 3. Paragraph's 1.1-1.3	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
23	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Typographical error: Include a full-stop at the end of paragraph 1.2.	Section 1: Introduction, page 3. Paragraph's 1.1-1.3	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
24	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Suggest rewording paragraph 1.3 to include 'If successful at referendum, the TPCNDP will form the basis for determining planning applications in the Designated Neighbourhood Area'. Alternatively wording of this nature could be used in paragraph 1.4 in the next section to make clear that the Plan covers the Designated Neighbourhood Area only.	Section 1: Introduction, page 3. Paragraph's 1.1-1.3	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
25	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Overall, the introduction in the document does not set out a clear structure and how users should navigate the document. However, it makes clear in this section what the NDP includes and that it is will be evidence based. Suggestion is to outline the policy topic areas that will be covered in the NDP and expand on how it is evidence based.	Section 1: Introduction, page 3. Paragraph's 1.1-1.3	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Added two paragraphs to show the links between our Vision and Principles with sections of the document

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
26	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	In addition, the Reference and Supporting Evidence is a good addition and makes it clear what evidence has been used to inform the Plan. Suggest using a table layout to make it easier to read this information. Include columns for the name of the document/evidence, the author, and the date of publication etc.	Section 1: Introduction, page 3. Paragraph's 1.1-1.3	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Considered and actioned in part, but table format not considered necessary.
27	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Suggest rewording of the subtitle to, 'What is a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)?'	Paragraph 1.4-1.6	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
28	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Para 1.6 states the NDP involves the local community however suggest rewording paragraph 1.6 to include wording to the effect: the Tilehurst NDP 'is a community plan' or 'it is community-led' or 'community is at the heart of the TPCNDP'.	Paragraph 1.4-1.6	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
29	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	NDPs are community plans and this must be evidenced for the plan to be successful.	Paragraph 1.4-1.6	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
30	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Paragraph 1.7 sets out a really good community focused approach.	Paragraph 1.7 to 1.8	Support existing content	No change to plan	No Change
31	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Paragraph 1.8 provides clarity, given that a part of Tilehurst falls within Reading Borough Council. It distinguishes between 'village' and 'parish'. The draft NDP also makes reference to 'a map in 'Figure ??' in Appendix B'. This needs to be referenced.	Paragraph 1.7 to 1.8	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
32	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Typographical correction to include '1.9' in the paragraph number.	Paragraph 1.9-1.10	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
33	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Paragraph 1.9 sets out what the plan focuses on. However referencing in the draft NDP is inconsistent, untidy and difficult to follow. It would be easier to navigate if the NDP includes reference to the policy topics, the projects and the actions that are in the draft NDP.	Paragraph 1.9-1.10	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Referencing has been tidied up and two new paragraphs have been inserted to show the links between Visions and Principles and the various sections of the NP
34	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	In this section, outline the colour coding that is used to distinguish policies from projects, and what the difference is between the two. What is the purpose of the policy, the project and action plan and how do they work in the NDP?	Paragraph 1.9-1.10	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
35	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	A further suggestion is to set out the policies, projects and actions in a contents-page style table format. List the policies and projects in the order they are found in the plan with a column for the page number.	Paragraph 1.9-1.10	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Considered but not actioned as likely to create confusion.
36	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Please refer to comments made above for paragraph 1.1 to 1.3.	Paragraph 1.9-1.10	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
37	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Suggest rewording paragraph 1.10 to abbreviate 'the Tilehurst Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan' e.g. 'TPCNDP' or 'Tilehurst NDP'. This is something to discuss in a meeting with the Steering Group and ask volunteers about. Once an abbreviation has been agreed, use it consistently in the document.	Paragraph 1.9-1.10	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
38	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	This abbreviation along with NP, NDP or the Plan is interchangeable. This can be set out at the start to make it clear to the community what the abbreviations are and how they'll be used.	Paragraph 1.9-1.10	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
39	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	This is a good section which gives clarity to the process in which the NDP has been agreed but also how it has been conducted with efforts made to use a range of mediums to reach out to the community at large. In particular, the efforts made from all the volunteers to support those without internet access is commendable and having undergone this during the COVID-19 pandemic.	Paragraph 1.11-14	Support existing content	No change to plan	No change needed.
40	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	This section makes good use of signposting by providing webpage addresses.	Paragraph 1.11-14	Support existing content	No change to plan	No change
41	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	The first sentence in paragraph 1.16 refers to the 'Basic Conditions' and the second refers to 'basic conditions'. Typographical error/suggestion: use either upper case/lower case letters in the document. Have a volunteer do a consistency check.	Paragraph 1.15-1.18	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Thoroughly reviewed entire document and corrected consistency, spelling, grammatical and formatting issues.
42	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Suggest referencing this section (insert footnote). What source has been used to list the Basic Conditions?	Paragraph 1.15-1.18	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
43	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Suggest rewording paragraph 1.16: 'A NDP must meet a number of tests set out in the Basic Conditions:' Then list the bullet points.	Paragraph 1.15-1.18	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
44	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Suggested re-wording to paragraph 1.17: 'The NDP will form part of the development plan for West Berkshire for the Designated Tilehurst Neighbourhood Area, if successful with a 'yes' vote at referendum.'	Paragraph 1.15-1.18	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
45	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Paragraph 1.18: There are multiple 'visions' in the NDP. This makes it difficult to read the plan and understand the exact vision. The vision needs to be clear.	Paragraph 1.15-1.18	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Reworded to clarify.
46	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Suggest: (1) Rewording, 'In essence the Plan seeks to:' and (2) decide what the 'vision' is and where it will be placed in the document.	Paragraph 1.15-1.18	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
47	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Look at other NDPs and their vision section. The Steering Group can request examples of other NDPs. Overall, the bullet points are packed with words.	Paragraph 1.15-1.18	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
48	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Suggestion: reduce the wording to make it accessible to the community e.g. 'NDPs must meet a number of tests set out in the Basic Conditions: - It is in compliance with national policy and guidance from the Secretary of State; - It contributes to sustainable development; - It needs to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area. In West Berkshire the strategic policies are contained within the Core Strategy; and - Doesn't breach/is otherwise compatible with the provisions of European Directive 2001/42/EC, transposed into UK law through the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2002 (or SEA Regulations)'. Only the Examiner will determine whether the NDP conforms to local strategic policy through the examination process. This is reiterating what is included within Basic Condition, and without making an assertion.	Paragraph 1.15-1.18	Change to content other than project or policy	Update plan	Actioned
49	WBDC- Transport Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	Bullet Point 3: WBDC welcomes this element of the TPNP vision, but would ask that the Parish reflect on whether it has consistently underpinned all the below policies and projects.	Paragraph 1.15-1.18	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
50	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	Bullet Point 3: WBDC welcomes this element of the TPNP vision, however this needs to be unpacked in terms of what this really means and how can this be achieved. For example further in the document it talks about all new dwellings being carbon neutral from 2023. This is a sentiment we welcome but what is the evidence base for this (something we're working on for the LPR), what is the scope of carbon neutral (regulated and unregulated energy? embodied carbon impact of materials?), how will this be achieved (inc. design guides and cost implications). I think this wording is fine as a front end but I think some care is needed further into the document about how climate change mitigation (reducing GHG inc. Co2) and adaptation (i.e. overheating, flood risk, biodiversity, water usage, material usage -design for durability and resilience, etc.) is dealt with.	Paragraph 1.15-1.18	Support existing content	Update plan	Actioned with the links to the policies, projects and action plans
51	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	This map appears clear but some place names or copyright can't be easily read and appears distorted. I can liaise with the Council's GIS Officer to overcome the issues with this map and provide a clear map.	Figure 1.1	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	All maps regenerated with correct scale using Ordnance Survey data under TPC license.
52	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	2.5: WBDC welcomes this but as stated this needs to be unpacked.	Executive Summary, page 7	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
53	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	Paragraph 2.8: WBDC welcomes this but I would reword it to be '...are built in line with the energy hierarchy and where feasible consider the appropriate use of Low Zero Carbon (LZC) Technologies either via on site or off site (near site) connection.	Executive Summary, page 7	Support existing content	Update plan	Actioned
54	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	LZC definition: A term applied to renewable sources of energy, and also to technologies which are significantly more efficient than traditional solutions, or which emit less carbon in providing heating, cooling or power. Source – National House Builders Council (NHBC) <a href="https://nhbc-standards.co.uk/8-services/8-2-low-or-zero-carbon-technologies/">https://nhbc-standards.co.uk/8-services/8-2-low-or-zero-carbon-technologies/</a>	Executive Summary, page 7	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
55	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	e. WBDC welcomes this but I'm not sure about the wording. I'd maybe add a full stop after 'Thames Valley' and have a new sentence on micro climate i.e. The location of tree planting should also consider the micro climate of the area and the effect on human comfort levels, for example can the location of tree planting benefit environmental variables like solar radiation, air temperature, surface temperatures, humidity, and wind speed?	Executive Summary, page 7	Support existing content	Update plan	Actioned
56	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	Paragraph 2.9, bullet point 4: Suggested rewording: We will encourage new housing developments to consider the energy hierarchy and LZC technologies where appropriate, be fitted with solar panels, recycled water systems, an electric car charging point and battery storage facilities and other appropriate emerging sustainable technologies and practices.	Executive Summary, page 7	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
57	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	Bullet point 7: WBDC welcomes this but my understanding is that highways already take this approach. Please check with highways.	Executive Summary, page 7	Support existing content	Update plan	See Travel section 8
58	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	In terms of lowering impact on nature, which I presume relates to bats, has Gareth been consulted on this? There are a lot of things which relate to lighting and nature, it's not just street lighting but any pathway lighting – bollards, sensors, not using up lighting.	Executive Summary, page 7	Change to content other than project or policy	Update plan	ILP Guidance note 1 consulted
59	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	Consideration of the ILP Guidance Note 1 for the reduction of obtrusive light 2021. I don't have a copy of this but I can ask Officers in the Council and forward this on.	Executive Summary, page 7	Change to content other than project or policy	Update plan	ILP Guidance note 1 consulted
60	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	In paragraph 2.8, principle 2 refers to the 'settlement boundary' but the definition is unclear. In email exchange with the Steering Group it has been confirmed that they are using the WBDC Local Plan definition and this needs to be made clear in the document and referenced.	Executive Summary, page 7	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	See map on page 66
61	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	Paragraph 2.10: This sounds like Smart City principles (the internet of things), could we add a line that this would be futureproofing for future adoption of Smart City principles?	Background to Tilehurst Parish, page 10	Change to content other than project or policy	Update plan	Actioned.
62	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	The first map appears grainy however it is acceptable as the focal point is the Settlement Boundary and not place names.	Figures 3.6 and 3.7	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	All maps regenerated with correct scale using Ordnance Survey data under TPC license and WBDC shapefiles.



