Woking Borough Council

Byfleet Village Neighbourhood Plan

Summary of responses to Regulation 16 Consultation

Surrey County Council	Policy 1: propose referring to additional documents, the strategic policies of which the NP must be in general conformity with: • Surrey Primary Aggregates Development Plan Document 2011 (July 2011) • Surrey Minerals Site Restoration Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (July 2011) • Surrey Aggregates Recycling Joint Development Plan Document 2013 (February 2013) Policy 8: Object to the proposals to designate St Mary's Primary School playing field as a Local Green Space. Education land is fully protected under statute and is not open space fully accessible to the public. Local Green Spaces are usually available for public use and so such a policy might conflict with the schools' safeguarding and community shared use arrangements. We would also like to see the plan acknowledge that exceptions to Policy 8 might be acceptable where schools need to expand for operational reasons and as a last resort the only land available may comprise part of an existing playing field. As per Paragraph 99 of the National Planning Policy Framework, *'Local Planning Authorities should give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools through the preparation of plans and decisions on applications.'*
Surrey County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority	Policy 6: Propose changes as follows, for compliance with NPPF: 1. Where it is appropriate new development will be supported where it can demonstrate that the development will not increase the risk of flooding *from any source on or off site. There should be consideration of opportunities presented by development to reduce local flood risk.* ~~*to other land, arising from the development*~~. 2. All ~~*major*~~ *developments*, in compliance with CS9, should provide full details of the proposed surface water drainage…. *Page 35:* All ~~*major*~~ *developments*, in compliance with

	CS9, should provide full details of the proposed surface water drainage… Figure 49: check latest EA maps have been used Propose adding the following paragraphs: *Land alongside watercourses is particularly valuable for wildlife and it is essential it is protected. Development that encroaches on watercourses has a potentially severe impact on their ecological value and can increase flood risk. Development proposals likely to affect a watercourse and its associated corridor should seek to conserve and enhance its ecological, landscape and recreational value. This should include providing adequate natural buffer zones to the watercourse, to ensure there is no increase in flood risk.* *Riparian owner is the person, or people, with watercourses on, next to or under their property. Riparian owners have the responsibility for maintenance of these watercourses. Riparian responsibilities usually lie with the person who owns the land or property but may be the tenant depending upon the agreement in place.*
Surrey County Council-Heritage	p. 8: under 'History- Major Events', refer to the dissociation between the historic core of Byfleet Village, and the modern Conservation Area as they are distinctly separate from one another. p.14, Figure 4: It is undesirable to cut the historic archaeological core of Byfleet into 2 sections (sections 1 and 5). From a management perspective it may have been more useful to combine Common Meadow/ Nature Reserve with Byfleet Manor/Mill as a section to preserve open space, ecology and heritage assets as a distinct character area. The zones shown in figure 4 do not reflect particular character or thematic purposes. Better definition of character areas would enable a more holistic treatment of heritage. Policy 3: Policy should address heritage across the Neighbourhood Plan area, not just Byfleet Village Conservation Area. E.g. important heritage assets such as the Wey Navigation and the Brookland racetrack. Support the listing of "important views, open spaces and vegetation" in the key features. Welcome the inclusion of proactive provisions regarding the replacement of previous inappropriate or unsympathetic development. Welcome the final part of the heritage section which details several buildings of architectural value. However the methodology behind this is outdated, and the list of buildings is inconsistent with the Borough's new draft Local List. It would strengthen the plan, ensure consistency and add weight within the planning process if this section were to be revised considering "Local Heritage Listing: Identifying and Conserving Local Heritage (Historic England, 2021), with strong reference to the draft Borough Local List. It may be useful to procure the results of a free search from the Historic Environment Record for the Neighbourhood Plan Area. This should be done prior to revising this final part, so that the Plan can be

