

# Runnymede 2030

## Site Selection

## Methodology and Assessment

Final Version



December 2017



# Contents

- 1. Introduction & Background Evidence..... 1
  - Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) ..... 1
  - Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA)..... 1
  - Employment Land Review (ELR)..... 2
  - Green Belt Review ..... 2
  - The Local Plan & Brownfield Register ..... 4
  - Thorpe..... 5
- 2. Policy Context ..... 6
  - National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) ..... 6
  - National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW)..... 7
  - National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)..... 8
- 3. Comparative Studies ..... 9
- 4. Site Selection Methodology .....12
  - Stage 1: Initial Sift .....13
  - Stage 2 – Undertake SA/SEA of Sites .....16
  - Stage 3: Assessment of Accessibility and Significant Non-Absolute Constraints.....16
  - Stage 4: Assessment Non Significant Non-Absolute Constraints.....26
  - Stage 5: Assessment of sites with Green Belt Review .....28
  - Stage 6: Consider the performance of sites in this assessment and the Sustainability Appraisal and recommend sites for allocation .....30
  - Stage 7: Deliverability.....30
  - Stage 8: Site Capacity .....30
- 5. Site Selection Assessments .....32
  - Stages 1 & 2 Assessment .....32
  - Stage 3 Assessment .....32
  - Stage 4 Assessment .....51
  - Stage 5 Assessment .....58
  - Stage 6 Assessment .....64
  - Stage 7 Assessment .....74
  - Appendix 1 - Initial Sift of Housing Sites .....77
  - Appendix 2 - Initial Sift of Employment Sites .....88
  - Appendix 3 - Assessment of Site Accessibility (Housing) .....92
  - Appendix 4 - Assessment of Significant Non-Absolute Constraints (Housing) .....130
  - Appendix 5 - Assessment of Site Accessibility (Employment).....197
  - Appendix 6 – Assessment of Significant Non-Absolute Constraints (Employment).....201
  - Appendix 7 – Assessment of Non-Significant Non Absolute Constraints .....211
  - Appendix 8 - Performance of Sites & Green Belt.....247
  - Appendix 9 – Sustainability Objectives .....289

Appendix 10 - Table of Representations on First Draft Site Selection Methodology & Assessment (2016) with Officer Responses .....	291
Appendix 11 - Table of Representations on Final Draft Site Selection Methodology & Assessment (May 2017) with Officer Responses .....	305
Table 3-1: Comparative Studies .....	9
Table 4-1: Identified Buffer Zones .....	14
Table 4-2: Major Employment Centres in Runnymede .....	17
Table 4-3: Bus Service Levels .....	17
Table 4-4: Accessibility Standards.....	20
Table 4-5: Significant Non-Absolute Constraints .....	23
Table 4-6: Non-Significant Non-Absolute Constraints.....	26
Table 5-1: Overall Performance of Housing Sites against Accessibility and Significant Non-Absolute Constraints.....	33
Table 5-2: Overall Performance of Employment Sites against Accessibility and Significant Non-Absolute Constraints .....	47
Table 5-3: Performance against Non-Significant Non-Absolute Constraints .....	51
Table 5-4: Assessment of Sites from Stages 3 & 4 and Green Belt Reviews.....	58
Table 5-5: Performance of Sites in Sustainability Appraisal.....	64
Table 5-6: Availability/Viability of Sites .....	75

# 1. Introduction & Background Evidence

- 1.1 The Runnymede Local Plan 2030 will be the document which allocates land in the Borough for a variety of uses, but primarily new housing, employment and retail development.
- 1.2 Runnymede has undertaken a number of evidence studies to identify its development needs and its potential land supply to meet these. Evidence has also been compiled to assess how well the Green Belt in the Borough performs.
- 1.3 This is the third and final version of the Site Selection Methodology and Assessment (SSMA) which informs housing and employment allocations in the Local Plan. Two draft versions of the SSMA were subject to consultation at the same time as the Local Plan Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches (IOPA) and the Additional Sites & Options (ASO) consultations in 2016 & 2017 respectively. The comments made on the draft versions of the SSMA and how they have been taken into account in this final version are set out in Appendices 10 & 11.

## **Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)**

- 1.4 The joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) commissioned by Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Council's sets out the level of objectively assessed housing need (OAN) across the two Boroughs which form the Housing Market Area (HMA). The SHMA has been updated since its first iteration and over the period 2016-2030 finds an OAN for Runnymede of 498 dwellings per annum.