#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
63	WBDC- Transport Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	WBDC welcomes this element of the TPNP vision, but would ask that the Parish reflect on whether it has consistently underpinned all the below policies and projects.	Strategic Vision for Tilehurst	Support existing content	No change to plan	Actioned.
64	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	There is a theme of sustainability (environmental, social and economic) which runs through this NP. Should it be framed in this way? We could reference the NPPF – the presumption in favour of sustainable development (Page 6, para 11 of NPPF). I think framing the environmental, social and economic elements of sustainable development through the document allows the plan to be tied together in a holistic and coherent way.	Strategic Vision for Tilehurst	Change to content other than project or policy	No change to plan	In several parts of the NP already. No need to make a separate section
65	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	Should linkages with the UN SDGs also be considered? The UN SDGs are also referenced in the NPPF para 7?	Strategic Vision for Tilehurst	Change to content other than project or policy	No change to plan	Reviewed and no further action required.
66	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	I think there is also a strong smart cities thread which runs through the plan which isn't necessarily tied together in that way.	Strategic Vision for Tilehurst	Support existing content	No change to plan	No action
67	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	A lot of what the TPNP is trying to address will be addressed within the LPR. I presume the Tilehurst Parish Neighbourhood Plan will be adopted before our new Local Plan? I note that the TPNP states that it is a living document and will be regularly reviewed and updated. I think many of the policies of the TPNP can only remain as aspirations until WBDC have done the detailed evidence based work which is informing the LPR. I welcome what TPNP is aiming to achieve but they will need the strong base of the LPR to actually be able to take some of the elements forward.	Strategic Vision for Tilehurst	Support existing content	No change to plan	No change needed. Document aligned with changes in LPR.
68	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	As above: This is a good section which gives clarity to the process in which the NDP has been agreed but also how it has been conducted with efforts made to use a range of mediums to reach out to the community at large. In particular, the efforts made from all the volunteers to support those without internet access is commendable and having undergone this during the COVID-19 pandemic.	Neighbourhood Planning Residents Survey – Key Findings, page 16	Support existing content	No change to plan	No action required

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
69	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	This section makes good use of signposting by providing webpage addresses. However, the survey methodology could be outlined in this section and how the Steering Group decided on questions.	Neighbourhood Planning Residents Survey – Key Findings, page 16	Support existing content	No change to plan	It is outlined in section 5 and Appendix A
70	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	Second sentence in the Key Objective (Green Box): Some of this is too specific and doesn't keep the objective open to allow for other more appropriate technologies to be used. They also can't be too prescriptive as it will go against the LPR. Suggested rewording:...These dwellings will be environmentally sustainable and follow the energy hierarchy. The following will be strongly encouraged: The use of appropriate on site or off site (near site) LZC technologies and infrastructure for heating and power; the use of grey water for non –potable water use, for example recycle bath/shower water for toilet flushing; the use of materials with low embodied carbon, are sustainability sourced or re-used and are durable and resilient to extreme weather. <del>use efficient heating systems with zero use of fossil fuels, whilst maintaining a supply of clean, fresh air.</del>	Building Types and Design – 'Building Better, Building Beautiful', page 17	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Wording changed to reflect alternative technologies throughout the NP
71	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	I've reviewed the 'Approach to Future Buildings Developments' chapter and have the following observations:	Approach to Future Building Developments, page 29			
72	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	There is no requirement for NDPs to include allocations for housing (or for any other use), and I therefore feel the inclusion of this chapter is unnecessary. The purpose of NDPs is to include policies to guide the use of land in a designated Neighbourhood Area, and this chapter contains no policies.	Approach to Future Building Developments, page 29	Change to content other than project or policy	Update plan	Section 6 clearly outlines the way housing can be developed in the Parish. Appendix E shows a design and Access statement for future dwellings
73	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	If the Parish Council do want to include mention of why the NDP does not include residential allocations then I think they should set this out briefly in the introduction under the sub-heading 'what does the Tilehurst NP cover'. The first two paragraphs of chapter 7 could be moved to this section. The remaining text in chapter 7 does not need to be moved into this section.	Approach to Future Building Developments, page 29	Change to content other than project or policy	Update plan	Clearly stated in Section 2 - Executive Summary

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
74	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	The title of chapter 7 is confusing. It refers to the approach to future building developments yet the text in the chapter focuses solely on residential development.	Approach to Future Building Developments, page 29	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Clarified text.
75	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	The information in chapter 7 will date quickly – it refers to planning applications that are currently pending determination. I therefore think that it is unnecessary to include this.	Approach to Future Building Developments, page 29	Change to content other than project or policy	Update plan	Modified text, removed irrelevant/dated content.
76	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	As an aside, it would be helpful if the NDP could include paragraph numbers as this will make it easier to cross-reference the plan.	Approach to Future Building Developments, page 29	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
77	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	This section looks incomplete and this is clarified by the text at the end of the page, 'this is a living document and is subject to review as circumstances change.	Going Forward – How the policies and identified projects will be delivered, page 54	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
78	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	It is unclear what this section is trying to achieve. There are currently only two headings for Housing Design and Getting Around includes 2 short points.	Going Forward – How the policies and identified projects will be delivered, page 54	Change to content other than project or policy	Update plan	Whole of section 10 modified
79	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	It is already difficult to navigate between policies, projects and actions in the draft NDP. This section could be used to explain clearly how the aforementioned come together e.g. Housing Policy/policies, Housing Projects and Housing Action Points. Although it is expected this section will be long given there are numerous policies, projects and action plans. Looking at this section, and other sections, it is felt the plan was not ready for a Regulation 14 consultation.	Going Forward – How the policies and identified projects will be delivered, page 54	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Done in Section 1
80	WBDC- Development Control	By email received 24 October 2022	Bullet Point 1: What is meant by these terms to assess planning applications?	Policy H1: Housing Development Principles, page 17	Improve document presentation or readability	No change to plan	Unclear what this means, and meetings with WBDC were unable to clarify.
81	WBDC- Development Control	By email received 24 October 2022	I would suggest including a policy for a percentage of houses on any scheme to meet building regulations standards for adaptable as it's more specific.	Policy H1: Housing Development Principles, page 17	Change to content other than project or policy	Update plan	See Appendix E
82	WBDC- Development Control	By email received 24 October 2022	Bullet Point 2: This is more restrictive than the Council's policies ADPP1, CS1, and C1 – it doesn't allow for sites within settlement unless they are brownfield or infill (and it doesn't define what's meant by infill).	Policy H1: Housing Development Principles, page 17	Change to content other than project or policy	Update plan	See Glossary for definition of 'infill'
83	WBDC- Development Control	By email received 24 October 2022	Bullet Point 3: Repeat of previous bullet point.	Policy H1: Housing Development Principles, page 17	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Removed duplication

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
84	WBDC- Development Control	By email received 24 October 2022	Bullet Point 5: Does this mean no planning application would comply with this policy unless the applicant has first submitted a site design brief to the Parish Council before submitting a planning application? And the site design brief contents should be the same as a design and access statement? This seems onerous and not compliant with planning legislation”.	Policy H1: Housing Development Principles, page 17	Change to content other than project or policy	Update plan	Yes. Wording now changed to clarify
85	WBDC- Housing	By email received 24 October 2022	In order to achieve affordable housing on developer led sites some developments will need to be at scale to gain interest from a registered provider, feedback we have received suggests a minimum of approx 20 affordable homes maybe required to make a scheme viable to an RP.	Policy H1: Housing Development Principles, page 17	Change to content other than project or policy	No change to plan	No. See WBDC Local Plan
86	WBDC- Housing	By email received 24 October 2022	Lifetime Homes is an old standard, replaced by the optional Building Regs M4 Category 2: Accessible and Adaptable dwellings.	Policy H1: Housing Development Principles, page 17	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned
87	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	It would be helpful if this policy referred to complying with the policies of the Local Plan (review) e.g. Provide a mix of types of homes and tenures, in line with the requirements set out in the West Berkshire Local Plan that make it possible for all sectors of the community to live the whole of their lives in the parish if they so wish with a focus on the provision of both ‘starter’ homes and downsizing homes as well as the opportunity to increase house size as families grow. Developments should reflect the needs of all sectors of the community including disabled and elderly residents.	Policy H1: Housing Development Principles, page 17	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned
88	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	It would also be helpful if the policy acknowledged that rural exception sites can come forward outside of the settlement boundary.	Policy H1: Housing Development Principles, page 17	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned
89	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	Note: Can’t be specific in a policy and about how this money is distributed out during the CIL stage. This is outside the scope of a NDP.	Policy H1: Housing Development Principles, page 17	Change to content other than project or policy	Update plan	Removed from policy, added as a project
90	WBDC- Development Control	By email received 24 October 2022	First Sentence: Should this include mix as well?	Policy H2: Affordable Home, page 18	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned
91	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	There could be some information in First Homes legislation.	Policy H2: Affordable Home, page 18	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
92	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	I feel there is a lack precision in its wording and I am not sure that it is in general conformity with the current Local Plan (Core Strategy policy CS 6) or the proposed local plan which both seek a more specific split in the types of affordable housing. That is 70% Social Rent and 30% intermediate tenure, I do not see this draft neighbourhood plan approach justified by evidence, only a response from a survey? It flows logically from the survey but there is no properly carried out local needs survey. They are also trying to stop any new greenfield housing development, which is very typical of many neighbourhood plans which do not intend to meet identified housing need.	Policy H2: Affordable Home, page 18	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned. See Appendix E
93	WBDC- Development Control	By email received 24 October 2022	First Sentence: This implies even a householder application would need to achieve carbon neutral. The Council's policy is only for major housing developments. What is your evidence to justify this?	Policy H3: Domestic Energy & Sustainability, page 19	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	Actioned
94	WBDC- Development Control	By email received 24 October 2022	Bullet Point 3: I'm not sure how this is relevant to a planning application?	Policy H3: Domestic Energy & Sustainability, page 19	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	Actioned
95	WBDC- Drainage	By email received 24 October 2022	Policy H3 mentions green walls and roofs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorporate sustainable 'green' planting including new woodland trees and hedges and, where practical, the use of green walls and roofs.</li> </ul> Planning requirements on visual appearance generally require pitched roofs which therefore overrides any possibility of incorporating green roofs; this outlook is perhaps something to be changed in the bigger picture as without it, green roofs on a large scale will never get built.	Policy H3: Domestic Energy & Sustainability, page 19	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned
96	WBDC- Drainage	By email received 24 October 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimise water consumption through efficient and effective design with rainwater harvesting systems and greywater recycling. Perhaps here, it should be noted that multiple occupancy buildings such as flats/apartment blocks and care homes etc are ideally suited to this.</li> </ul>	Policy H3: Domestic Energy & Sustainability, page 19	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	
97	WBDC- Environment Delivery	By email received 24 October 2022	Much of the attached is laudable with much that would be supported by the Local Highway Authority whenever possible.	Policy H3: Domestic Energy & Sustainability, page 19	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
98	WBDC- Environment Delivery	By email received 24 October 2022	I am concerned that the car parking policies contained on page 22 are contradictory to the Councils own car parking standards set out in Policy P1 of the Housing Site Allocations DPD. For instance the level of visitor car parking is much higher than the Councils Policy P1, and is so high at one space per two houses, that it would have a significant impact on housing site layouts. Furthermore garages are not counted in Policy P1 as car parking spaces within the Councils car parking standards.	Policy H3: Domestic Energy & Sustainability, page 19	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	Have been checked against Local Plan
99	WBDC- Rights of Way	By email received 24 October 2022	This is fine as far as it goes, but the document does not seem to acknowledge equestrian use in the parish, and there could also be a commitment to improving off-road equestrian links via bridleways or permitted bridleways.	Policy H3: Domestic Energy & Sustainability, page 19	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned
100	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	This is one of the policies which needs to be unpacked in terms of what this really means and how can this be achieved (please see my comments in the vision section). Again I agree with the principle of what this is trying to achieve but it needs rewording. Please see my suggestions below.  Policy H3: Domestic Energy & Sustainability To ensure that environmental sustainability considerations are applied, all new developments will be designed in line with the energy hierarchy and consider the appropriate use of Low Zero Carbon (LZC) Technologies either via on site or off site (near site) connection to enable them to be carbon-neutral ready from 2025 in terms of their regulated energy, (in line with the Government decision to prevent the installation of gas boilers from that date). Carbon neutral is ambitious to achieve from 2023 so I think it's framing it as carbon neutral ready is better. On 19 January 2021, the government published its response to the Future Homes Standard consultation. The response includes plans to radically improve the energy performance of new homes, with all homes to be highly energy efficient, with low carbon heating and be zero carbon ready by 2025. These homes are expected to produce 75-80% lower carbon emissions compared to current levels. To ensure industry is ready to meet the new standards	Policy H3: Domestic Energy & Sustainability, page 19	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
101	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	Suggested deletion: <del>All new houses or dwellings should be encouraged to have a system of green energy for the provision of heating</del> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All new dwellings to have at least one electric vehicle (EV) rapid charging point</li> <li>• All such energy-saving installations will be the responsibility of the developer, the costs of which will be incorporated into the purchase price of the new dwelling.</li> </ul>	Policy H3: Domestic Energy & Sustainability, page 19			Actioned
102	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	Paragraph 6.14, bullet point 1, suggested rewording: Be designed to be carbon-neutral ready, <del>which gives rise to zero emissions to air and which will improve overall air quality.</del>	Policy H3: Domestic Energy & Sustainability, page 19	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned
103	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	Paragraph 6.14, bullet point 2: incorporate the principles of the energy hierarchy – ‘The first step is to reduce energy demand (be lean), the second step is to supply energy efficiently (be clean) and the third step is use renewable energy (be green).’ Ref <a href="https://www.designingbuildings.co.uk/wiki/Energy_hierarchy">https://www.designingbuildings.co.uk/wiki/Energy_hierarchy</a> And where feasible include connection to on site or off site (near site is the priority) LZC technologies. <del>Minimise energy use and maximise energy efficiency, and major development to consume less non-renewable energy than the development it replaces. New developments must incorporate on-site renewable energy sources – currently including, but not limited to, solar panels, battery storage units, biomass boilers and heat pumps, cavity wall and loft insulation – and</del> Such installations will be the responsibility of the developer.	Policy H3: Domestic Energy & Sustainability, page 19	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned
104	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	Paragraph 6.14 bullet point 3: Incorporate sustainable ‘green’ landscape and building infrastructure planting including new woodland trees and hedges and, where practical, the use of green walls and roofs.	Policy H3: Domestic Energy & Sustainability, page 19	Modify existing policy	Update plan	See Appendix E

