

# Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD)

## Regulation 18 consultation questionnaire

18 June 2015 – 31 July 2015



### How to respond to this Consultation

The Site Allocations DPD public consultation documents are available on the Woking2027 website (see [www.woking2027.info](http://www.woking2027.info)), local libraries and the Council's Civic Offices.

You can use this form to let us have your comments on the draft Site Allocations DPD. Additional copies of this questionnaire can also be downloaded from the website.

Alternatively, the Woking2027 website features an online version of this questionnaire and an interactive map of the proposed development sites, through which you can let us know your views.

The public consultation is open to **5pm on Friday 31 July 2015**. Unfortunately we cannot accept responses received after 5pm on the closing date.

Data Protection: Please be aware that representations received by the Council will be made publicly available. If you have any questions about completing this form please contact the Planning Policy team by email [planning.policy@woking.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@woking.gov.uk) or on **01483 743871**.

### Your details

**Please provide your contact details below.** We are unable to accept anonymous or confidential responses.

Title: Mr / Mrs / Miss / Ms / Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

First name \_\_\_Carrie\_\_\_\_\_

Surname \_\_\_Whittaker\_\_\_\_\_

Position (if applicable) \_\_\_Planning Advisor\_\_\_\_\_

Organisation (if applicable) \_\_\_Environment Agency\_\_\_\_\_

House name and/or number \_\_\_\_\_

Street \_\_\_\_\_

Locality \_\_\_\_\_

Town \_\_\_\_\_

County \_\_\_\_\_

Post code \_\_\_GU10 4LH\_\_\_\_\_

Email address \_\_\_[REDACTED]\_\_\_\_\_

Telephone \_\_\_\_\_

**Please select your status or that of any party you are representing:**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Resident of Woking Borough                              | <input type="radio"/> Owner of land in Woking Borough |
| <input type="radio"/> Someone who works in Woking Borough                     | <input type="radio"/> Planning / land agent           |
| <input type="radio"/> Someone who visits Woking Borough                       | <input type="radio"/> Developer                       |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Someone representing a group or organisation | <input type="radio"/> Other (please specify)          |
- 

If you are an agent representing another party, please state who:

---

---

---

**Please note that everyone responding to this consultation will be notified of future Woking Borough planning policy consultations. If you would prefer not to be contacted in the future, please tick Otick**

**Woking Citizens' Panel**

Woking Citizens' Panel is comprised of a group of residents from across Woking from all backgrounds, ages and ethnicities. They are contacted a number of a times each year, via email or post, and asked to provide their views on all kinds of issues that affect local people.

**Would you like to join the Woking Citizens' Panel?**

- Yes  No  I am already a member

**Please provide your comments using the questions on the following two pages and return the whole questionnaire – including any additional comments pages – by 5pm, Friday 31 July 2015:**

- By email to: [planning.policy@woking.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@woking.gov.uk)
- By post to: **Planning Policy, Woking Borough Council, Civic Offices, Gloucester Square, Woking, Surrey, GU21 6YL**

Please note that responses will not be individually acknowledged.

**Thank you for taking the time to respond.**

## Your views

Please complete a separate copy of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire for each individual site or section that you wish to comment on.

**Which consultation document does your comment concern?** Please tick one option only:

- Site Allocations DPD       Sustainability Appraisal Report       Habitat Regulations Assessment  
or  General comment (not specific to any one of the consultation documents)       Suggest a new site

**Which site or section of the document does your comment concern? (if applicable)**

Please state all that apply:

Site reference: (please select and note number) UA / GB \_UA1 Library, 71 High Road, Byfleet, KT14 7QN

Section title \_\_\_\_\_

Page number \_\_\_\_\_

Paragraph number \_\_\_\_\_

**Are you?**  Supporting       Objecting       A combination of these       Neutral

**Your comment**

We are very encouraged by the recommendation that the development uses the sequential approach and takes place in flood zone 1 only as the core strategy advises that development in flood zone 2 will only be considered that there are no suitable alternatives in areas at lower risk. This site will require the application of the sequential test. We would also encourage the impacts of climate change are taken into account when considering this site.

As stated in my response dated 8 January 2015 our reference WA/2011/110020/SL-03/IS1, this site is located on a principle aquifer and within a high risk groundwater vulnerability zone. This needs to be stated within this policy to ensure any necessary mitigation to protect controlled waters is put in place.