## **Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA)**

- 1.5 Runnymede has undertaken a Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) to inform the preparation of the Local Plan. The SLAA sets out the evidence for potential land supply in the Borough for housing and employment sites after having undertaken a call for sites in September 2015 and October 2016. The sites identified from the call for sites and previous land availability assessments (where these sites are still considered to be available) were set out within an initial SLAA sitebook<sup>1</sup> to support the Local Plan Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document. The SLAA report and sitebook are being updated to reflect the latest housing supply position, as well as taking account of the results of previous versions of the Site Selection Methodology & Assessment. Subsequently all of the additional sites which came forward for the final SLAA have been appraised in this assessment, provided they met the initial sifting process as set out in this methodology.
- 1.6 The sites considered in the SLAA have been assessed as to whether they are deliverable and whether they are suitable. The assessment of suitability takes into account a number of absolute constraints which cannot be overcome, even if mitigation is proposed. This includes constraints such as functional floodplain and sites of international importance for nature conservation such as the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. The SLAA also considers the suitability of sites against a number of non-absolute constraints which could be overcome if mitigation or certain measures are taken. The SLAA methodology<sup>2</sup> which was developed jointly with

---

<sup>1</sup> Runnymede Initial SLAA Sitebook (2016) RBC. Available at: <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/10103/Strategic-Land-Availability-Assessment-SLAA-previously-known-as-the-SHLAA>

<sup>2</sup> Runnymede SLAA Final Methodology (2015) RBC. Available at: <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/10103/Strategic-Land-Availability-Assessment-SLAA-previously-known-as-the-SHLAA>

Spelthorne Borough Council sets out details of the absolute and non-absolute constraints considered through the SLAA process.

- 1.7 However, the role of the SLAA is to consider the potential land supply to help meet development needs in Runnymede, but it is not the evidence which considers which of the submitted sites perform more strongly or sustainably than others and which should be taken forward to allocation. That is the role of the Local Plan supported by this methodology and assessment, other evidence and the Sustainability Appraisal.
- 1.8 The SLAA did not consider the Green Belt as an absolute constraint but as a policy constraint. SLAA sites which were identified in the Green Belt have been appraised through this assessment having regard to the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Green Belt Reviews and the sifting process set out in the methodology of this assessment. As such, only those Green Belt sites which are recommended for allocation in this assessment have been considered suitable to meet development needs (unless the sites were found to be previously developed) in the SLAA. However, unsuitable sites are still recorded in the SLAA for audit purposes.

### **Employment Land Review (ELR)**

- 1.9 The Runnymede Employment Land Review (ELR) considers the need for additional employment floorspace across the Borough to 2035. Based on projected labour supply, there is estimated to be a surplus of 30,957sqm of office floorspace but a deficit of 105,797sqm of storage & distribution (use class B8) floorspace. This is based on a housing figure of 466 dwellings per annum. However evidence as updated in the SHMA considers the employment projections in the ELR to be too optimistic and that a lower level of employment floorspace is required over the plan period to 2030.

### **Green Belt Review**

- 1.10 The Green Belt Review (GBR) Part 1 undertaken by consultants Arup on behalf of the Borough Council considered whether the whole of the Green Belt in Runnymede still meets the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in paragraphs 79 and 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Part 1 GBR split the Green Belt into a number of land parcels and considered how each of these performed against a number of criteria which were developed by the consultants and through Duty to Cooperate discussions. This included refining land parcels to account for absolute and non-absolute environmental constraints.
- 1.11 The Part 1 GBR identified a number of land parcels which when refined either only weakly met Green Belt purposes or which did not meet purposes at all. These were identified as Resultant Land Parcels (RLPs) which the Council could look to remove from the Green Belt, and which could then be used to meet development needs.
- 1.12 The first iteration of the Site Selection Methodology & Assessment considered the findings of the Part 1 GBR in determining how sites performed against Green Belt purposes and aided in considering the balance between protection of the Green Belt and need for sustainable development. Following consultation of the Local Plan Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches Document in 2016 a number of representations commented that the land parcels in the Part 1 GBR were too large to determine whether smaller areas could be released and a finer grained review should be undertaken.