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
105	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	Paragraph 6.14 bullet point 4: Minimise water consumption through efficient and effective design with the use low water using components (i.e. low flow devices), greywater recycling and rainwater harvesting systems for non-potable water uses such as toilet flushing and irrigation.	Policy H3: Domestic Energy & Sustainability, page 19	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned
106	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	All such energy-saving installations will be the responsibility of the developer, the costs of which will be incorporated into the purchase price of the new dwelling. Not sure we can be that specific in a policy. Change wording to 'all energy saving must be incorporated in the bill/invoice'. Has the policy been tested for viability and it is not clear what is meant by carbon neutral by 2025 or how the planning system will play it's part in the process? I think the whole policy goes beyond what the planning system has the power to achieve. It is a very clear statement of intention but not realistic or clear how the making of planning decisions will put this into effect. EV charging point requirement may now be covered by building regulations. Whilst you can see what they are trying to achieve in the supporting text the policy is too vague to do this.	Policy H3: Domestic Energy & Sustainability, page 19	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Modified wording but retained core principle of the policy within what is possible in a planning context.
107	WBDC- Development Control	By email received 24 October 2022	This differs from the Council's policy P1 where garages aren't included as a car parking space. So an application including a garage would need to be large enough under this policy to store a car but won't be included in the car parking space calculations under policy P1. P1 also has a specific ratio for visitor spaces, not just 'a reasonable number'.	Policy H4: Parking – Internal & External, page 20	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	Clarified text.
108	WBDC- Transport Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	WBDC parking standards for residential properties does not include garages. Many modern residences do not have garages. This recognises that they are mostly not used for parking cars. People use them for storage, cycles, leisure and garden equipment etc. They find it easier to park cars on driveways for quick access and loading/unloading.	Policy H4: Parking – Internal & External, page 20	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Agree



#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
109	WBDC- Transport Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	Increasing the size of garages: Requiring garages large enough for modern cars would increase the total floor area of developments, lower the density and make development less attractive to developers and/or further price the property out of the reach of many of the residents of the parish. This policy is not supported.	Policy H4: Parking – Internal & External, page 20	Modify existing project	Update plan	Acknowledged
110	WBDC- Transport Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	The policy to require provision for the secure storage of cycles is welcomed.	Policy H4: Parking – Internal & External, page 20	Support existing content	No change to plan	No action
111	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	The policy lacks precision and would be difficult to implement for lack of clarity. Does it apply to every flat and house when and how does it apply? What are a reasonable number of parking spaces and what is appropriate cycle storage?	Policy H4: Parking – Internal & External, page 20	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	Copied from Local Plan
112	WBDC- Development Control	By email received 24 October 2022	This is covered differs from policy H3 above which requires all new dwellings to have an electric vehicle charging point.	Policy H5: Electric Vehicle Charging Points, page 22	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	Unclear what this means, and meetings with WBDC were unable to clarify.
113	WBDC- Transport Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	WBDC is currently working on a draft EVCP policy for residential developments and would support this policy. This will include both individual charging points for housing units and also communal charging points sufficient for flats. However, we would not allow the developer the ease of avoiding compliance on the grounds of “technical feasibility”. We would regard it as the developer’s responsibility to work with the electricity supplier to ensure the required infrastructure – sub-stations, cabling etc. – is put in place.	Policy H5: Electric Vehicle Charging Points, page 22	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned
114	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	Electric Vehicle Charging Points: This may now be covered by building regulations and I think goes beyond what the planning system can achieve.	Policy H5: Electric Vehicle Charging Points, page 22	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	No action

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
115	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	The dwelling shall not be occupied until an electric vehicle charging point has been provided in accordance with the approved drawings. The charging point shall thereafter be retained and kept available for the potential use of an electric car. Suggest rewording to protect and enhance include as project rather than a policy. Bear in mind Environment Bill will be enacted soon. 10% biodiversity net gain requirement on planning apps but will allow for an offsite mitigation measure. Insulation could be wrapped up in terms of climate change ' we would expect high quality building' Some issues are building control but can reword. In supporting text as statement. Confusion about development control or planning policies.	Policy H5: Electric Vehicle Charging Points, page 22	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned in part
116	WBDC- Development Control	By email received 24 October 2022	Waste Management have their own criteria whereby bin storage cannot be too far from the road. I'm not sure what's meant by discreet?	Policy H6: Refuse Storage, page 23	Modify existing project	No change to plan	
117	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	Suggested rewording: All new developments, residential or commercial, will provide dedicated adequate, discreet and off-street storage facilities (appropriate to the size of the development) for refuse bins and clearly labelled recycled waste bins to allow for segregation. Containers should not be visible on direct view from the street.	Policy H6: Refuse Storage, page 23	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned
118	WBDC- Waste Team	By email received 24 October 2022	"Thanks for sharing. We are happy with the requirements set out under Policy H6. I have added in the words highlighted in the text below for your consideration and potential inclusion: Suggested wording to the title: Refuse and Recycling Storage Suggested wording for the text: All new developments, residential or commercial, will provide adequate, discreet and off-street storage facilities for refuse bins <b>and recycling</b> containers which will not be visible on direct view from the street.	Policy H6: Refuse Storage, page 23	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned
119	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	Again this policy lacks clarity and precision.	Policy H6: Refuse Storage, page 23	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	Unclear what this means, and meetings with WBDC were unable to clarify.

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
120	WBDC- Development Control	By email received 24 October 2022	This may conflict with other guidance/best practice with regard to personal safety. Would it be better to refer to the requirements in the Council's Design SPD?	Policy H7: Street Lighting, page 23	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned
121	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	Suggested rewording: The need for high-level street lighting in each development will be reduced and instead low-level energy efficient lighting will be installed throughout all new developments whilst ensuring that such developments have adequate street-level lighting to ensure safety and security for pedestrians and reducing higher level light pollution. The latest ILP Guidance Note 1 for the reduction of obtrusive light should be followed.	Policy H7: Street Lighting, page 23	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Acknowledged
122	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	Again this policy lacks clarity and precision. What is meant by commensurate size?	Policy H8: Outdoor Amenity Space, page 23	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	The first sentence is both clear and precise. Commensurate size will be dependent on the size of the development
123	WBDC- Transport Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	WBDC welcomes this policy, which is in line with the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Policy (LCWIP).	Policy H9: Pedestrian & Cycle Access, page 2	Support existing content	No change to plan	No action required
124	WBDC- Development Control	By email received 24 October 2022	There's no requirement to comply with in this policy or does it mean that all types and every application must provide a flood risk assessment?	Policy H10: Flood Risk Assessment, page 24	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Actioned

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
125	WBDC- Drainage	By email received 24 October 2022	<p>We think the phrase “To encourage developers to adopt a ‘worst case scenario’ is a little ambiguous where it refers to “worst case scenario”. Under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, our policy CS16 and the NPPF, developers have a duty to design their developments to deal with run off from a 1 in 100year storm event + 40% for climate change. That will include managing surface water exceedance flows. It may therefore warrant a bit of re-wording of the given description.</p> <p>In the explanatory wording that follows, it states “there is little evidence within the Parish, of any serious flooding.....” but during the intense rainfall event of July 2007, there were instances of flooding within the Parish.</p> <p>Should this section also be expanded to cover surface water management as well so that SuDS are referred to? Developers are expected to provide sufficient SuDS measures in accordance with the WBDC SuDS SPD and the SuDS Manual.</p>	Policy H10: Flood Risk Assessment, page 24	Modify existing policy	Update plan	Clarified text.
126	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	<p>Recommended reading, new or more localised evidence: <a href="https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/NP_Roadmap_online_full.pdf">https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/NP_Roadmap_online_full.pdf</a>.</p>	Project H1: Cleaner Vehicles, page 25	Change to content other than project or policy	No change to plan	Actioned. No change required
127	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	<p>Recommended reading, community involvement: <a href="https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/NP_Roadmap_online_full.pdf">https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/NP_Roadmap_online_full.pdf</a>.</p>	Project H2: Community Involvement, page 26	Change to content other than project or policy	No change to plan	Actioned. No change required
128	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	<p>Suggested rewording to paragraph 6.36, Context and Justification:</p> <p>The very wet weather of <a href="#">early 2022</a> has caused many walkers to create other footpaths around the muddy areas and these footpaths are being made wider and wider by the ‘2 metre’ rule. Some walkers are moving onto farmland and destroying crops.</p>	Project H3: Pedestrian Access, page 26	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
129	WBDC- Transport Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	<p>Bullet point 1: On the face of it, this policy commends support in dealing with the issue of vehicles parked on paved front gardens detracting from the visual aesthetics and tidiness of the neighbourhood etc. It also entails drivers gaining access without having lowered kerbs causing unseen damage, affecting the safety of car tyres.</p> <p>However, it is more complex: The property may not have a driveway or garage; parking on a paved area may mean one less car parked on a verge or footpath and/or restricting the width of the road for buses and reducing sight lines for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>A medium-term solution will involve reducing the dependency on individually owned cars by increasing other forms of transport and promoting active travel.</p>	Project H4: Paving over of front gardens/lawns for vehicle parking spaces, 28	Modify existing project	Update plan	Actioned
130	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	<p>There are Projects and corresponding Action Points in this section making it difficult to follow the content</p> <p>The Projects are highlighted in blue and are in bold text</p> <p>The Actions Points are in a blue box and are therefore more prominent than the Projects. The blue boxes occasionally have a black border.</p>	Projects T1 to T5	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Tidied up and defined in Section 1
131	WBDC- Transport Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	Supported	Project T1: To encourage more walking and cycling within and around the parish, page 34	Support existing content	No change to plan	No action
132	WBDC- Transport Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	Supported	Project T2: To help keep schools accessible on foot and by cycle to cut down on the need for travelling to school by car, page 35	Support existing content	No change to plan	No action
133	WBDC- Transport Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	Supported	Project T3: To design a suitable road system that significantly reduces the need for car travel and encourages the use of bicycles and affordable public transport and makes provisions for communal remotely controlled vehicle (RCV) taxi-pods and suitable stopping points, page 36	Support existing content	No change to plan	No action