**Proposed modifications** – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.)

The suitability of the site for the proposed use should be demonstrated by applying a robust flood risk sequential test. The flood risk sequential test should inform the sustainability appraisal and the site should only be included in your site allocations document if you can demonstrate that there are no alternative sites which are reasonably available and at lower flood risk.

Constraint added of principle aquifer and high groundwater vulnerability zone within the policy. You may also wish to state within the policy that other studies may be required in order to ensure the protection of controlled waters.

These comments are page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_ pages.

### More comments?

If you would like to make additional comments about other proposed sites or sections of any of the consultation documents, please complete further copies of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire. Please ensure that these are firmly attached with the main questionnaire - including pages 1 and 2 providing your details - and return this by email or post to the Council (contact details on page 2).

### Your views

**Please complete a separate copy of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire for each individual site or section that you wish to comment on.**

**Which consultation document does your comment concern?** Please tick one option only:

Site Allocations DPD       Sustainability Appraisal Report       Habitat Regulations Assessment

**or**  General comment (not specific to any one of the consultation documents)       Suggest a new site

**Which site or section of the document does your comment concern? (if applicable)**

Please state all that apply:

Site reference: (please select and note number) UA / GB \_ UA32: Land within Sheerwater Priority Place, Albert Drive, Woking, GU21 5RE

Section title \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Page number \_\_\_\_\_

Paragraph number \_\_\_\_\_

Are you?  Supporting  Objecting  A combination of these  Neutral

**Your comment**

The document states that this is residential development with some areas of the site within the floodplain. It is recommended that development proposals in Flood Zones 2, 3a and 3b are required to be accompanied by a comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment to demonstrate that the development will not increase flood risk elsewhere or exacerbate the existing situation from all sources of flooding. Whilst we are very encouraged by this recommendation we would require more weighting on the sequential approach and the sections of development with the highest vulnerability class are located in the areas of lowest risk on site. For the areas of the site that are located in flood zone 3b, we would recommend that only water compatible development is placed here as this is the only development type which is suitable for this flood zone class according to table 3 of the NPPG. This site will require the application of the sequential test. We would also encourage the impacts of climate change are taken into account when considering this site.

**Proposed modifications** – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.)

The suitability of the site for the proposed use should be demonstrated by applying a robust flood risk sequential test. The flood risk sequential test should inform the sustainability appraisal and the site should only be included in your site allocations document if you can demonstrate that there are no alternative sites which are reasonably available and at lower flood risk.

These comments are page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_ pages.

**More comments?**

If you would like to make additional comments about other proposed sites or sections of any of the consultation documents, please complete further copies of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire. Please

ensure that these are firmly attached with the main questionnaire - including pages 1 and 2 providing your details - and return this by email or post to the Council (contact details on page 2).

## Your views

Please complete a separate copy of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire for each individual site or section that you wish to comment on.

**Which consultation document does your comment concern?** Please tick one option only:

- Site Allocations DPD       Sustainability Appraisal Report       Habitat Regulations Assessment  
or  General comment (not specific to any one of the consultation documents)       Suggest a new site

**Which site or section of the document does your comment concern? (if applicable)**

Please state all that apply:

Site reference: (please select and note number) UA / GB \_ UA35: Monument Way West Industrial Estate, Monument Way West, Woking, GU21 5EN

Section title \_\_\_\_\_

Page number \_\_\_\_\_

Paragraph number \_\_\_\_\_

**Are you?**  Supporting       Objecting       A combination of these       Neutral

### Your comment

The site is adjacent to Basingstoke Canal, that is not a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) in this location, but is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI), designated for its aquatic plants and invertebrates, supporting nationally scarce and regionally rare species. Also a European eel migratory route and historic records of water voles.

Therefore there is an opportunity to create a wider undeveloped buffer zone to the canal, to enhance the canal corridor for biodiversity, including the rare plants.

Adjacent to the North East corner is a strip of good quality, semi-improved grassland, a Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) Section 41 habitats of principal importance.

Therefore there is an opportunity to increase this area of grassland by habitat creation and to manage the area as a whole. (This may require taking the existing grassland into the same ownership). This would benefit biodiversity, help to increase the buffer zone to the canal and could be used as a recreation space.

The site may be contaminated and is located on a secondary aquifer.

**Proposed modifications** – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.)

The requirement for a buffer zone should be included within this policy, as well as an opportunity to improve the green infrastructure in the area.

A requirement to protect controlled waters as part of any remediation should be included within the policy as the land is likely to be contaminated, is on a secondary aquifer and is adjacent to the Basingstoke canal.