- 1.13 As such, Runnymede commissioned Arup to undertake a finer grained review of the Green Belt (Part 2 GBR) to ensure that smaller parcels of land could be considered. However, the Part 2 GBR did not re-examine every land parcel from the Part 1 GBR but considered smaller parcels where they fell into defined buffer zones around existing urban settlements in Runnymede. This methodology of only considering areas within buffer zones or sites which are large enough to form their own settlement has also been adopted in this assessment as an initial sifting exercise and further details can be found in the methodology section.
- 1.14 In considering which sites to take forward from the SLAA for potential allocation, Runnymede needs to consider the performance of each site and how they compare to one another. As such, a methodology is required that can assess sites in a consistent and robust way to ensure that the best performing sites are taken forward. As such, this methodology and assessment seeks to build on the evidence in the SLAA by applying a more rigorous approach to constraints and sustainability issues as well as how a site performs in terms of Green Belt purposes.
- 1.15 As stated in paragraph 1.6, it is not the role of the SLAA to consider which sites perform better than others and as such each site identified in the SLAA within the buffer zones around urban settlements have been considered in this assessment to ensure that all sites are considered in the round. It is clear from the initial and final SLAA sitebook that insufficient sites within the urban areas of Runnymede will come forward to meet development needs over the Plan period (2015-2030). As such, and providing 'exceptional circumstances' can be demonstrated, sites in the Green Belt could be considered for allocation.
- 1.16 A second iteration of the SSMA was published in May 2017 which took account of the smaller sub-areas identified in the Part 2 GBR. During consultation of the ASO some comments remained that the sub-areas considered by Arup in the Part 2 GBR are still too large and should be refined further to what would be a site level assessment. Arup has responded to these comments and considers that the sub-areas considered in the Part 2 GBR remain the most appropriate and the Council therefore considers that these are reasonable for determining how a site within a sub-area performs against Green Belt purposes.
- 1.17 It should also be noted that although the Council is in the main, fully supportive of Arup's Green Belt Reviews, there are a few instances where the Council does not entirely agree with the findings of the Part 2 GBR. Where this is the case, the Council has taken account of the findings of the Part 2 GBR and sets out why it disagrees with the findings for that particular site or sub-area.



## The Local Plan & Brownfield Register

- 1.18 Section 150 of the Housing & Planning Act 2016, provides for the making of Development Orders which can either grant permission in principle for sites which have been allocated in a qualifying document or by application to the Council. A qualifying document can include a brownfield register. The brownfield register is a register of all previously developed land in the borough, which the Council considers suitable and available for housing led development. This can include previously developed land in the Green Belt.
- 1.19 Runnymede Borough Council took part in the government's pilot project for preparing brownfield registers in 2016 and the first brownfield register must be published by 31<sup>st</sup> December 2017 in accordance with Regulation 3(2) of the Brownfield Register Regulations April 2017<sup>3</sup>. Since the publication of the Regulations the government has also published Planning Practice Guidance Notes on Brownfield Land Registers and Permission in Principle.
- 1.20 As such, some sites that are included within the brownfield register can be allocated for development with permission in principle automatically granted irrespective of location having regard to national policy. The detailed impacts of any development proposed at a site granted by permission in principle are then considered by the Council through a Technical Details application. The Technical Details application would not reconsider the principle of development as this will already have been granted by the permission in principle.
- 1.21 Therefore, in order to inform potential sites for allocation through the Local Plan, consideration needs to be had to opportunities for allocating sites through a brownfield register instead. The Council has taken account of the Brownfield Register Regulations and PPG notes on Brownfield Land Registers and Permission in Principle and considers that in the main it cannot include sites within the register and automatically grant permission in principle. This is either because a site falls within the 5km zone of influence around the Thames Basin Heaths SPA where mitigation needs to be secured upon the grant of permission to ensure no significant effects or because a site falls within areas of flood risk where mitigation needs to be secured on grant of permission. There being no mechanism at the permission in principle stage to secure mitigation either through condition or planning obligation the council considers that these sites cannot be determined as suitable and will not be included in the Register.
- 1.22 There are a number of sites identified in the interim and final SLAA sitebook within the Green Belt which are partially developed. Whilst the developed areas of these sites could be allocated through the brownfield register (subject to the issues highlighted in paragraph 1.21 above) their allocation through a Local Plan could potentially yield higher levels of development as the whole site would be included not just the area considered to be previously developed. As such, those sites in the Green Belt which are partly PDL have been included in this assessment where they fall within the buffer zone.
- 1.23 The former DERA site at Longcross has been confirmed by government to be one of the first 14 garden villages in England, although its allocation through the Local Plan is required to enable this. The area of the DERA site south of the M3 is considered to be partially previously developed and the area north of the M3 is now under construction for 200 residential units and 79,000sqm of employment floorspace and other uses. The

---

<sup>3</sup> The Town & Country Planning (Brownfield Land Register) Regulations 2017. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2017/403/contents/made>



site is considered to be large enough to create its own settlement and as such has been considered in the round with all other sites in this SSMA.

- 1.24 All sites within the urban area have not been considered through this site selection assessment. In terms of both housing and employment sites there is a presumption in favour of development within existing urban areas and housing sites could be allocated through the brownfield register subject to para 1.21 above. As such, there is no need to consider urban brownfield housing/employment sites within this SSMA. This allows the Local Plan to concentrate on those larger sites in the Green Belt which are fundamental to delivery of the spatial strategy.