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
134	WBDC- Transport Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	While supporting this policy, WBDC would note that it is heavily dependent on funding from central government. Having worked hard to develop its Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) and Enhanced Partnership with the local bus operator, it is likely that the intimated funding to support BSIPs will be less than envisaged, which could disappointingly lead to a reduction in bus services.	Project T4: To pursue the maintenance of and continuity of the current service levels and potential improvements to existing bus/public transport routes to and from Reading town centre and other regions, page 37	Support existing content	No change to plan	Point acknowledged. no action taken
135	WBDC- Transport Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	We recognise the attractiveness of this project to contemporary levels of car ownership and use. However, it is not a project aligns itself with the Parish's own vision point (above). Within the 15-year timeframe of this document, the vision, policies and projects must be harmonised to support the Council's Climate Change and Environment strategies, improving public transport, reducing dependence on private car ownership and promoting alternative, e.g. Car Club use, and active means of travel.	Project T5: To achieve more appropriate and adequate levels of parking, both on- and off street, within the parish, page 38	Modify existing project	Update plan	Acknowledged. Sentence added to reflect shared car ownership or 'zip' cars
136	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Project I1 is in a grey box whereas project I2 is not. The Action Points are in blue boxes. The blue boxes do not make use of a black border.	Projects I1 to I3 and I4.1 to I4.3	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
137	WBDC- Education	By email received 24 October 2022	<p>In the Tilehurst parish area are a number of primary and secondary schools as identified. These schools have catchment areas that cover the parish as well as a wider area. There is sufficient capacity within these schools to satisfy catchment demand. This does not necessarily align with preferences, although we do strive to satisfy preferences as far as possible. This may have given rise to the perception within the NDP document that there is not sufficient space within the local schools to satisfy parental demand.</p> <p>At primary level there is a falling birth rate, as referenced in the document. This is being experienced not only across the parish but also across the district and nationally. We are therefore looking at removing capacity in the area, to ensure the viability of the schools over the longer term. We have considered the impact of new housing, alongside demographic trends when considering the future picture.</p> <p>Across the area a number of Reading pupils seek places at both primary and secondary phases. This contributes to the demand for school places. We anticipate that these pupils would be displaced, at point of entry, by any demographic or new housing growth within the catchment area of a particular school.</p> <p>We can assist further if required and are happy for the authors to contact us directly if that would be helpful.</p>	Projects I1, I2, pages 41, 44	Support existing content	No change to plan	Acknowledged
138	WBDC- Development Control	By email received 24 October 2022	<p>It's not clear what the requirement of this policy is for planning applications.</p> <p>Top of page 46, Pincents Hill: This may be an issue for the Council's plan making if it is looking to allocate the site in the LPR. The planning practice guidance states local green space designation should not be used in a</p>	Project I4.1: To preserve all current green spaces listed above and to identify, where possible additional green spaces, page 51	Change to content other than project or policy	No change to plan	Reviewed in follow-up meetings with WBDC and LGS designation as part of NDP agreed.

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
139	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	<p>A neighbourhood plan's capacity to designate land as Local Green Space (LGS) provides the highest level of protection to green space. There are strict criteria set out in paragraphs 101 and 102 of the NPPF, which effectively allows communities to identify and protect valued green areas. One of the criteria is that the green space must be demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular significance and it gives examples of such significance, such as for its beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or the richness of its wildlife. Appendix F of the Draft NDP sets out how two of the proposed designations Pincents Hill and a Designated area within Calcot Golf Club meet the criteria, and a detailed assessment is provided.</p> <p>However, the following sites Calcot Playing Fields, Turnham's Farm Recreation Ground, the Cornwell Sports Centre, Foxcombe/Hilden's Drive Recreational Area, the Cotswold Sports Centre, Conway Road Recreational Ground, Vicarage Wood Way play area and the Little Heath School Playing Fields have not gone through the same process. Appendix F) states that 'Although these existing recreational areas do not necessarily cover all the requisite criteria for Local Green Space designation, all do offer proximity to residential areas, recreational value (by nature of their</p>	Project I4.1: To preserve all current green spaces listed above and to identify, where possible additional green spaces, page 51	Modify existing project	No change to plan	Follow-up meetings with WBDC clarified review process and agreed reasons for inclusion. No change proposed or needed.
140	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	Policy I4 (1 and 2) Green Spaces AONB. It is not clear that this is Neighbourhood Plan policy it appears to be just a statement of general intent.	Project I4.1: To preserve all current green spaces listed above and to identify, where possible additional green spaces, page 51			See our definition of 'Policy' in section 1
141	WBDC- Development Control	By email received 24 October 2022	As the policy wording should this be included in the yellow policy box? Please see the paragraph below the yellow policy box. Should this paragraph be in the yellow box?	Project I4.2: Through the parish council, to produce and install a number of suitable signposts for all public footpaths including notification of farmland, page 51	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned



#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
142	WBDC- Planning Policy, Countryside	By email received 24 October 2022	<p>The North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (NWD AONB) will be protected from any development which would not be commensurate with its statutory designation. Great weight must will be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB.</p> <p>Planning permission for any proposal within the NWD AONB or affecting the setting of the NWD AONB in Tilehurst will only be granted where it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conserves and enhances the NWD AONB's landscape and scenic beauty;</li> <li>- Protects its dark night skies and sense of tranquillity;</li> <li>- <del>Contributes to</del> Supports opportunities for quiet enjoyment and recreation where appropriate; and</li> <li>- <del>Contributes to</del> Supports the social, economic and environmental well-being of the local community.</li> </ul> <p>The NWD AONB Management Plan will be an important consideration when evaluating planning proposals both within the AONB, and within the its setting of the protected landscape.</p>	Project I4.2: Through the parish council, to produce and install a number of suitable signposts for all public footpaths including notification of farmland, page 51	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
143	WBDC- Rights of Way	By email received 24 October 2022	The document seems unclear as to the purpose of these signposts – are they to mark public footpaths, or are they to inform people about the natural environment? If they are to mark the public rights of way, it is important to liaise with WBDC, which already has a programme of rights of way signposting.	Project I4.2: Through the parish council, to produce and install a number of suitable signposts for all public footpaths including notification of farmland, page 51	Modify existing project	No change to plan	Both. Refer to West Berks signposting on footapths around farmland near Newbury and Hungerford
144	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	<p>Projects I4.1 and I4.2 are in a yellow box whereas Project I4.3 is not mentioned previously and is found in the list of actions.</p> <p>It is not clear if there should be a yellow project box for this or not.</p>	Project I4.3 To work with Natural England and the NWD AONB Partnership to ensure that the NWD AONB meets and maintains its full potential, page 51	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned
145	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Policies set in a yellow box with no outline. The overall layout and design of the plan needs to be a lot clearer, with a clear distinction between policies and projects. Many NP's have projects separated out at the end of the plan.	Policies PE1 to PE3	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Actioned

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
146	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	It is not clear that these policies comply with guidance or how they will be achieved.	Policy PE1, Page 52	Change to content other than project or policy	No change to plan	There is no policy PE1 in the consultation document. WBDC acknowledged they were using an old, pre-consultation version of the document. This comment and several others were revoked following further consultation with WBDC.
147	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	It is not clear that these policies comply with guidance or how they will be achieved.	Policy PE2, Page 52	Change to content other than project or policy	No change to plan	See above comment/action
148	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	It is not clear that these policies comply with guidance or how they will be achieved.	Policy PE3, Page 52	Change to content other than project or policy	No change to plan	See above comment/action
149	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	It is unclear how these projects match with the aforementioned policies. They are thrown in at the end of the section.	Project PE9.51, Page 53	Change to content other than project or policy	No change to plan	See above comment/action
150	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	It is unclear how these projects match with the aforementioned policies. They are thrown in at the end of the section.	Project PE9.52, Page 53	Change to content other than project or policy	No change to plan	See above comment/action
151	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	The table is incomplete.	Glossary of Terms	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Added suggested suggested glossary terms.
152	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Could include the survey questions. The graphs and the results are clear, but suggested change is to include titles on the horizontal and vertical bars of the graph so it is clear what is being referred to. Overall, good use of infographics. Did the group design the illustrations or should a source be added to the image/Figure?	Appendix A	Change to content other than project or policy	No change to plan	Questions are on Steering Group website and linked from the Consultation Statement
153	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	This is a clear map and it could be placed earlier in the document.	Appendix B	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Done- all maps revised, updated, scale and attributions added.
154	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Insert reference as a footnote.	Appendix C	Improve document presentation or readability	No change to plan	Another WBDC reference to an outdated version of the document.
155	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	Insert reference as a footnote.	Appendix D	Improve document presentation or readability	No change to plan	Already done in consultation version of document
156	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	"I presume this was the context the Parish Council set out as their ambition?"	Appendix E	Change to content other than project or policy	No change to plan	Yes
157	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	Typographical error: Village Design Statement repeated. Delete repetition.	Appendix E	Improve document presentation or readability		Actioned

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
158	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	<p>What is a Village Design Statement? Incorporate the requirements of the Design Brief into policies in the NDP.</p> <p>Consider including design codes in the NPPF. These are a set of illustrated design requirements that provide specific, detailed parameters for the physical development of the area. The Locality design technical support package see a consultant working with the steering group to develop a set of design codes, and the outcomes can be slotted into the NDP. The work could be done by the Steering Group and Locality have guidance on this: <a href="https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/toolkits-and-guidance/good-design-neighbourhood-planning/">https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/toolkits-and-guidance/good-design-neighbourhood-planning/</a>.</p>	Appendix E	Change to content other than project or policy	Update plan	Clarified text and removed any ambiguity.
159	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	<p>What is the NDPPF (2021)? Do you mean NPPF?</p>	Appendix F	Improve document presentation or readability	Update plan	Corrected typo
160	WBDC- Environmental Sustainability	By email received 24 October 2022	“Please add in WBDC – Environment Strategy 2020”.	Appendix G	Change to content other than project or policy	Update plan	After consultation with WBDC used consistent terminology and abbreviations throughout.
161	WBDC- Planning Policy	By email received 24 October 2022	The Reference and Supporting Evidence is a good addition and makes it clear what evidence has been used to inform the Plan. Suggest using a table layout to make it easier to read this information which includes columns for the name of the document/evidence, the author, and the date of publication/status e.g. ‘ongoing’.	Appendix G	Support existing content	No change to plan	Decided against a table reference
162	WBDC	By email received 24 October 2022	<p>Suggest moving the acknowledgements to the front of the document.</p> <p>Reference to the Tilehurst NDP Steering Group could be placed in an acknowledgements section along with the names of additional volunteers, such as the community for public engagement, the consultant(s), the Parish Clerk and/or GIS Technician.</p>	Appendix H	Change to content other than project or policy	No change to plan	Decided against this