These comments are page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_ pages.

### More comments?

If you would like to make additional comments about other proposed sites or sections of any of the consultation documents, please complete further copies of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire. Please ensure that these are firmly attached with the main questionnaire - including pages 1 and 2 providing your details - and return this by email or post to the Council (contact details on page 2).

### Your views

**Please complete a separate copy of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire for each individual site or section that you wish to comment on.**

**Which consultation document does your comment concern?** Please tick one option only:

- Site Allocations DPD       Sustainability Appraisal Report       Habitat Regulations Assessment  
or  General comment (not specific to any one of the consultation documents)       Suggest a new site

**Which site or section of the document does your comment concern? (if applicable)**

Please state all that apply:

Site reference: (please select and note number) UA / GB \_ UA49: Camphill Tip, Camphill Road, West Byfleet, KT14 6EW

Section title \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Page number \_\_\_\_\_

Paragraph number \_\_\_\_\_

**Are you?**  Supporting       Objecting       A combination of these       Neutral

**Your comment**

We are pleased to see that it is stated that this site may be contaminated and further investigation will need to be completed. We are also pleased to see that risk of contamination has been considered to the adjacent main river and the Basingstoke canal.

However, no mention has been made of the risks to groundwater. As stated in my response dated 8 January 2015 our reference WA/2011/110020/SL-03/IS1, this site is located on a principle aquifer and within a high risk groundwater vulnerability zone. This needs to be stated within this policy to ensure any necessary mitigation to protect controlled waters is put in place.

This site is adjacent to the Basingstoke Canal that is a SNCI in this location and a European eel migratory route. In addition the Rive Ditch flows through the site. Therefore there is an opportunity to enhance both watercourses for biodiversity and for the benefit of the people working at the site.

**Proposed modifications** – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.)

Constraint added of principle aquifer and high groundwater vulnerability zone and a requirement to protect all controlled waters on the site.

These comments are page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_ pages.

**More comments?**

If you would like to make additional comments about other proposed sites or sections of any of the consultation documents, please complete further copies of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire. Please ensure that these are firmly attached with the main questionnaire - including pages 1 and 2 providing your details - and return this by email or post to the Council (contact details on page 2).



## Your views

Please complete a separate copy of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire for each individual site or section that you wish to comment on.

**Which consultation document does your comment concern?** Please tick one option only:

- Site Allocations DPD       Sustainability Appraisal Report       Habitat Regulations Assessment  
or  General comment (not specific to any one of the consultation documents)       Suggest a new site

**Which site or section of the document does your comment concern? (if applicable)**

Please state all that apply:

Site reference: (please select and note number) UA / GB \_ GB1: Land at Coblands Nursery and Lyndhurst, Brookwood Lye Road, Brookwood – safeguarded site

Section title \_\_\_\_\_

Page number \_\_\_\_\_

Paragraph number \_\_\_\_\_

**Are you?**    Supporting       Objecting       A combination of these       Neutral

**Your comment**

This is a relatively small site allocated for residential use. The development is adjacent to Flood Zones 2 and 3. The document states proposals in Flood Zones 3a and 3b are required to be accompanied by a comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment to demonstrate that the development will not increase flood risk elsewhere or exacerbate the existing situation. We recommend that the sequential approach is undertaken and the sections of development with the highest vulnerability class are located in the areas of lowest risk on site. This site will require the application of the sequential test. We would also encourage the impacts of climate change are taken into account when considering this site.

Very close to Brookwood Lye SNCI that historically supported a water vole population. Therefore an up to date water vole survey would be needed and an assessment of the impacts of increased public pressure on the local wildlife site and on the water vole population (if present). Opportunity for development to contribute to ecological enhancements of the site.

**Proposed modifications** – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.)

The suitability of the site for the proposed use should be demonstrated by applying a robust flood risk sequential test. The flood risk sequential test should inform the sustainability appraisal and the site should only be included in your site allocations document if you can demonstrate that there are no alternative sites which are reasonably available and at lower flood risk.

The policy should include the need for an up to date water vole survey and an assessment of the impacts of increased public pressure on the local wildlife site and on the water vole population (if present). Opportunity for development to contribute to ecological enhancements of the site.

These comments are page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_ pages.

### More comments?

If you would like to make additional comments about other proposed sites or sections of any of the consultation documents, please complete further copies of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire. Please ensure that these are firmly attached with the main questionnaire - including pages 1 and 2 providing your details - and return this by email or post to the Council (contact details on page 2).