### **Thorpe**

- 1.25 Runnymede has undertaken a Green Belt Villages Review. Stage 1 of the review considered whether any of the developed areas considered as villages within the Runnymede Green Belt should be returned to the urban area when assessed against paragraph 86 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Stage 1 only recommended that the village of Thorpe should be returned to the urban area.
- 1.26 Stage 2 of the Green Villages Review considered where the detailed village boundary should be located around Thorpe. The boundary review recommends a number of small land parcels around the village be brought into the urban area and for the purposes of this site selection methodology the village of Thorpe with the additional land parcels identified in the boundary review have been considered as part of the urban area. This means that those small land parcels as set out in the Stage 2 Green Belt Villages Review and identified as options TH2 to TH6 in the IOPA have not been considered in this SSMA and not proposed for allocation. If development were to come forward on any of these areas they would need to be subject to any policies set out in both the Local Plan 2015-2030 and a Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan which is in preparation.
- 1.27 It should also be noted that the Thorpe Industrial Estate is designated as urban area on the current Local Plan Policies Map. However, the industrial estate is not part of any of Runnymede's residential settlements, being detached from the settlements of both Egham and Thorpe. Neither does the industrial estate have any of its own facilities or services but is purely an employment area. As such to include the Thorpe Industrial Estate as an urban area when it performs no residential function would be unreasonable. Therefore, for the purposes of this methodology the Thorpe Industrial Estate is not taken to be part of the urban area to which buffer zones have been attached.
- 1.28 The Local Plan will allocate sites for retail/mixed use in the Borough's town and local centres, however, as these sites are all located in the urban area, alternatives for this type of allocation have not been considered within this methodology and assessment.

## 2. Policy Context

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)<sup>4</sup>

- 2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the overarching national policy for Local Plan making in England. It sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development and in paragraph 14 states that local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and that Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs unless any adverse impacts of doing so outweigh the benefits or where the NPPF indicates development should be restricted.
- 2.2 Paragraph 157 bullet 4 of the NPPF states that Local Plans should indicate broad locations for strategic development and bullet 5, that Local Plans should allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing new land forward where necessary. One of the tests of soundness for Local Plans as set out in paragraph 182 of the NPPF is that to be justified they should be based on the most appropriate strategy when assessed against the reasonable alternatives. As such, the assessment of sites and how they compare against one another will be important to demonstrate reasonable alternatives have been considered.
- 2.3 The NPPF sets out guidance on a range of matters which is considered to be relevant to this methodology and assessment including:
  - Accessibility – The NPPF supports patterns of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport (para 29), ensures that development generating significant amounts of traffic are located where the need to travel is minimised (para 34) and where practical within large scale developments locate key facilities within walking distance of most properties. Planning should actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling (para 17, bullet 11);
  - Protection of Green Belt – The NPPF sets out that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances (para 83), that if reviewing boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development (para 84) and that when defining boundaries local planning authorities should ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development, not include land unnecessary to keep permanently open, safeguard land and define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent (para 85).
  - Land – Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value (para 17 bullet 7) with least environmental amenity value (para 110) and planning should encourage the effective use of land by reusing land which has been previously developed (para 17 bullet 8 & 111). Loss of agricultural land should be of poorer quality rather than higher quality (para 112) and planning should protect and enhance valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils (para 109);
  - Open Space – NPPF sets out that open space, sports and recreation buildings and land, including playing fields should not be built on subject to criteria (para 74) and

---

<sup>4</sup> NPPF (2012) CLG. Available at: <http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/>

designated Local Green Spaces will only be subject to development in very special circumstances (para 76);

- Climate Change – NPPF sets out that local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change taking account of flood risk (para 94) and support locations for development which reduce greenhouse gas emissions (para 95);
- Natural Environment – The NPPF seeks to minimise impacts on biodiversity and achieve net gains (para 109 bullet 3), promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats and ecological networks and protection of priority species (para 117 bullet 3) and sets out protection for designated sites (para 113 & 118 bullet 6) as well as setting general protection for irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland (para 118 bullet 5);
- Flood Risk – The NPPF sets out that inappropriate development in areas of flood risk should be avoided and Local Plans should apply a sequential, risk based approach to the location of development (para 100);
- Environmental Protection – The NPPF seeks to avoid the risk to/from development of soil, air, water or noise pollution (para 109 bullet 5) and in preparing plans to meet development needs the aim should be to minimise pollution and other adverse effects on the local and natural environment (para 110).
- Heritage – Great weight should be given to the conservation of a heritage asset with harm to assets exceptional or wholly exceptional depending on their significance (para 132);
- Minerals – Local planning authorities should define Mineral Safeguarding Areas and adopt policies in order to ensure that mineral resources of local and national importance are not sterilised (para 143 bullet 3).