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
163	Thames Water (david wilson <david.wilson@thameswater.co.uk>)	By email received 21 October 2022	Add the following policy and supporting text: “Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades.” “The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste water company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development.”	General Water and Wastewater infrastructure comments	Needs more investigation	Need to check if this is in V	Added to Appendix E
164	Thames Water (david wilson <david.wilson@thameswater.co.uk>)	By email received 21 October 2022	Add the following policy: “Development must be designed to be water efficient and reduce water consumption. Refurbishments and other non-domestic development will be expected to meet BREEAM water-efficiency credits. Residential development must not exceed a maximum water use of 105 litres per head per day (excluding the allowance of up to 5 litres for external water consumption) using the ‘Fittings Approach’ in Table 2.2 of Part G of Building Regulations. Planning conditions will be applied to new residential development to ensure that the water efficiency standards are met.”	Water Efficiency/Sustainable Design	New policy	Update plan	See Appendix E for a statement on reduction of water usage
165	Thames Water (david wilson <david.wilson@thameswater.co.uk>)	By email received 21 October 2022	Add the following policy: “It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding.”	Surface Water Drainage	New policy	Update plan	Added to Appendix E

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
166	TOWN (Mike Bodkin, Head of Planning)	By email 24 October 2022	I commend parts of the Tilehurst Neighbourhood Development Plan (Tilehurst NDP) as a useful document for developers, property owners and residents; its policies seek to provide guidance to developers and residents on the decisions they make and how they can contribute to the function and beauty of Tilehurst in a way that supports the future of the Neighbourhood in a changing climate. From a developer's perspective it is helpful to understand the priorities of a neighbourhood.	NDP overall	Support existing content	No change to plan	Acknowledged
167	TOWN (Mike Bodkin, Head of Planning)	By email 24 October 2022	Strongly object to the proposed designation of Pincents Hill as a Local Green Space as part of Policy 14.1 (with detailed reasons in email)	14.1	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	Objections noted. Reviewed LGS designation criteria and clarified the justification wording in the NDP. Checked with WBDC that the proposed designation meets the criteria and the proposal should be retained in the NDP.
168	TOWN (Mike Bodkin, Head of Planning)	By email 24 October 2022	Strongly object to the draft plan's failure to identify any housing sites to deliver the housing needed as is required by the National Planning Policy Framework and as was proposed by the emerging West Berkshire Local Plan (with detailed reasons in email)	14.1	Remove policy	No change to plan	Objection noted. However, the LDP has not allocated any new housing to the Parish and so there is no expected need in the lifetime of the NDP for sites to be allocated.
169	Jonathon Walton, Opus Works on behalf of Calcot Park Golf Club & Bewley Homes	By email received October 24 2022	Object to designation of LGS	14.2	Remove policy	No change to plan	Objections noted. Reviewed LGS designation criteria and clarified the justification wording in the NDP. Checked with WBDC that the proposed designation meets the criteria and the proposal should be retained in the NDP.
170	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree	Policy H1	Support existing content	No change to plan	
171	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree	Policy H2	Support existing content	No change to plan	
172	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Strongly Agree	Policy H3	Support existing content	No change to plan	
173	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree	Policy H4	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
174	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	"unless it has been demonstrated by the developer that it would not be technically feasible" - this is a loophole where developers will simply opt out. They are required to install the correct current rating lines for houses which as of now more than sufficient to provide charging points. i.e. it would never be technically unfeasible	Policy H5	Modify existing policy	Needs more investigation	No change to policy following investigation.
175	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Strongly Agree	Policy H6	Support existing content	No change to plan	
176	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree	Policy H7	Support existing content	No change to plan	
177	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Policy H8	Support existing content	No change to plan	
178	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Policy H9	Support existing content	No change to plan	
179	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree	Policy H10	Support existing content	No change to plan	
180	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Strongly Agree	Project H1: Cleaner Vehicles, page 25	Support existing content	No change to plan	
181	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Strongly Agree	Project H2: Community Involvement, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
182	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree	Project H3: Pedestrian Access, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
183	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Disagree	Project H4: Paving over of front gardens/lawns for vehicle parking spaces, 28	Modify existing project	Needs more investigation	No change to project following investigation.

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
184	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree	Proposal not to allocate sites	Support existing content	No change to plan	
185	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree	Project T1: To encourage more walking and cycling within and around the parish, page 34	Support existing content	No change to plan	
186	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree	Project T2: To help keep schools accessible on foot and by cycle to cut down on the need for travelling to school by car, page 35	Support existing content	No change to plan	
187	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Strongly Agree	Project T3: To design a suitable road system that significantly reduces the need for car travel and encourages the use of bicycles and affordable public transport and makes provisions for communal remotely controlled vehicle (RCV) taxi-pods and suitable s	Support existing content	No change to plan	
188	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree Upgrading the bus stops to Pull-Out Stops should be added here. There are many in lane bus stops that during rush hour (or a bus breakdown) cause more traffic than actually help.	Project T4: To pursue the maintenance of and continuity of the current service levels and potential improvements to existing bus/public transport routes to and from Reading town centre and other regions, page 37	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	outside the scope of the NDP
189	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree	Project T5: To achieve more appropriate and adequate levels of parking, both on- and off street, within the parish, page 38	Support existing content	No change to plan	
190	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree	Project I1 Address current and future educational needs	Support existing content	No change to plan	
191	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Strongly Agree	Project I2 Seek an appropriate site for a new 'Community Centre'	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
192	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree	Project I3 Commercial hubs	Support existing content	No change to plan	
193	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Strongly Agree	Policy I4.1 Designate Local Green Spaces	Support existing content	No change to plan	Mis-labeled as project I4 in survey
194	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Strongly Agree	Project I4.1: To preserve all current green spaces listed above and to identify, where possible additional green spaces, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
195	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project I4.2: Through the parish council, to produce and install a number of suitable signposts for all public footpaths including notification of farmland, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
196	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Strongly Agree	Project I4.3 To work with Natural England and the NWD AONB Partnership to ensure that the NWD AONB meets and maintains its full potential, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
197	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Strongly Agree	Policy I4.2 Conserving and Enhancing the North Wessex Downs AONB	Support existing content	No change to plan	
198	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree	Policy PE1 All developments to provide an enhanced wildlife friendly environment	Support existing content	No change to plan	
199	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Strongly Agree	Policy PE2 Wildlife corridors, habitat-rich wildlife areas	Support existing content	No change to plan	
200	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Strongly Agree	Policy PE3 Protected habitats.	Support existing content	No change to plan	
201	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree	Project PE9.51 Identify and map existing and potential wildlife corridors	Support existing content	No change to plan	



#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
202	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree	Project PE9.52 Seek funding to organise the above projects	Support existing content	No change to plan	
203	Adrian Podea	Survey submitted September 24 2022	Agree	Village Design Statement	Support existing content	No change to plan	
204	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Agree	Policy H1	Support existing content	No change to plan	
205	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Policy H2	Support existing content	No change to plan	
206	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Policy H3	Support existing content	No change to plan	
207	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Strongly Agree	Policy H4	Support existing content	No change to plan	
208	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Policy H5	Support existing content	No change to plan	
209	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Agree	Policy H6	Support existing content	No change to plan	
210	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Agree	Policy H7	Support existing content	No change to plan	
211	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Strongly Agree	Policy H8	Support existing content	No change to plan	
212	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Agree	Policy H9	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
213	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Strongly Agree	Policy H10	Support existing content	No change to plan	
214	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project H1: Cleaner Vehicles, page 25	Support existing content	No change to plan	
215	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Strongly Agree	Project H2: Community Involvement, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
216	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Strongly Agree	Project H3: Pedestrian Access, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
217	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Strongly Agree - Having seen an increased number of vehicles parking on the pavement / road especially in areas like Highworth Way and Dark Lane. This section represented a lot of what needs to be done to move forward.	Project H4: Paving over of front gardens/lawns for vehicle parking spaces, 28	Support existing content	No change to plan	
218	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Neither agree nor disagree, I can see benefit of not identifying sites but equally it makes me slightly concerned that this may then leave us open to what WBDC determine to be a good location for development	Proposal not to allocate sites	Support existing content	No change to plan	
219	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Agree	Project T1: To encourage more walking and cycling within and around the parish, page 34	Support existing content	No change to plan	
220	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Agree	Project T2: To help keep schools accessible on foot and by cycle to cut down on the need for travelling to school by car, page 35	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
221	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Agree	Project T3: To design a suitable road system that significantly reduces the need for car travel and encourages the use of bicycles and affordable public transport and makes provisions for communal remotely controlled vehicle (RCV) taxi-pods and suitable s	Support existing content	No change to plan	
222	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Agree	Project T4: To pursue the maintenance of and continuity of the current service levels and potential improvements to existing bus/public transport routes to and from Reading town centre and other regions, page 37	Support existing content	No change to plan	
223	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Strongly Agree- Too many people park on the road and footpaths which makes it dangerous for people walking with children, dogs or disabilities. Encouragement to have appropriate parking spaces is necessary	Project T5: To achieve more appropriate and adequate levels of parking, both on- and off street, within the parish, page 38	Support existing content	No change to plan	
224	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Strongly Agree	Project I1 Address current and future educational needs	Support existing content	No change to plan	
225	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Strongly Agree	Project I2 Seek an appropriate site for a new 'Community Centre'	Support existing content	No change to plan	
226	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project I3 Commercial hubs	Support existing content	No change to plan	
227	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Strongly Agree	Policy I4.1 Designate Local Green Spaces	Support existing content	No change to plan	
228	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Strongly Agree	Project I4.1: To preserve all current green spaces listed above and to identify, where possible additional green spaces, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
229	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Agree	Project I4.2: Through the parish council, to produce and install a number of suitable signposts for all public footpaths including notification of farmland, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
230	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Strongly Agree- Agree with the proposals. As someone with young children, having access to green open spaces is important to us as a family. Community centre is one of importance to me. Cotswold while it is great is now looking very tired and in need of modernisation. Not a lick of paint but an overhaul.	Project I4.3 To work with Natural England and the NWD AONB Partnership to ensure that the NWD AONB meets and maintains its full potential, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	Comments are regarding the entire chapter
231	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Strongly Agree Again, links to use of green spaces and preventing over development of the area. Darcliffe homes being a prime example	Policy I4.2 Conserving and Enhancing the North Wessex Downs AONB	Support existing content	No change to plan	
232	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Agree	Policy PE1 All developments to provide an enhanced wildlife friendly environment	Support existing content	No change to plan	
233	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Strongly Agree	Policy PE2 Wildlife corridors, habitat-rich wildlife areas	Support existing content	No change to plan	
234	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Strongly Agree	Policy PE3 Protected habitats.	Support existing content	No change to plan	
235	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Agree	Project PE9.51 Identify and map existing and potential wildlife corridors	Support existing content	No change to plan	
236	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Agree	Project PE9.52 Seek funding to organise the above projects	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
237	Jennifer McGee	Survey submitted September 26 2022	Agree	Village Design Statement	Support existing content	No change to plan	
238	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Policy H1	Support existing content	No change to plan	
239	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Policy H2	Support existing content	No change to plan	
240	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Policy H3	Support existing content	No change to plan	
241	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Policy H4	Support existing content	No change to plan	
242	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Policy H5	Support existing content	No change to plan	
243	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Policy H6	Support existing content	No change to plan	
244	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Policy H7	Support existing content	No change to plan	
245	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree I would draw you attention to Sport England's Active Design which is a useful reference guide: <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design-for-this-document">https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design-for-this-document</a>	Policy H8	Support existing content	No change to plan	
246	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Policy H9	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
247	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Policy H10	Support existing content	No change to plan	
248	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Project H1: Cleaner Vehicles, page 25	Support existing content	No change to plan	
249	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Project H2: Community Involvement, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
250	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Project H3: Pedestrian Access, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
251	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project H4: Paving over of front gardens/lawns for vehicle parking spaces, 28	Support existing content	No change to plan	
252	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Proposal not to allocate sites	Support existing content	No change to plan	
253	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Strongly agree	Project T1: To encourage more walking and cycling within and around the parish, page 34	Support existing content	No change to plan	
254	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Strongly agree	Project T2: To help keep schools accessible on foot and by cycle to cut down on the need for travelling to school by car, page 35	Support existing content	No change to plan	
255	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Strongly agree	Project T3: To design a suitable road system that significantly reduces the need for car travel and encourages the use of bicycles and affordable public transport and makes provisions for communal remotely controlled vehicle (RCV) taxi-pods and suitable s	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
256	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Project T4: To pursue the maintenance of and continuity of the current service levels and potential improvements to existing bus/public transport routes to and from Reading town centre and other regions, page 37	Support existing content	No change to plan	
257	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Project T5: To achieve more appropriate and adequate levels of parking, both on- and off street, within the parish, page 38	Support existing content	No change to plan	
258	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Project I1 Address current and future educational needs	Support existing content	No change to plan	
259	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree I 2 Any new sports facilities should be supported by a robust needs assessment. West Berkshire have been working on a built facilities strategy which would help to inform if there was a need in the area and if so what the facilities mix should be. NB any new sports facilities should be self financing when it is operational. Para 9.411 Should it not be the NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework and not NDPPF as written? This happens on several occasions in the document. Reference should be made to the adopted West Berks Playing Pitch Strategy and Sport England planning policies for sport here. The TPCNP should consider how existing sports site can expand and increase their capacity to meet future demand.	Project I2 Seek an appropriate site for a new 'Community Centre'	Support existing content	Needs more investigation	TPC is engaged in discussions with WBDC regarding sports facilities outside the scope of the NDP.
260	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Project I3 Commercial hubs	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
261	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Policy I4.1 Designate Local Green Spaces	Support existing content	No change to plan	
262	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Strongly agree	Project I4.1: To preserve all current green spaces listed above and to identify, where possible additional green spaces, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
263	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Project I4.2: Through the parish council, to produce and install a number of suitable signposts for all public footpaths including notification of farmland, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
264	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Project I4.3 To work with Natural England and the NWD AONB Partnership to ensure that the NWD AONB meets and maintains its full potential, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
265	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Policy I4.2 Conserving and Enhancing the North Wessex Downs AONB	Support existing content	No change to plan	
266	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Policy PE1 All developments to provide an enhanced wildlife friendly environment	Support existing content	No change to plan	
267	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Policy PE2 Wildlife corridors, habitat-rich wildlife areas	Support existing content	No change to plan	
268	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Policy PE3 Protected habitats.	Support existing content	No change to plan	
269	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Project PE9.51 Identify and map existing and potential wildlife corridors	Support existing content	No change to plan	
270	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Agree	Project PE9.52 Seek funding to organise the above projects	Support existing content	No change to plan	