	informed of the archaeological and other non-related heritage assets in the area.
Surrey County Council: Ecology	p.30: propose separating out the two objectives, *"to retain sites which count as wet habitat"* and *"to retain and enhance hedgerows"*. Policy 9: Welcome the policy. General: The plan makes no reference to BNG or the emerging LNRS, which are statutory requirements. We suggest adding a policy in reference to '*Delivering a Net Gain for Biodiversity and supporting the implementation of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy*'. We would recommend creating an aim such as '*Development proposals should align with and contribute to the delivery of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (emerging), to maximise nature recovery in the local area*' and '*Development proposals should produce a positive net gain of at least 10% biodiversity'*.
Surrey County Council: Climate Change	Infrastructure Delivery: Welcome that the areas on increasing cycling and walking infrastructure, and increasing public EV charging infrastructure, are in keeping with Surrey's Climate Change Strategy and Delivery Plan. Policy 2: The policy appears to seek to limit the generation of energy and not encourage it. We suggest rewording policy 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 to give confidence that renewable energy proposals will be encouraged and positive solutions will be sought to resolve any issues around scale, sighting, visual impact and heritage. In support of policy 2.2, it may be appropriate to link to this guidance from historic England : Adapting Historic Buildings for Energy and Carbon Efficiency | Historic England . We welcome policy 2.4.
Surrey County Council: Transport	p. 20: replace reference to "the highways agency" with "National Highways" (with regard to the A3) The A245 and A318 are designated as local distributor A roads and not as part of the Primary Route Network. p.21: It may be useful to reference that the Wider Woking LCWHIP Stage 1 has just commenced, which will look to provide safer segregated cycle routes to connect Byfleet with Woking. p.23: It may be useful to refer to the following guidance: Electric vehicles and our on-street chargepoint rollout - Surrey County Council
NHS Surrey Heartlands ICB	As currently drafted, we do not feel the Neighbourhood Plan fully considers, or allows the ICB the flexibility required to deliver an estate that meets needs of patients whilst remaining affordable (including in relation to workforce). Further to this, the ICB would be keen to be sighted on the evidence base which identifies a need for additional infrastructure (as detailed in Section 6) and would welcome discussions with the Parish Council to ensure the delivery of any required healthcare infrastructure is justified and is

	appropriately planned for across the strategic and local levels, should there be a resulting identified need (as identified in a health needs assessment). The ICB would therefore request flexibility in the wording, in line with the suggested amendments below. **Suggested Amendments:** ~~Re-instatement of a health centre to provide walk in facility with trained medical advice available. This in turn would alleviate the enormous pressure on the surgeries in West Byfleet.~~ Increase of healthcare facilities within West Byfleet and/or Byfleet which aligns with the Integrated Care Board's estates and primary care strategies. The ICB would welcome the opportunity to work with Byfleet Residents' Neighbourhood Forum and Woking Council to ensure the healthcare infrastructure required to meet the needs of residents is delivered, particularly in relation to primary healthcare services...
Thames Water	Policy 7- We consider that Neighbourhood Plan should include a specific reference to the key issue of the provision of wastewater/sewerage [and water supply] infrastructure to service development proposed in a policy. This is necessary because it will not be possible to identify all of the water/sewerage infrastructure required over the plan period due to the way water companies are regulated and plan in 5 year periods (Asset Management Plans or AMPs). We recommend the Neighbourhood Plan include the following policy/supporting text: PROPOSED NEW WATER/WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE 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."* Policy 6- Flood risk sustainability objectives should accept that water and sewerage infrastructure development may be necessary in flood risk areas. Flood risk sustainability objectives should also make reference to 'sewer flooding' and an acceptance that flooding can occur away from the flood plain as a result of development where off site sewerage infrastructure and capacity is not in place ahead of development. Limiting the opportunity for surface water entering the foul and