### Your views

**Please complete a separate copy of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire for each individual site or section that you wish to comment on.**

**Which consultation document does your comment concern?** Please tick one option only:

- Site Allocations DPD       Sustainability Appraisal Report       Habitat Regulations Assessment  
**or**  General comment (not specific to any one of the consultation documents)       Suggest a new site

**Which site or section of the document does your comment concern? (if applicable)**

Please state all that apply:

Site reference: (please select and note number) UA / GB \_ GB2: Land at Five Acres 1, Brookwood Lye Road, Brookwood, GU24 0HD

Section title \_\_\_\_\_

Page number \_\_\_\_\_

Paragraph number \_\_\_\_\_

**Are you?**  Supporting       Objecting       A combination of these       Neutral

### Your comment

Both of these allocated sites are for the use by travellers and are located adjacent to Flood Zones 2 and 3. Proposals in Flood Zones 3a and 3b are required to be accompanied by a comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment to demonstrate that the development will not increase flood risk elsewhere or exacerbate the existing situation. Whilst we are encouraged by this we would strongly recommended that these sites are located in flood zone 1 as they are classed a highly vulnerable according to NPPG and are only deemed appropriate to be located in this flood zone classification. This site will require the application of the sequential test. We would also encourage the impacts of climate change are taken into account when considering this site.

Very close to Brookwood Lye SNCI that historically supported a water vole population. Therefore an up to date water vole survey would be needed and an assessment of the impacts of increased public pressure on the local wildlife site and on the water vole population (if present). Opportunity for development to contribute to ecological enhancements of the site.

**Proposed modifications** – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.)

The suitability of the site for the proposed use should be demonstrated by applying a robust flood risk sequential test. The flood risk sequential test should inform the sustainability appraisal and the site should only be included in your site allocations document if you can demonstrate that there are no alternative sites which are reasonably available and at lower flood risk.

The policy should include an up to date water vole survey would be needed and an assessment of the impacts of increased public pressure on the local wildlife site and on the water vole population (if present). Opportunity for development to contribute to ecological enhancements of the site.

These comments are page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_ pages.

### More comments?

If you would like to make additional comments about other proposed sites or sections of any of the consultation documents, please complete further copies of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire. Please ensure that these are firmly attached with the main questionnaire - including pages 1 and 2 providing your details - and return this by email or post to the Council (contact details on page 2).

### Your views

Please complete a separate copy of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire for each individual site or section that you wish to comment on.

**Which consultation document does your comment concern?** Please tick one option only:

- Site Allocations DPD       Sustainability Appraisal Report       Habitat Regulations Assessment  
or  General comment (not specific to any one of the consultation documents)       Suggest a new site

**Which site or section of the document does your comment concern? (if applicable)**

Please state all that apply:

Site reference: (please select and note number) UA / GB \_ GB3: Land at Five Acres 2, Brookwood Lye Road, Brookwood, GU24 0HD

Section title \_\_\_\_\_

Page number \_\_\_\_\_

Paragraph number \_\_\_\_\_

**Are you?**  Supporting       Objecting       A combination of these       Neutral

**Your comment**

This allocated site is for the use by travellers and is located adjacent to Flood Zones 2 and 3. As site is within flood zone 3a and 3b any applications are required to be accompanied by a comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment to demonstrate that the development will not increase flood risk elsewhere or exacerbate the existing situation. Whilst we are encouraged by this we would strongly recommended that these sites are located in flood zone 1 as they are classed a highly vulnerable according to table 2 of the NPPG and are only deemed appropriate to be located in this flood zone classification. This site will require the application of the sequential test. We would also encourage the impacts of climate change are taken into account when considering this site.

This site is also very close to Brookwood Lye SNCI that historically supported a water vole population. Therefore an up to date water vole survey would be needed and an assessment of the impacts of increased public pressure on the local wildlife site and on the water vole population (if present). Opportunity for development to contribute to ecological enhancements of the site.

**Proposed modifications** – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.)

The suitability of the site for the proposed use should be demonstrated by applying a robust flood risk sequential test. The flood risk sequential test should inform the sustainability appraisal and the site should only be included in your site allocations document if you can demonstrate that there are no alternative sites which are reasonably available and at lower flood risk.

The policy should include an up to date water vole survey would be needed and an assessment of the impacts of increased public pressure on the local wildlife site and on the water vole population (if present). Opportunity for development to contribute to ecological enhancements of the site.

These comments are page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_ pages.