#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
271	Bob Sharples (Sport England)	Survey submitted September 28 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Village Design Statement	Support existing content	No change to plan	
272	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H1	Support existing content	No change to plan	
273	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H2	Support existing content	No change to plan	
274	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Agree	Policy H3	Support existing content	No change to plan	
275	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H4	Support existing content	No change to plan	
276	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Policy H5	Support existing content	No change to plan	
277	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Agree	Policy H6	Support existing content	No change to plan	
278	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Agree	Policy H7	Support existing content	No change to plan	
279	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H8	Support existing content	No change to plan	
280	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H9	Support existing content	No change to plan	
281	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree If there is any risk whatsoever of a property being flooded, it shouldn't be built there. Domestic energy didn't mention heat pumps What about a service charge / visitors permit for on street parking	Policy H10	Modify existing project	No change to plan	Comments relate to entire chapter
282	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Agree	Project H1: Cleaner Vehicles, page 25	Support existing content	No change to plan	
283	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Agree	Project H2: Community Involvement, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
284	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Agree	Project H3: Pedestrian Access, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
285	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree- Paving over a garden for a parking space should be prohibited by the property's covenants The footpaths should be kept clean, littering has been a problem in the past, and children still don't seem to be aware of the anti-social nature of it	Project H4: Paving over of front gardens/lawns for vehicle parking spaces, 28	Support existing content	No change to plan	
286	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Proposal not to allocate sites	Support existing content	No change to plan	
287	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project T1: To encourage more walking and cycling within and around the parish, page 34	Support existing content	No change to plan	
288	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project T2: To help keep schools accessible on foot and by cycle to cut down on the need for travelling to school by car, page 35	Support existing content	No change to plan	
289	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project T3: To design a suitable road system that significantly reduces the need for car travel and encourages the use of bicycles and affordable public transport and makes provisions for communal remotely controlled vehicle (RCV) taxi-pods and suitable s	Support existing content	No change to plan	
290	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project T4: To pursue the maintenance of and continuity of the current service levels and potential improvements to existing bus/public transport routes to and from Reading town centre and other regions, page 37	Support existing content	No change to plan	
291	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Agree	Project T5: To achieve more appropriate and adequate levels of parking, both on- and off street, within the parish, page 38	Support existing content	No change to plan	
292	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Agree	Project I1 Address current and future educational needs	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
293	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Agree- What about a bit of local advertising ( leaflets, nextdoor / facebook website) with existing recreational / commercail organisations both in the Parish of Tilehurst (WB) and Tilehurst Village (Reading) to kick-start a commuinity centre / commerce hub Organised	Project I2 Seek an appropriate site for a new 'Community Centre'	Support existing content	Needs more investigation	Passed to TPC to action.
294	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Agree	Project I3 Commercial hubs	Support existing content	No change to plan	
295	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy I4.1 Designate Local Green Spaces	Support existing content	No change to plan	
296	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project I4.1: To preserve all current green spaces listed above and to identify, where possible additional green spaces, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
297	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree- Leader-led walks may promote awareness of the AONB nearby	Project I4.2: Through the parish council, to produce and install a number of suitable signposts for all public footpaths including notification of farmland, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
298	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project I4.3 To work with Natural England and the NWD AONB Partnership to ensure that the NWD AONB meets and maintains its full potential, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
299	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy I4.2 Conserving and Enhancing the North Wessex Downs AONB	Support existing content	No change to plan	
300	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy PE1 All developments to provide an enhanced wildlife friendly environment	Support existing content	No change to plan	
301	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy PE2 Wildlife corridors, habitat-rich wildlife areas	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
302	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy PE3 Protected habitats.	Support existing content	No change to plan	
303	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project PE9.51 Identify and map existing and potential wildlife corridors	Support existing content	No change to plan	
304	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project PE9.52 Seek funding to organise the above projects	Support existing content	No change to plan	
305	Julian McEntegart	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Village Design Statement	Support existing content	No change to plan	
306	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree- Reading town centre has seen an explosion of high rise apartments and whilst there is no suggestion of any such similar development in Tilehurst Parish should your document make this explicit	Policy H1	Modify existing policy	Needs more investigation	Comment noted. No change to plan needed, this is covered by existing policies.
307	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Agree	Policy H2	Support existing content	No change to plan	
308	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Agree- 6.14, bullet point 3 - I agree that adding to our greenery is a very positive objective, however, recent developments have resulted in loss of green space, natural habitats and biodiversity, surely in future this should be avoided	Policy H3	Support existing content	No change to plan	
309	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H4	Support existing content	No change to plan	
310	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree- - is there a policy related to providing electric vehicle charging points to existing properties ?	Policy H5	Support existing content	No change to plan	
311	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H6	Support existing content	No change to plan	
312	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H7	Support existing content	No change to plan	
313	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Agree	Policy H8	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
314	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H9	Support existing content	No change to plan	
315	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H10	Modify existing project	No change to plan	
316	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Agree- two points Vehicle pollution is significantly increased by vehicles queueing and the start / stop of slow moving traffic. There appears to be no attempt to smooth the flow of traffic through the village and its surrounding roads Whilst outside the control of TPC there has been very little detail about how diesel and petrol cars sold before 2030 will be phased out.	Project H1: Cleaner Vehicles, page 25	Outside scope of NDP	No change to plan	
317	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project H2: Community Involvement, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
318	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project H3: Pedestrian Access, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
319	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project H4: Paving over of front gardens/lawns for vehicle parking spaces, 28	Support existing content	No change to plan	
320	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree, The feedback from the TPC survey was that residents consider TP to be 'full' and that any future developments should be restricted to brownfield and infill sites.	Proposal not to allocate sites	Support existing content	No change to plan	
321	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project T1: To encourage more walking and cycling within and around the parish, page 34	Support existing content	No change to plan	
322	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project T2: To help keep schools accessible on foot and by cycle to cut down on the need for travelling to school by car, page 35	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
323	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Neither agree or disagree- I think project T3 is well intended but if you ban vehicles from using a number of roads this flow would surely add to the congestion on other roads. Also how would residents of these roads have access to vehicles ? I agree that we need to improve the integration of road, rail and bus and particularly have more bus services linking the parish with Tilehurst station.	Project T3: To design a suitable road system that significantly reduces the need for car travel and encourages the use of bicycles and affordable public transport and makes provisions for communal remotely controlled vehicle (RCV) taxi-pods and suitable s	Modify existing project	No change to plan	
324	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Agree	Project T4: To pursue the maintenance of and continuity of the current service levels and potential improvements to existing bus/public transport routes to and from Reading town centre and other regions, page 37	Support existing content	No change to plan	
325	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Agree	Project T5: To achieve more appropriate and adequate levels of parking, both on- and off street, within the parish, page 38	Support existing content	No change to plan	
326	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project I1 Address current and future educational needs	Support existing content	No change to plan	
327	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project I2 Seek an appropriate site for a new 'Community Centre'	Support existing content	No change to plan	
328	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project I3 Commercial hubs	Support existing content	No change to plan	
329	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy I4.1 Designate Local Green Spaces	Support existing content	No change to plan	
330	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project I4.1: To preserve all current green spaces listed above and to identify, where possible additional green spaces, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
331	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project I4.2: Through the parish council, to produce and install a number of suitable signposts for all public footpaths including notification of farmland, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
332	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree- Recent surveys have shown that local residents have a strong desire to maintain our green spaces and increase our biodiversity. If we are serious about protecting our biodiversity we need to do more to provide protected areas of natural habitat for flora and fauna.	Project I4.3 To work with Natural England and the NWD AONB Partnership to ensure that the NWD AONB meets and maintains its full potential, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	Comments relate to entire chapter
333	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree- This area needs to be given the highest level of protection.	Policy I4.2 Conserving and Enhancing the North Wessex Downs AONB	Support existing content	No change to plan	
334	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy PE1 All developments to provide an enhanced wildlife friendly environment	Support existing content	No change to plan	
335	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy PE2 Wildlife corridors, habitat-rich wildlife areas	Support existing content	No change to plan	
336	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Policy PE3 Protected habitats.	Support existing content	No change to plan	
337	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree- We need to maintain protected areas that allow wildlife to develop.	Project PE9.51 Identify and map existing and potential wildlife corridors	Support existing content	No change to plan	
338	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree	Project PE9.52 Seek funding to organise the above projects	Support existing content	No change to plan	
339	Nick Pflaeger	Survey submitted October 20 2022	Strongly agree- I support the objectives stated in E14 but I suspect mandating their implementation on all new developments from next year will be somewhat of a challenge.	Village Design Statement	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
340	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Disagree	Policy H1	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	No explanation given for disagreement/suggestions to improve
341	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Strongly disagree	Policy H2	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	No explanation given for disagreement/suggestions to improve
342	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Strongly disagree	Policy H3	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	No explanation given for disagreement/suggestions to improve
343	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Strongly disagree	Policy H4	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	No explanation given for disagreement/suggestions to improve
344	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Disagree	Policy H5	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	No explanation given for disagreement/suggestions to improve
345	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Disagree	Policy H6	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	No explanation given for disagreement/suggestions to improve
346	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Policy H7	Support existing content	No change to plan	No explanation given for disagreement/suggestions to improve
347	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Agree	Policy H8	Support existing content	No change to plan	
348	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Agree	Policy H9	Support existing content	No change to plan	
349	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Policy H10	Modify existing project	No change to plan	
350	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project H1: Cleaner Vehicles, page 25	Support existing content	No change to plan	
351	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project H2: Community Involvement, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
352	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project H3: Pedestrian Access, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
353	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project H4: Paving over of front gardens/lawns for vehicle parking spaces, 28	Support existing content	No change to plan	
354	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Proposal not to allocate sites	Support existing content	No change to plan	