	combined sewer networks is of critical importance to Thames Water. Thames Water have advocated an approach to SuDS that limits as far as possible the volume of and rate at which surface water enters the public sewer system… With regard to surface water drainage, Thames Water request that the following paragraph should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan: "*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.*"
National Grid Electricity Transmission	We have identified an NGET asset within the Plan area: ZM ROUTE: 275 kV Overhead Transmission Line route: CHESSINGTON- WEST WEYBRIDGE 1 – CHESSINGTON – WEST WEYBRIDGE 2 [map provided: the route runs through the NA down the inside of the M25 and then north of the River Wey]. Currently there are no known new infrastructure interactions within the area, however demand for electricity is expected to rise as the way NGET power our homes, businesses and transport changes… NGET need to make changes to the network of overhead lines, pylons, cables and other infrastructure that transports electricity around the country, so that everyone has access to clean electricity from these new renewable sources.
Environment Agency	We regret we are unable to review the Byfleet Neighbourhood plan as a whole. However we do have an update on the timing of the Byfleet flood alleviation scheme (FAS) which should be amended in the Neighbourhood Plan document. For the purposes of clarity and accuracy the following paragraph on Page 35 of the Regulation 16 Byfleet Neighbourhood Plan should be amended as follows: *"… This has resulted in the Sanway-Byfleet Flood Alleviation Scheme, due to commence in ~~2024~~ 2026…"*
National Highways	No comments
WBC Planning Policy	We commend the Byfleet Residents' Neighbourhood Forum for all their work in producing the draft Byfleet Neighbourhood Plan. We believe that the draft Plan meets the Basic Conditions, including general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan.
Elmbridge Borough Council	Given the proximity of the Byfleet neighbourhood plan area to Elmbridge Borough Council, and specifically Strategic Employment Land (SEL) at Brooklands Industrial Park and the Heights, officers note the potential cumulative impacts of proposed development or regeneration in the area on traffic and transport infrastructure in Elmbridge. This is particularly relevant to the A245 Parvis Road, which crosses both Boroughs. Officers also note the potential for impacts of proposed development on the continued function of the Brooklands and Heights sites as SEL. Therefore, we would welcome consultation on any planning application that may impact the SEL's and/or traffic and transport infrastructure in the Borough.
Woodland Trust	Support Policy 9 – Trees, hedges and woodland Support for native species is particularly welcome for biodiversity as well as landscape character.

	It is important that any new planting should be from biosecure sources, preferably UK sourced & grown tree stock. Within Byfleet some areas have relatively low tree cover, particularly the north and south ends, and would benefit most from additional tree planting to improve tree equity. See https://uk.treeequityscore.org/map#14.67/51.32972/-0.46454
Keith Creswell Local resident and Cycling Uk Local Representative	The Plan is a well crafted document and the Committee and contributors should be applauded for its production. R.e. Infrastructure (p37) and Community Priorities - Infrastructure (p43) I agree that completion of a cycle way from Byfleet to West Byfleet is essential, the current shared path on the North side of Parvis Road is not LTN1/20 compliant, is too narrow, fails to provide adequate crossing places, is intimidating to pedestrians and is often allowed to be overgrown by adjacent shrubbery further reducing its effectiveness. Further the barricades on the motorway bridge are below current height standards and pose a risk particularly to cyclists. The busy A245 discourages cycling on the road for the less confident cyclist thus creating isolation of the Byfleet Village from a cycling perspective and increases motor traffic accordingly as was pointed out. Further to the above comment, other than a brief mention of the Muddy Lane Bridleway and the Towpath along the canal, the Plan does not address the need to integrate the cycling infrastructure with neighbouring areas, I would offer the following: a. An extension of the intended Parvis Road cycle way to Plough Bridge to connect with cycle access to Brooklands Road to Weybridge and Byfleet Road to Cobham. b. Reference to Muddy Lane providing access to Wisley and Ockham and the developments taking place there. c. Noting that the “official” cycling route on the canal towpath stretches only between Murrays Bridge and Dodds Bridge (Venus Trail) and that SCC and National Trust (the owner of the Wey Navigation) should be pressed to extend the “official” cycle path to the Parvis Road Bridge and, with the cooperation of Elmbridge and Runnymede BCs, onto to New Haw Lock and thereafter to provide access to the Thames Path and also alternative safe cycling to Fullbrook along the Saturn Trail. d. similarly, in co-operation with Guildford BC, extending the “official” route southward to connect with the Downs Link path and Guildford. e. provision of a safe cycling route from Byfleet Village Centre alongside Sopwith Drive to provide access both to the Superstores in Brooklands but also connection to the Weybridge cycling network to provide easier and traffic free access to Weybridge rather than Brooklands Road.
Lynn Cozens (resident of NA)	Support plan
Paul Cozens (resident of NA)	Support plan

Fiona Syrett (resident of NA)	Support plan and hope for its adoption
Ann Kirkpatrick	The Council wastes money and does what it wants. Question point of consultation.