### More comments?

If you would like to make additional comments about other proposed sites or sections of any of the consultation documents, please complete further copies of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire. Please ensure that these are firmly attached with the main questionnaire - including pages 1 and 2 providing your details - and return this by email or post to the Council (contact details on page 2).

### Your views

**Please complete a separate copy of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire for each individual site or section that you wish to comment on.**

**Which consultation document does your comment concern?** Please tick one option only:

- Site Allocations DPD       Sustainability Appraisal Report       Habitat Regulations Assessment  
or  General comment (not specific to any one of the consultation documents)       Suggest a new site

**Which site or section of the document does your comment concern? (if applicable)**

Please state all that apply:

Site reference: (please select and note number) UA / GB \_ GB5: Land to the south of Murray's Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE – safeguarded site

Section title \_\_\_\_\_

Page number \_\_\_\_\_

Paragraph number \_\_\_\_\_

**Are you?**  Supporting       Objecting       A combination of these       Neutral

## Your comment

The policy states: "Development to meet relevant Sustainable Drainage Systems requirements at the time of planning application for the development of the site; South and eastern parts of the site shown to be within Flood Zone 2 therefore the impact of climate change on the flood risk to the site should be assessed for any proposed development in this area (Flood Risk Assessment.)" We are encouraged by the forward thinking of the borough that climate change is considered within this development as potential the flood risk on site could increased by time that the site becomes developed. We would recommend that this consideration for climate change is taken forward for all sites within Flood Zone 2. This does contradict with what is stated in the Sustainability Appraisal Report which states: "Most of the site is in flood zone 1 where development is encouraged. It is envisaged that development will be focused at the area covered by Flood Zone 1". We would welcome confirmation on which Flood Zone designation the development will be located in and that the borough ensures both documents are consistent with each other. We would prefer that the development is located in Flood Zone 1 as this would follow the sequential approach.

There has been no mention of the fact that this site is within a high groundwater vulnerability zone or on a principle aquifer. This was included within my response dated 3 February 2015 our reference WA/2011/110020/SL-04/IS1. This needs to be stated within this policy to ensure any necessary mitigation to protect controlled waters is put in place.

**Proposed modifications** – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.)

The suitability of the site for the proposed use should be demonstrated by applying a robust flood risk sequential test. The flood risk sequential test should inform the sustainability appraisal and the site should only be included in your site allocations document if you can demonstrate that there are no alternative sites which are reasonably available and at lower flood risk.

Constraint added of principle aquifer and high groundwater vulnerability zone and a requirement to protect all controlled waters on the site.

These comments are page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_ pages.

## More comments?

If you would like to make additional comments about other proposed sites or sections of any of the consultation documents, please complete further copies of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire. Please ensure that these are firmly attached with the main questionnaire - including pages 1 and 2 providing your details - and return this by email or post to the Council (contact details on page 2).

## Your views

Please complete a separate copy of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire for each individual site or section that you wish to comment on.

**Which consultation document does your comment concern?** Please tick one option only:

Site Allocations DPD       Sustainability Appraisal Report       Habitat Regulations Assessment

or  General comment (not specific to any one of the consultation documents)     Suggest a new site

**Which site or section of the document does your comment concern? (if applicable)**

Please state all that apply:

Site reference: (please select and note number) UA / GB \_ GB6: Six crossroads roundabout and environs, Chertsey Road, Woking, GU21 5SH

Section title \_\_\_\_\_

Page number \_\_\_\_\_

Paragraph number \_\_\_\_\_

**Are you?**    Supporting       Objecting       A combination of these       Neutral

**Your comment**

Impacts of the junction upgrade on the adjacent Horsell Common SSSI, part of Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and on Woodham Common SNCI will need to be assessed. This includes both the construction and operational phases.

**Proposed modifications** – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.)

We are pleased to see that a project specific HRA will be completed as part of the allocation policy which should take account of the impacts and required mitigation for the adjacent SSSI and SPA.

These comments are page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_ pages.

### More comments?

If you would like to make additional comments about other proposed sites or sections of any of the consultation documents, please complete further copies of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire. Please ensure that these are firmly attached with the main questionnaire - including pages 1 and 2 providing your details - and return this by email or post to the Council (contact details on page 2).