#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
355	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Strongly agree	Project T1: To encourage more walking and cycling within and around the parish, page 34	Support existing content	No change to plan	
356	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Strongly agree	Project T2: To help keep schools accessible on foot and by cycle to cut down on the need for travelling to school by car, page 35	Support existing content	No change to plan	
357	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project T3: To design a suitable road system that significantly reduces the need for car travel and encourages the use of bicycles and affordable public transport and makes provisions for communal remotely controlled vehicle (RCV) taxi-pods and suitable s	Support existing content	No change to plan	
358	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project T4: To pursue the maintenance of and continuity of the current service levels and potential improvements to existing bus/public transport routes to and from Reading town centre and other regions, page 37	Support existing content	No change to plan	
359	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project T5: To achieve more appropriate and adequate levels of parking, both on- and off street, within the parish, page 38	Support existing content	No change to plan	
360	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project I1 Address current and future educational needs	Support existing content	No change to plan	
361	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Agree	Project I2 Seek an appropriate site for a new 'Community Centre'	Support existing content	No change to plan	
362	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project I3 Commercial hubs	Support existing content	No change to plan	
363	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Strongly agree	Policy I4.1 Designate Local Green Spaces	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
364	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Strongly agree	Project I4.1: To preserve all current green spaces listed above and to identify, where possible additional green spaces, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
365	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Agree	Project I4.2: Through the parish council, to produce and install a number of suitable signposts for all public footpaths including notification of farmland, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
366	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Strongly agree	Project I4.3 To work with Natural England and the NWD AONB Partnership to ensure that the NWD AONB meets and maintains its full potential, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
367	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Agree	Policy I4.2 Conserving and Enhancing the North Wessex Downs AONB	Support existing content	No change to plan	
368	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Strongly agree	Policy PE1 All developments to provide an enhanced wildlife friendly environment	Support existing content	No change to plan	
369	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Strongly agree	Policy PE2 Wildlife corridors, habitat-rich wildlife areas	Support existing content	No change to plan	
370	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Strongly agree	Policy PE3 Protected habitats.	Support existing content	No change to plan	
371	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Strongly agree	Project PE9.51 Identify and map existing and potential wildlife corridors	Support existing content	No change to plan	
372	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Strongly agree	Project PE9.52 Seek funding to organise the above projects	Support existing content	No change to plan	
373	Helen Cox	Survey submitted October 21 2022	Neither agree nor disagree	Village Design Statement	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
374	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly disagree- To many houses being biult, animal and habitat destroyed. Can dress it up anyway you like. Pincent's area should be left alone. Bottlenecks everywhere. Building should be done on old sites ie unused industrial sites, boarded up houses. Disgusting the loss of habitat new biulds everywhere disfigured natural land. No hedgehogs, fox or other animal or hedgerows habitat. Strongly disagree with biulding on this area. Sorry to say once again money no thought for generations and natural habitat. Disgruntled yes.	Policy H1	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	Comments relate to entire chapter. Not clear exactly what their disagreement is, or how they would suggest improving.
375	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly disagree	Policy H2	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	Comments relate to entire chapter. Not clear exactly what their disagreement is, or how they would suggest improving.
376	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly disagree	Policy H3	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	Comments relate to entire chapter. Not clear exactly what their disagreement is, or how they would suggest improving.
377	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly disagree	Policy H4	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	Comments relate to entire chapter. Not clear exactly what their disagreement is, or how they would suggest improving.
378	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly disagree	Policy H5	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	Comments relate to entire chapter. Not clear exactly what their disagreement is, or how they would suggest improving.
379	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly disagree	Policy H6	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	Comments relate to entire chapter. Not clear exactly what their disagreement is, or how they would suggest improving.
380	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly disagree	Policy H7	Support existing content	No change to plan	Comments relate to entire chapter. Not clear exactly what their disagreement is, or how they would suggest improving.
381	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly disagree	Policy H8	Support existing content	No change to plan	Comments relate to entire chapter. Not clear exactly what their disagreement is, or how they would suggest improving.

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
382	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly disagree	Policy H9	Support existing content	No change to plan	Comments relate to entire chapter. Not clear exactly what their disagreement is, or how they would suggest improving.
383	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Policy H10	Modify existing project	No change to plan	Comments relate to entire chapter. Not clear exactly what their disagreement is, or how they would suggest improving.
384	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Agree	Project H1: Cleaner Vehicles, page 25	Support existing content	No change to plan	
385	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Agree	Project H2: Community Involvement, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
386	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project H3: Pedestrian Access, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
387	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly disagree- Shouldn't pave over gardens stops nature.	Project H4: Paving over of front gardens/lawns for vehicle parking spaces, 28	Support existing content	No change to plan	That's exactly what the policy says. Suspect the policy intention was misunderstood as this is exactly what the policy is intended to achieve. Reviewed wording to ensure clarity.
388	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree, Not enough natural habitat all swallowed up for building. Area cant take traffic.	Proposal not to allocate sites	Support existing content	No change to plan	
389	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Agree	Project T1: To encourage more walking and cycling within and around the parish, page 34	Support existing content	No change to plan	
390	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Agree	Project T2: To help keep schools accessible on foot and by cycle to cut down on the need for travelling to school by car, page 35	Support existing content	No change to plan	
391	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Agree	Project T3: To design a suitable road system that significantly reduces the need for car travel and encourages the use of bicycles and affordable public transport and makes provisions for communal remotely controlled vehicle (RCV) taxi-pods and suitable s	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
392	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Agree	Project T4: To pursue the maintenance of and continuity of the current service levels and potential improvements to existing bus/public transport routes to and from Reading town centre and other regions, page 37	Support existing content	No change to plan	
393	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Agree As long as dont take natural habitat to biuld car parks.	Project T5: To achieve more appropriate and adequate levels of parking, both on- and off street, within the parish, page 38	Support existing content	No change to plan	
394	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project I1 Address current and future educational needs	Support existing content	No change to plan	
395	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Disagree	Project I2 Seek an appropriate site for a new 'Community Centre'	Support existing content	No change to plan	
396	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly disagree	Project I3 Commercial hubs	Support existing content	No change to plan	
397	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Agree	Policy I4.1 Designate Local Green Spaces	Support existing content	No change to plan	
398	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Project I4.1: To preserve all current green spaces listed above and to identify, where possible additional green spaces, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
399	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Agree	Project I4.2: Through the parish council, to produce and install a number of suitable signposts for all public footpaths including notification of farmland, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
400	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree- No interruption of already natural spaces and habitat. Leave pincent's area alone, badger sets fox deer birds all live there. Dont need to be pushed out.	Project I4.3 To work with Natural England and the NWD AONB Partnership to ensure that the NWD AONB meets and maintains its full potential, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
401	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Agree- As said before natural habitat should be left alone.	Policy I4.2 Conserving and Enhancing the North Wessex Downs AONB	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
402	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Policy PE1 All developments to provide an enhanced wildlife friendly environment	Support existing content	No change to plan	
403	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree- Corridors dont work, animal habitat should be left alone. They have proved Corridors dont work. Disgusting leave habitat alone. Not enough land.	Policy PE2 Wildlife corridors, habitat-rich wildlife areas	Support existing content	No change to plan	
404	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Policy PE3 Protected habitats.	Support existing content	No change to plan	
405	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Neither agree or disagree	Project PE9.51 Identify and map existing and potential wildlife corridors	Support existing content	No change to plan	
406	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Neither agree or disagree- As said corridors useless, do not disturb or take animal habitat.	Project PE9.52 Seek funding to organise the above projects	Support existing content	No change to plan	
407	Annmarie Tuttle	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Neither agree nor disagree	Village Design Statement	Support existing content	No change to plan	
408	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Neither agree nor disagree	Policy H1	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
409	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly disagree- 'Affordable' homes is a pointless descriptor unless it is defined in such a way as to say for whom they are 'affordable', i.e. young, older, wealthy, poor, rented aspiring to own etc. I would suggest that by now the 2019 assumptions throughout the report are largely wrong and out of date particularly in relation to Covid and the economic crisis and a new survey initiated. Where they have any validity they are likely to be ignored by central government or superseded by other regulations or laws. As for other question where I have ticked agree strongly agree they seem to me to be no-brainers. We all want affordable homes but until we get a government that is not in the pockets of the building industry or the buy-to-let mafia 'affordable' homes are only a dream.	Policy H2	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	We have debated how to strengthen the affordable homes definition but we believe we are tied by the Local Plan. Reviewed again and came to the same conclusion.
410	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H3	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	
411	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H4	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	
412	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Neither agree nor disagree	Policy H5	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	
413	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H6	Modify existing policy	No change to plan	
414	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Agree	Policy H7	Support existing content	No change to plan	
415	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H8	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
416	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H9	Support existing content	No change to plan	
417	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H10	Modify existing project	No change to plan	
418	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Agree- Again defining 'cleaner' vehicles is an interesting talking point; cleaner for who? Keeping a car for longer and using it less is by far 'cleaner' than making a lot of new electric vehicles	Project H1: Cleaner Vehicles, page 25	Support existing content	No change to plan	
419	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Project H2: Community Involvement, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
420	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree- Walking and cycling should be encouraged obviously. However better maintenance of pavements would be good and possible reduce the number of accidents to older people. Same with the pot holes in roads	Project H3: Pedestrian Access, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
421	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree- I would make it unlawful to pave over front gardens unless there was a clean soak away plan.	Project H4: Paving over of front gardens/lawns for vehicle parking spaces, 28	Support existing content	No change to plan	
422	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly disagree- I think this is an opportunity missed. At the very least brown field sites and derelict areas should have been identified and an argument for development, cleaning up or compulsory purchase should have been made. By not identifying what the council might recognise as areas in need of appropriate development you are leaving some of the most important decisions to the haphazard whims of developers.	Proposal not to allocate sites	Modify existing project	No change to plan	The Local Plan Review now supports our decision not to allocate sites and no sites are allocated by WBDC.