2.4 The NPPF also sets out that Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic and that housing sites should either be deliverable or developable. The footnotes to paragraph 47 bullets 1 & 2 state that to be deliverable sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site in 5 years and is viable. To be developable a site should be in a suitable location for housing with a reasonable prospect that the site is available and is viable.

2.5 Paragraph 173 of the NPPF also sets out that Local Plans should be deliverable and the sites and scale of development identified should not be subject to a scale of obligations or policy burdens so that development viability is threatened.

### **National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW)<sup>5</sup>**

2.6 The NPPW sets out national planning policy on waste related matters. The NPPW sets out that waste planning authorities should identify in their Local Plans sites and/or areas for new or enhanced waste management facilities and consider a broad range of locations, giving priority to the re-use of previously developed land.

2.7 Surrey County Council is the waste authority for the Runnymede area and as such is responsible for preparing the Waste Local Plan.

---

<sup>5</sup> NPPW (2014) CLG. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-for-waste>

## **National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)<sup>6</sup>**

- 2.8 The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) supports the NPPF and adds additional guidance to some of the policy areas set out within it.
- 2.9 The PPG note on *Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessments* sets out the methodology to be used when preparing Strategic Land Availability Assessments (SLAA). The PPG note advocates a 5 stage approach and this has already been undertaken by Runnymede Borough Council in terms of stages 1 and 2 with the publication of the draft and preparation of the final SLAA site book.
- 2.10 The PPG advises that at Stage 2 plan makers should identify:
- Physical limitations or problems such as access, infrastructure, ground conditions, flood risk, hazardous risks, pollution or contamination;
  - Potential impacts including the effect upon landscapes including landscape features, nature and heritage conservation;
  - Appropriateness and likely market attractiveness for the type of development proposed;
  - Contribution to regeneration of priority areas;
  - Environmental/amenity impacts experienced by would be occupiers and neighbouring areas.
- 2.11 The PPG note on *Local Plans* sets out that policies in a Local Plan should recognise the diverse types of housing needed in their area and where appropriate identify specific sites for all types of housing to meet anticipated housing requirements.

---

<sup>6</sup> PPG (2014) CLG. Available at: <http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/>

### 3. Comparative Studies

- 3.1 In order to propose a robust and credible methodology for assessing sites for allocation in the Runnymede Local Plan, a review of comparative studies has been undertaken to check for any best practice or consistent approaches. Table 3-1 sets out the details of a number of studies for comparison.

**Table 3-1: Comparative Studies**

<b>Authority Area</b>	<b>Methodology</b>
<b>Blaby District Council</b>  <b>Site Selection Methodology<sup>7</sup></b>	<p>Sets out a 5 stage approach as follows: -</p> <p>Stage 1 - Initial site identification for sites meeting minimum size threshold</p> <p>Stage 2 – Sites considered against sustainability criteria including social, economic and environmental factors. Each factor assessed against a range of standards</p> <p>Stage 3 – Compliance with Core Strategy locational principles</p> <p>Stage 4 – Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>Stage 5 – Conclusions and recommendations</p> <p>No weighting given to individual sustainability factors and scoring is qualitative based on traffic light approach to standards.</p>
<b>Ryedale District Council</b>  <b>Site Selection Methodology<sup>8</sup></b>	<p>Sets out a 3 stage approach as follows:</p> <p>Stage 1 – Initial sift of sites which do not fit with Local Plan Strategy and which have significant constraints such as designated sites, heritage assets and floodplain.</p> <p>Stage 2 – Made up of three different assessments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Considers key strategic considerations such as accessibility, highways and flood risk;</li> <li>2) Considers groups of thematic considerations which influence merits of each site;</li> <li>3) Considers the deliverability of each site in terms of physical, commercial, legal and other factors</li> </ol> <p>Stage 3 – Represents the outcome of stages 1 &amp; 2</p> <p>Different weighting applied to different assessments at stage 2 with assessment 1 given more significant weight.</p> <p>Scoring system is not on points but on a rating system using positive or negative effects.</p>
<b>Selby District Council</b>	<p>Sets out a 4 stage approach as follows:-</p>

<sup>7</sup> Site Selection Methodology (2016) Blaby District Council. Available at: <http://www.blaby.gov.uk/about-the-council/strategies-plans-policies/environment-and-planning/local-plan/local-plan-delivery-dpd/>

<sup>8</sup> Site Selection Methodology (2014) Ryedale District Council. Available at: <http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/local-plan-sites>