### Your views

**Please complete a separate copy of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire for each individual site or section that you wish to comment on.**

**Which consultation document does your comment concern?** Please tick one option only:

- Site Allocations DPD       Sustainability Appraisal Report       Habitat Regulations Assessment  
**or**  General comment (not specific to any one of the consultation documents)       Suggest a new site

**Which site or section of the document does your comment concern? (if applicable)**

Please state all that apply:

Site reference: (please select and note number) UA / GB \_ GB7: Ten Acre Farm, Smarts Heath Road, Mayford, GU22 0NP

Section title \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Page number \_\_\_\_\_

Paragraph number \_\_\_\_\_

**Are you?**  Supporting       Objecting       A combination of these       Neutral



## Your comment

The proposed site is for the use by travellers and approximately 20% of the site is located within flood zone 3 and 50% within flood zone 2. The policy then goes on to recommend that any loss of flood plain storage will need to be mitigated for. This suggests that highly vulnerable development may be acceptable within flood zone 3. According to table 3 of the NPPG, highly vulnerable development is not acceptable within flood zone 3 and should not be permitted. This does contradict with what is stated in the Sustainability Appraisal Report which states:

“Only the part of the site in Flood Zone 1 is recommended for development. “

As above this type of development is classed highly vulnerable and we would strongly recommend that this is located in the part of the site that is within flood zone 1 (NW of the site). This was stated in our previous letter dated 3<sup>rd</sup> February our reference WA/2011/110020/SL-04/IS1. Whilst we are encouraged by the recommendation for a detailed Flood Risk Assessment to be submitted with a planning application demonstrating the proposed development is safe and does not increase flood risk elsewhere, we would prefer that the sequential approach is taken first to show that the site complies with the guidance set out within the NPPG. We would welcome confirmation on which Flood Zone designation the development will be located in and that the borough ensures both documents are consistent with each other.

We are pleased by the recommendation that any loss in floodplain storage within the 1 in 100 (1%) annual probability plus climate change flood extent will need to be compensated for on a level for level basis to ensure no loss in floodplain and flood risk should be considered as part of detailed assessment of the site layout.

This site will require the application of the sequential test. We would also encourage the impacts of climate change are taken into account when considering this site.

We would strongly recommend a minimum 8 metre buffer zone be required as part of this policy with suitable fencing surrounding the Hoe Stream. We have concerns over the impacts on the ecology of the adjacent Hoe Stream and water dependent habitats associated with this main river. The development will cause impacts on the quality of the water and disturbance of wildlife and habitats. The Hoe Valley SNCI and Smart's and prey heaths SSSI may also be impacted upon.

In the sustainability appraisal, potential impacts on the SSSI and SNCI are mentioned, but there is no mention of potential impacts on the ecology of the Hoe Stream which must be taken into consideration. There is some mention of water quality in the SA, but we would suggest going into more detail.

**Proposed modifications** – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.)

The suitability of the site for the proposed use should be demonstrated by applying a robust flood risk sequential test. The flood risk sequential test should inform the sustainability appraisal and the site should only be included in your site allocations document if you can demonstrate that there are no alternative sites which are reasonably available and at lower flood risk.

Highly vulnerable development is inappropriate in flood zone 3 according to table 3 of the NPPG. It is therefore suggested that the part of the red line boundary within flood zone 3 is not included as a site allocation for highly vulnerable development. This proposed site allocation is currently contrary to the NPPF, NPPG and policy CS9 of Woking Borough Councils Core Strategy.

We would strongly recommend a minimum 8 metre buffer zone be required as part of this policy with suitable fencing

These comments are page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_ pages.

### More comments?

If you would like to make additional comments about other proposed sites or sections of any of the consultation documents, please complete further copies of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire. Please ensure that these are firmly attached with the main questionnaire - including pages 1 and 2 providing your details - and return this by email or post to the Council (contact details on page 2).

### Your views

**Please complete a separate copy of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire for each individual site or section that you wish to comment on.**

**Which consultation document does your comment concern?** Please tick one option only:

- Site Allocations DPD       Sustainability Appraisal Report       Habitat Regulations Assessment  
or  General comment (not specific to any one of the consultation documents)       Suggest a new site

**Which site or section of the document does your comment concern? (if applicable)**

Please state all that apply:

Site reference: (please select and note number) UA / GB \_ GB15: Land surrounding West Hall, Parvis Road, West Byfleet, KT14 6EY

Section title \_\_\_\_\_

Page number \_\_\_\_\_

Paragraph number \_\_\_\_\_

**Are you?**  Supporting       Objecting       A combination of these       Neutral

## Your comment

According to the red line boundary the site is located within flood zone 1 and is allocated for residential use with a number of existing drainage channels. According to the policy, the site is located with flood zone 2. This does contradict with what is stated in the Sustainability Appraisal Report which states: "The developable area of the site is in flood zone 1 where development is encouraged. It is acknowledged that the site is adjacent to flood zone 2 and 3." We would welcome confirmation on which Flood Zone designation the development will be located in and that the borough ensures both documents are consistent with each other.