#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
423	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Project T1: To encourage more walking and cycling within and around the parish, page 34	Support existing content	No change to plan	
424	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree- This is something close to my heart. As a governor of Calcot Schools Federation I have with the head and colleagues been working with W.Berks to implement a Safer Streets area around school. Have the PC been interested? NO! Like so much in this report there is no acknowledgement of what is happening in Calcot. Calcot seems to be forgotten. And as for Calcot Schools not even properly shown on the map! Lots of interest in Tilehurst schools though!	Project T2: To help keep schools accessible on foot and by cycle to cut down on the need for travelling to school by car, page 35	Support existing content	No change to plan	Made sure maps are correct (school locations). At the very start of the document it is now clear that whenever we talk about "Tilehurst" we mean the *entire* Parish, including Calcot. Considered add a map showing the various "regions" within the Parish but rejected idea as it may just add to any confusion.
425	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Project T3: To design a suitable road system that significantly reduces the need for car travel and encourages the use of bicycles and affordable public transport and makes provisions for communal remotely controlled vehicle (RCV) taxi-pods and suitable s	Support existing content	No change to plan	
426	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Project T4: To pursue the maintenance of and continuity of the current service levels and potential improvements to existing bus/public transport routes to and from Reading town centre and other regions, page 37	Support existing content	No change to plan	
427	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Project T5: To achieve more appropriate and adequate levels of parking, both on- and off street, within the parish, page 38	Support existing content	No change to plan	
428	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Project I1 Address current and future educational needs	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
429	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree: It would be interesting to see where the intended 'community' Centre might be? And what are the plans for better use of existing centres and how well they are advertised and for whom? There is a huge need for medical and other facilities in the South of the Parish (Calcot). Even if surgeries are not strictly within the parish boundary the fact is that people in Tilehurst are well served by doctors and dentists whereas Calcot does not have one GP surgery. (The one on Royal Avenue is now used by district nurses) A Superhub with medical and social facilities should be considered and in my opinion be build onto or near the existing Calcot Community Centre	Project I2 Seek an appropriate site for a new 'Community Centre'	Support existing content	No change to plan	Comments like this will be transferred to the project owner after making the plan.
430	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Project I3 Commercial hubs	Support existing content	No change to plan	
431	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Policy I4.1 Designate Local Green Spaces	Support existing content	No change to plan	
432	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Project I4.1: To preserve all current green spaces listed above and to identify, where possible additional green spaces, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
433	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Project I4.2: Through the parish council, to produce and install a number of suitable signposts for all public footpaths including notification of farmland, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
434	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Project I4.3 To work with Natural England and the NWD AONB Partnership to ensure that the NWD AONB meets and maintains its full potential, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
435	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree- Best of luck with this one when you have a government who does not give a fig about the green belt!	Policy I4.2 Conserving and Enhancing the North Wessex Downs AONB	Support existing content	No change to plan	
436	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Policy PE1 All developments to provide an enhanced wildlife friendly environment	Support existing content	No change to plan	
437	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Policy PE2 Wildlife corridors, habitat-rich wildlife areas	Support existing content	No change to plan	
438	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree- All brilliant ideas. But until the entities that impact the environment like utilities and the building industry are brought under control be effective regulation you are whistling in the wind. For instance if you continue to allow pointless developments like Stoneham ( near Sulham Woods) where badgers have been turfed out of their habitat you won't have much to preserve or make friendly because there won't be any animal to preserve or be 'friendly' to!	Policy PE3 Protected habitats.	Support existing content	No change to plan	
439	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree- Might be a good idea to get it right in the first place!	Project PE9.51 Identify and map existing and potential wildlife corridors	Support existing content	No change to plan	Not clear what the comment means-ensure plans include wildlife corridors?
440	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	Strongly agree	Project PE9.52 Seek funding to organise the above projects	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
441	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	<p>Most if not all of the 'aspiration' whilst worthy are not likely to happen for any time soon. Indeed some of them have been superseded by new technology, i.e. hydrogen cells or more importantly the government's imbecilic lack of financial support for the conversion to these technologies!</p> <p>By the way ground source heat pumps are very expensive as are heat exchange which would be the most likely alternative for a domestic setting. However the 'hidden' cost is that most homes would have to replace all their radiators! (average house cost approx £20K for heat exchange and the gov., grand is in chaos</p>	Village Design Statement	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
442	Joseph Lally	Survey submitted October 22 2022	This is in many respects a very ambitious and useful plan. However when I read through it I was saddened by one glaring fact and that it simply ignores Calcot and the needs of the people of Calcot. I suspect that since the parish council is named Tilehurst it has a real blind spot to a significant area of the parish i.e. Calcot. Having lived in the Parish for eleven years it was only after three years living in the area that I became aware that this part of Calcot brought us under 'Tilehurst Council'. For me not to be aware of that as a governor of a school and a former parish councillor in Lancashire suggests that the Parish Council are not doing a very good job of informing all of the parishioners about where the boundaries are and what services are offered. I feel that the problem is first of all in the name; 'Tilehurst Parish Council' Surely it should be, 'Tilehurst and Calcot Parish Council'. Why would anyone in Calcot think that a plan for Tilehurst had anything to do with them especially when there appears to be a 'Calcot' council over the A4? There is nothing specific pointing out the fact that Calcot has a very different housing stock, demography (ageing), socio economic profile and unlike much of Tilehurst very poor infrastructure especially in relation to medical support. At the time of the survey I certainly was not aware that it was asking questions about Calcot. I am still baffled by the fact that not one parish councillor seems to care about the wonderful and	Overall comment on the plan	Change to content other than project or policy	Needs more investigation	See note above on ensuring plan wording at outset makes it clear it encompasses all the various places within the Parish.  It is correct that much of our evidence base is now dated although that is largely because the type of demographic data referred to here comes from the ONS census, for which recent data is currently still not available. We reviewed our evidence base, though, and updated anything where newer data was available if this has any material impact on any of our policies/projects.
443	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H1	Support existing content	No change to plan	
444	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H2	Support existing content	No change to plan	
445	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H3	Support existing content	No change to plan	
446	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H4	Support existing content	No change to plan	
447	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H5	Support existing content	No change to plan	
448	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H6	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
449	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H7	Support existing content	No change to plan	
450	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H8	Support existing content	No change to plan	
451	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H9	Support existing content	No change to plan	
452	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Policy H10	Support existing content	No change to plan	
453	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Project H1: Cleaner Vehicles, page 25	Support existing content	No change to plan	
454	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Project H2: Community Involvement, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
455	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Project H3: Pedestrian Access, page 26	Support existing content	No change to plan	
456	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Project H4: Paving over of front gardens/lawns for vehicle parking spaces, 28	Support existing content	No change to plan	
457	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Proposal not to allocate sites	Support existing content	No change to plan	
458	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Project T1: To encourage more walking and cycling within and around the parish, page 34	Support existing content	No change to plan	
459	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Project T2: To help keep schools accessible on foot and by cycle to cut down on the need for travelling to school by car, page 35	Support existing content	No change to plan	
460	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Project T3: To design a suitable road system that significantly reduces the need for car travel and encourages the use of bicycles and affordable public transport and makes provisions for communal remotely controlled vehicle (RCV) taxi-pods and suitable s	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
461	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Project T4: To pursue the maintenance of and continuity of the current service levels and potential improvements to existing bus/public transport routes to and from Reading town centre and other regions, page 37	Support existing content	No change to plan	
462	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Project T5: To achieve more appropriate and adequate levels of parking, both on- and off street, within the parish, page 38	Support existing content	No change to plan	
463	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Project I1 Address current and future educational needs	Support existing content	No change to plan	
464	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Project I2 Seek an appropriate site for a new 'Community Centre'	Support existing content	No change to plan	
465	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Agree	Project I3 Commercial hubs	Support existing content	No change to plan	
466	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Policy I4.1 Designate Local Green Spaces	Support existing content	No change to plan	
467	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Project I4.1: To preserve all current green spaces listed above and to identify, where possible additional green spaces, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
468	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Project I4.2: Through the parish council, to produce and install a number of suitable signposts for all public footpaths including notification of farmland, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
469	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Project I4.3 To work with Natural England and the NWD AONB Partnership to ensure that the NWD AONB meets and maintains its full potential, page 51	Support existing content	No change to plan	
470	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Policy I4.2 Conserving and Enhancing the North Wessex Downs AONB	Support existing content	No change to plan	

#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
471	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree- , re Swift nest boxes: could planning regulations be altered to include statutory inclusion of Swift nest boxes or nest bricks in all new buildings (where possible, as there are particular siting requirements)? "Swift Cities", such as Oxford, Belfast and Bristol, have added these stipulations to their Planning Policy. The Swift Local Network (of which I'm a member) had guidance on this.	Policy PE1 All developments to provide an enhanced wildlife friendly environment	Support existing content	Update plan	We do have a policy mentioning swift boxes. Need to review and include referenced material in evidence base.
472	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Policy PE2 Wildlife corridors, habitat-rich wildlife areas	Support existing content	No change to plan	
473	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Policy PE3 Protected habitats.	Support existing content	No change to plan	
474	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Project PE9.51 Identify and map existing and potential wildlife corridors	Support existing content	No change to plan	
475	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree- Urban verges and open green spaces, from school playing-fields to grassed areas on sites and along footpaths such as those between The Sadlers and Trelawney Drive, can have their biodiversity enriched by changing the mowing regime. Fewer cuts each year, and removal of arisings, will result in the growing of wildlife corridors. Perhaps some community engagement, via schools and local groups such as the WI, can help draw residents into this project so they feel invested, and can spread the biodiversity message into their own gardens.	Project PE9.52 Seek funding to organise the above projects	Support existing content	No change to plan	
476	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Strongly agree	Village Design Statement	Support existing content	No change to plan	



#	Contributor	Contact Details	Feedback Summary	Reference (chapter/page/...)	Category	Disposition	Comments/Actions
477	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	on p.11 Fallow Deer are referenced as being in local woods: I am sure there are no Fallow Deer in our area, though there are Roe and Muntjac Deer.	P.11 Reference to fallow deer	Change to content other than project or policy	Update plan	
478	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	<p>Appendix F, p.72 Richness of Wildlife Red Kites are referenced as an example of one of 'many species' of birds. It's great to have Kites over Pincents Hill, but the Hill is home to several Birds of Conservation Concern, whose presence carries more weight, in conservation terms, than the Kites do. Would it be more persuasive to include some, or all, of these? Red-listed Birds (most at-risk of extinction) present on Pincents Hill: Mistle Thrush, Greenfinch, Linnet, Yellowhammer. Amber-listed Birds present on Pincents Hill: Stock Dove, Sparrowhawk, Kestrel, Wren, Song Thrush, Dunnock, Bullfinch.</p> <p>Also, in conservation terms, one of the most important features of Pincents Hill, which was recognised by the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre when I submitted my bird surveys last October, is the abundance of bird species and numbers there, unparalleled in Tilehurst, and for many miles beyond. Might add weight to your argument.</p>	Appendix F, p.72	Change to content other than project or policy	Needs more investigation	
479	Ailsa Claybourn	Survey submitted October 23 2022	Finally, many thanks to all of you in the steering group for all your dedication and hard work involved in creating this Neighbourhood Plan for us all. It may look as if I've just zipped through the questionnaire, selecting 'Strongly Agree' for almost every point, but , having read the Plan, I do strongly agree with what you've put together. Thank you.	Overall comment on the plan	Support existing content	No change to plan	