<p><b>A Framework for Site Selection<sup>9</sup></b></p>	<p>Stage 1 – Initial sift of sites to account for absolute constraints such as floodplain, designated sites and other issues such as proximity to urban areas.</p> <p>Stage 2 – Qualitative assessment based on accessibility to a range of facilities as well as flood risk, physical &amp; infrastructure constraints and impact on international/national sites (SPA, SAC, SSSI).</p> <p>Stage 3 – Qualitative assessment against a range of non-absolute constraints.</p> <p>Stage 4 – Deliverability considered in terms of availability and achievability.</p> <p>The methodology uses a criteria based approach using standards developed from evidence/guidance/good practice. Each site is scored against standards using a traffic light system to describe positive or negative results.</p>
<p><b>South Staffordshire Council</b></p> <p><b>Site Allocations Document: Methodology Paper<sup>10</sup></b></p>	<p>Contains a number of stages of which the most relevant include: -</p> <p>Stage 1 – Starting point are SHLAA sites in compliance with the spatial strategy. Sites not adjoining village boundaries excluded. Sites with absolute constraints excluded.</p> <p>Stage 2 – Applies a site size threshold according to adopted policy (10 or more dwellings or 0.3ha for main service areas).</p> <p>Stage 3 – Sites assessed against two tiers of selection criteria. Sites ranked against tier 1 criteria including Green Belt impact with top 2-3 taken forward for assessment against tier 2 criteria with remaining sites considered in the round.</p>
<p><b>West Berkshire Borough Council</b></p> <p><b>Housing Site Allocations DPD – Background Paper<sup>11</sup>: Approach to Housing Site Allocations</b></p>	<p>Appendix B sets out a two stage approach focussing on sites considered to be potentially developable in the SHLAA. Stages are as follows:</p> <p>Stage 1 – Initial sift of sites excluding those with absolute constraints and which did not meet site size threshold. Sites within settlement areas also excluded on the basis that there is a presumption in favour of development and no need to allocate.</p> <p>Stage 2 – Sites not excluded by stage 1 are considered against a range of further constraints and criteria. All sites</p>

<sup>9</sup> A Framework for Site Selection (2015) Arup. Available at: <http://www.selby.gov.uk/plan-selby-site-allocations-draft-framework-site-selection>

<sup>10</sup> Site Allocations Document: Methodology Paper (2014) South Staffordshire Council. Available at: [http://www.sstaffs.gov.uk/your\\_services/strategic\\_services/planning\\_policy\\_-\\_local\\_plans/site\\_allocations/initial\\_issues\\_and\\_options.aspx](http://www.sstaffs.gov.uk/your_services/strategic_services/planning_policy_-_local_plans/site_allocations/initial_issues_and_options.aspx)

<sup>11</sup> West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations DPD Background Paper (2015) West Berks Borough Council. Available at: <http://info.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=32494>

	not excluded by stage 1 were subject to Sustainability Appraisal.
<b>Woking Borough Council</b>  <b>Site Assessment Methodology<sup>12</sup></b>	<p>Sets out a 2 stage approach as follows: -</p> <p>Stage 1 – Identifies sites from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and Employment Land Review. Sites of fewer than 10 units or 500sqm commercial floorspace excluded. Sites excluded on basis of absolute constraints including zone 3 flood risk, designated sites or mitigation for designated sites.</p> <p>Stage 2 – Reasonable alternative site options supported as preferred sites or rejected on the basis of sustainability appraisal and associated tests which include a range of non-absolute constraints. The SA framework is used to score each site in terms of its likely impact either (positive or negative) rather than point scoring. Deliverability of sites assessed and preferred sites in the Green Belt will be assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt informed by Green Belt Review.</p>

- 3.2 The above comparator reviews highlight a number of similar stages in a site selection methodology. All methodologies reviewed have an initial stage of sifting sites so that those with known constraints which cannot be overcome are excluded early in the process. Three of the six methodologies also exclude sites which do not adjoin or lay adjacent to existing urban/settlement areas and four exclude some sites based on a site size threshold. Only one of the methodologies uses weighting of different constraints as a factor, but all set out a range of different constraints and criteria by which to assess sites including accessibility criteria and standards. The Sustainability Appraisal process is fed into all of the methodologies although not always at the same stage and two are informed by their Green Belt Review evidence. One methodology excludes sites in existing urban/settlement areas as there is a presumption in favour of development and as such there is no need to allocate.