Very encouraged that consideration of sustainable drainage and flood attenuation within the landscape are potential options for this development and that Woking are seeking for early engagement with the Environment Agency to discuss.

Site also has adjacent investigated sites, and is on a high ground water vulnerability zone which should be included as a possible constraint due to the risks posed to ground and surface waters.

**Proposed modifications** – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.)

The suitability of the site for the proposed use should be demonstrated by applying a robust flood risk sequential test. The flood risk sequential test should inform the sustainability appraisal and the site should only be included in your site allocations document if you can demonstrate that there are no alternative sites which are reasonably available and at lower flood risk.

Constraint of high risk groundwater vulnerability zone and principle aquifer needs to be included within this policy.

These comments are page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_ pages.

## More comments?

If you would like to make additional comments about other proposed sites or sections of any of the consultation documents, please complete further copies of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire. Please ensure that these are firmly attached with the main questionnaire - including pages 1 and 2 providing your details - and return this by email or post to the Council (contact details on page 2).

## Your views

Please complete a separate copy of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire for each individual site or section that you wish to comment on.

**Which consultation document does your comment concern?** Please tick one option only:

- Site Allocations DPD       Sustainability Appraisal Report       Habitat Regulations Assessment  
or  General comment (not specific to any one of the consultation documents)       Suggest a new site

**Which site or section of the document does your comment concern? (if applicable)**

Please state all that apply:

Site reference: (please select and note number) UA / GB \_ GB16: Broadoaks, Parvis Road, West Byfleet, KT14 6LP

Section title \_\_\_\_\_

Page number \_\_\_\_\_

Paragraph number \_\_\_\_\_

**Are you?**    Supporting       Objecting       A combination of these       Neutral

**Your comment**

We are pleased to see that it is stated that contamination may be a constraint and further investigation will be required.

As stated within our response dated 3 February 2015 our reference WA/2011/110020/SL-04/IS1, the site has adjacent investigated sites, and is on a high ground water vulnerability zone. This needs to be included as a possible constraint due to the risks posed to ground and surface waters.

About 5% of the site within flood zone 2.

**Proposed modifications** – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.)

The suitability of the site for the proposed use should be demonstrated by applying a robust flood risk sequential test. The flood risk sequential test should inform the sustainability appraisal and the site should only be included in your site allocations document if you can demonstrate that there are no alternative sites which are reasonably available and at lower flood risk.

Constraint of high risk groundwater vulnerability zone and principle aquifer needs to be included within this policy to ensure protection of controlled waters.

These comments are page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_ pages.

### More comments?

If you would like to make additional comments about other proposed sites or sections of any of the consultation documents, please complete further copies of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire. Please ensure that these are firmly attached with the main questionnaire - including pages 1 and 2 providing your details - and return this by email or post to the Council (contact details on page 2).

### Your views

**Please complete a separate copy of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire for each individual site or section that you wish to comment on.**

**Which consultation document does your comment concern?** Please tick one option only:

- Site Allocations DPD       Sustainability Appraisal Report       Habitat Regulations Assessment  
**or**  General comment (not specific to any one of the consultation documents)       Suggest a new site

**Which site or section of the document does your comment concern? (if applicable)**

Please state all that apply:

Site reference: (please select and note number) UA / GB \_ GB20: First SANG at Gresham Mill, High Street, Old Woking, GU22 9LH

Section title \_\_\_\_\_

Page number \_\_\_\_\_

Paragraph number \_\_\_\_\_

**Are you?**  Supporting       Objecting       A combination of these       Neutral

### Your comment

This site is within Flood Zone 3 and we are encouraged by the recommendation for of sustainable drainage and flood attenuation within the landscape of the development. This could potentially lead to a reduction in flood risk to the surrounding area; close consideration should be made later on in the planning process to quantify any potential benefits that this could provide. With the recommendations of boardwalk/raised paths may be necessary to ensure that a circular walk is accessible throughout the year, consideration should be made within a Flood Risk Assessment to quantify the potential impacts of this on the floodplain storage of the area.

As the proposed use is water compatible according to the NPPG, this use is appropriate within flood zone 3.