<sup>12</sup> Site Selection Methodology (2015) Woking Borough Council. Available at: <http://www.woking2027.info/allocations>



## 4. Site Selection Methodology

- 4.1 Given the findings from the review of comparator methodologies, it is clear that a multi-step approach to site assessment is required. Whilst there were some differences between the methodologies reviewed in section 3 there are also a number of similarities which can be taken forward.
- 4.2 The majority of the methodologies reviewed did not assess sites through a point scoring exercise, rather they were assessed on positive or negative impacts and a qualitative assessment made on officer judgement. This methodology will use the same approach by considering whether sites have positive or negative impacts on certain criteria based on performance against a range of standards where appropriate. In the main, the methodologies also assessed both housing and employment sites against the same criteria with some tweaks or additional criteria.
- 4.3 The reason for not choosing a point scoring exercise is that scores can sometimes be misleading or not represent the true impact of a site. There may be occasions where a site could score highly, but there may be a fundamental constraint which cannot be overcome and which would not be reflected in the score. Whilst weighting could be applied to the scoring exercise for a range of constraints, this again could still result in anomalous results.
- 4.4 The conclusions of the Runnymede Green Belt Review Parts 1 & 2 are also considered in this methodology with sites considered against these.
- 4.5 Therefore the following stages for the site selection assessment are as follows:

**Stage 1:** An initial sift of sites;

**Stage 2:** Undertake SA/SEA of all sites carried forward from Stage 1 as an independent assessment;

**Stage 3:** Assessment of accessibility & compare sites against significant non-absolute constraints as identified in the Green Belt Reviews;

**Stage 4:** Compare sites against non-significant and non-absolute constraints identified in the Green Belt Reviews;

**Stage 5:** Assess sites taken forward from stages 1, 3 & 4 with findings of the Green Belt Reviews;

**Stage 6:** Consider the performance of sites in this assessment and the Sustainability Appraisal and recommend sites for allocation;

**Stage 7:** Deliverability of sites taken forward from stage 6;

**Stage 8:** Consider capacity of sites taken forward from stage 7<sup>13</sup>.

---

<sup>13</sup> Capacity analysis of sites set out in a separate evidence study available at: <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/12181/Site-Selection-and-Capacity-Work>

## **Stage 1: Initial Sift**

- 4.6 In order to ensure that only those sites which could be considered reasonable alternatives, Stage 1 of this methodology contains an initial sift of sites.
- 4.7 For housing, all SLAA sites will be considered aside from those where the SLAA proforma indicates a use other than housing. For employment, only those sites where the SLAA site proforma indicated that an employment use might be considered or where sites are undeveloped housing reserve sites have been considered. If the SLAA site proforma did not indicate that housing/employment use would be considered by the land owner/promoter, then it is considered that the site is not available for housing/employment uses and is not therefore deliverable. Undeliverable sites are not considered to be reasonable alternatives.
- 4.8 To ensure consistency between this methodology and the Green Belt Reviews, Stage 1 will include the same absolute constraints as the Green Belt Reviews, with the exception of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) given that this designation does not occur in Runnymede. From the review of comparator methodologies a number of other criteria will also be included at this stage, some of which were not included in the Green Belt Reviews. As such, there is considered to be merit in considering a number of additional criteria for consideration in the stage 1 sift. These are outlined in the paragraphs below.
- 4.9 The initial sift will focus on those sites which are entirely covered by an absolute constraint or other criteria or which fall entirely outside of an urban buffer area (see paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 below). This will ensure that sites are not excluded in their entirety in Stage 1 where alterations to a site boundary could be made to remove absolute constraints or where areas of absolute constraint could be considered for other uses i.e. open space.
- 4.10 The initial sift will therefore focus on:

### **Proximity to Settlement**

- 4.11 The draft SSMA focused on an initial sift of sites with those not adjoining the urban areas of Runnymede excluded at Stage 1 unless they were of a size which could form their own settlement. Following on from the Part 2 Green Belt Review work this particular criteria for an initial sift has been amended and now considers sites based on whether they fall within a 'buffer' which has been placed around each urban area of the borough or whether they would be large enough to form their own settlement.
- 4.12 The buffer approach was developed in response to a number of representations made at the IOPA stage of Local Plan preparation which stated that the land parcels considered in the Part 1 Green Belt Review were too large and that if smaller areas had been considered then a different outcome may have been reached. However, rather than re-visit each land parcel from the Part 1 work and split into smaller parcels, the Part 2 work has focussed on buffer 'zones' placed around each urban area in Runnymede.
- 4.13 The buffer approach is considered to be more spatially focussed and a proportionate response to assessing smaller land parcels in the Borough and is justified given the seriously fragmented nature of the Green Belt in North West Surrey. Using wider buffers would also to some degree duplicate the Part 1 work.
- 4.14 In developing the extent of buffers to place around Runnymede's urban areas regard has been had to comparable studies carried out in other authority areas, to the fragmented nature of the Green Belt in North West Surrey and to Runnymede's centre

hierarchy. This resulted in a buffer 'zone' extending 400m out from areas with Town or Key Service Centres and 250m from areas with only Local Service Centres and surrounding urban areas. Table 4-1 sets out the buffer zones applied to each urban area.