**Proposed modifications** – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.)

We are happy to see that consideration within the policy has been given to raising the pathway to ensure the SANG is accessible even during times of flooding.

It should be ensured that any land raising within flood zone 3 is compensated for, and this should be demonstrated within a flood risk assessment.

These comments are page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_ pages.

### More comments?

If you would like to make additional comments about other proposed sites or sections of any of the consultation documents, please complete further copies of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire. Please ensure that these are firmly attached with the main questionnaire - including pages 1 and 2 providing your details - and return this by email or post to the Council (contact details on page 2).

### Your views

Please complete a separate copy of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire for each individual site or section that you wish to comment on.

**Which consultation document does your comment concern?** Please tick one option only:

- Site Allocations DPD       Sustainability Appraisal Report       Habitat Regulations Assessment  
or  General comment (not specific to any one of the consultation documents)       Suggest a new site

**Which site or section of the document does your comment concern? (if applicable)**

Please state all that apply:

Site reference: (please select and note number) UA / GB \_ GB21: Second SANG at Gresham Mill, High Street, Old Woking, GU22 9LH

Section title \_\_\_\_\_

Page number \_\_\_\_\_

Paragraph number \_\_\_\_\_

**Are you?**    Supporting       Objecting       A combination of these       Neutral

**Your comment**

This site is within Flood Zone 3 and we are encouraged by the recommendation for of sustainable drainage and flood attenuation within the landscape of the development. This could potentially lead to a reduction in flood risk to the surrounding area; close consideration should be made later on in the planning process to quantify any potential benefits that this could provide. With the recommendations of boardwalk/raised paths may be necessary to ensure that a circular walk is accessible throughout the year, consideration should be made within a Flood Risk Assessment to quantify the potential impacts of this on the floodplain storage of the area.

As the proposed use is water compatible according to the NPPG, this use is appropriate within flood zone 3.

**Proposed modifications** – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.)

We are happy to see that consideration within the policy has been given to raising the pathway to ensure the SANG is accessible even during times of flooding.

It should be ensured that any land raising within flood zone 3 is compensated for, and this should be demonstrated within a flood risk assessment.

These comments are page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_ pages.

### More comments?

If you would like to make additional comments about other proposed sites or sections of any of the consultation documents, please complete further copies of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire. Please ensure that these are firmly attached with the main questionnaire - including pages 1 and 2 providing your details - and return this by email or post to the Council (contact details on page 2).

### Your views

**Please complete a separate copy of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire for each individual site or section that you wish to comment on.**

**Which consultation document does your comment concern?** Please tick one option only:

- Site Allocations DPD       Sustainability Appraisal Report       Habitat Regulations Assessment  
or  General comment (not specific to any one of the consultation documents)       Suggest a new site

**Which site or section of the document does your comment concern? (if applicable)**

Please state all that apply:

Site reference: (please select and note number) UA / GB \_ GB22: Woking Palace, Carters Lane, Old Woking, GU22 8JQ

Section title \_\_\_\_\_

Page number \_\_\_\_\_

Paragraph number \_\_\_\_\_

**Are you?**  Supporting       Objecting       A combination of these       Neutral



**Your comment**

This 64.4ha site is allocated for use as Heritage Parkland/Country Park surrounding Woking Palace and is located in an area at risk of flooding. The flood zone designation has not been mentioned here, this should be included so that it can be determined if this development is appropriate in accordance with NPPG. As previously stated we approve of the potential to consider flood attenuation with the landscape proposals this should be considered within the Flood Risk Assessment.

It is proposed that the site incorporates low-key recreation and leisure uses that will have a minimal impact on surrounding landscape. We are supportive of this; however consideration will need to be made on the impact of this on floodplain storage of the area and we would recommend that there that any loss in floodplain storage within the 1 in 100 (1%) annual probability plus climate change flood extent will need to be compensated for on a level for level basis to ensure no loss in floodplain storage.

**Proposed modifications** – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.)

We are happy to see that consideration within the policy has been given to raising the pathway to ensure the SANG is accessible even during times of flooding.

It should be ensured that any land raising within flood zone 3 is compensated for, and this should be demonstrated within a flood risk assessment.

These comments are page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_ pages.

**More comments?**

If you would like to make additional comments about other proposed sites or sections of any of the consultation documents, please complete further copies of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire. Please ensure that these are firmly attached with the main questionnaire - including pages 1 and 2 providing your details - and return this by email or post to the Council (contact details on page 2).