**Table 4-1: Identified Buffer Zones**

<b>Town Centre/Key Service Centre (400m Buffer)</b>	<b>Local Service Centre and Surrounding Urban Areas (250m Buffer)</b>
Addlestone Chertsey/Chertsey South Egham New Haw/Woodham Virginia Water	Englefield Green Ottershaw Thorpe Village

- 4.15 In undertaking the initial sift based on buffer zones any site wholly or partially falling within the zone has been taken forward to Stage 2, provided other criteria in the initial sift have also been passed (see below).

### **Flood Risk**

- 4.16 The NPPF and PPG clearly set out that development for housing/employment is not appropriate in the floodplain. Any sites which fall entirely within Flood Risk Zone 3b (functional floodplain) have therefore been excluded.

### **Sites of International, National and Local Importance**

- 4.17 The European Birds and Habitats Directives and the Conservation of Natural Habitats & Species Regulations set out strong levels of protection for a number of designated sites. Although, locally protected Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) and Local Nature Reserves (LNR) are also considered to be important areas for local wildlife and biodiversity. As such, sites will be excluded if they are wholly within an international, national or local designation for nature conservation importance including:

- Special Protection Areas (SPA);
- Special Areas of Conservation (SAC);
- Ramsar Sites;
- Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI);
- National Nature Reserves;
- Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI);
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR).

- 4.18 Further, any site considered for housing that is entirely within a 400m zone of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, including parts of the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC will not be taken forward due to recreational and urbanising impacts which cannot be avoided. The basis for this has been set out in the Thames Basin Heaths Delivery Framework<sup>14</sup>. Employment sites within 400m will not be excluded at this stage.

- 4.19 To avoid impacts arising from residential development within 400m-5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, a series of avoidance measures have been agreed by all

<sup>14</sup> Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Delivery Framework (2009) Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership. Available at: <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/5251/Thames-Basin-Heaths-Special-Protection-Area-TBH-SPA-policy-documents-and-guidance>

authorities affected by the SPA and Natural England. The avoidance measures are in the form of Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG), which are alternative areas for recreation. Therefore, any site which is entirely within a designated Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) will also be excluded.

#### **Ancient Woodland:**

- 4.20 Para 118 bullet 5 of the NPPF gives strong protection to irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland and therefore a site wholly covered by ancient woodland will be excluded.

#### **Heritage Assets:**

- 4.21 The NPPF states that harm or loss of a Grade II Registered Park or Garden should be exceptional or wholly exceptional in terms of Grade II\* and I Registered Parks or Gardens (para 132). Therefore if all or the majority of a site is within a Historic Park and Garden it will be excluded unless harm could be overcome.
- 4.22 The NPPF states that harm to or loss of Scheduled Monuments should be wholly exceptional (para 132). Therefore if all or the majority of a site is within a Scheduled Monument it will be excluded unless harm could be overcome.
- 4.23 The impact of development on the setting of all other designated and non-designated heritage assets will be considered at a later stage, as it is not considered to be a reason for exclusion at this stage.

#### **Site Access**

- 4.24 If physical access cannot be gained to a site from a highway, the site will be excluded. For employment sites an assessment will also be made of accessibility to the strategic highway network, to ensure a location is suitable for storage & distribution uses (B8). This will also take into account routes to the strategic highway network to ensure that traffic movements in the main, remain on routes with an A classification and can avoid moving through residential streets. Sites more than 5km (3 miles) from a strategic highway junction or which can only access a junction predominantly through extensive areas of residential development will be excluded.

#### **Site Size**

- 4.25 Sites which do not fall into the definition of a major development<sup>15</sup> will be excluded. This will also include larger sites, where due to absolute constraints the site area is reduced below the definition of major development.
- 4.26 For housing sites major development is defined as where the number of dwelling houses to be provided is 10 or more or the development site is 0.5ha or more in area. For employment the definition is where the floorspace of buildings to be created would be 1,000sqm or more or the development site is 1ha or more in area.
- 4.27 Part of this stage will include planning judgement to be exercised in order to sense check site boundaries. This will enable an understanding of whether sites failing on any of the above criteria would benefit from redrawing their site boundaries to enable them to progress through the sifting process.

---

<sup>15</sup> Major development as defined in Part 1 of the Town & County Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order 2015. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2015/595/contents/made>

- 4.28 All sites which were not sifted out of the process at this stage in this version of the SSMA were appraised through either the initial Sustainability Appraisal which accompanied the IOPA document or further Sustainability Appraisal which accompanied the further options consultation in May 2017. This ensured that all reasonable alternatives were properly considered where sites passed through the initial sift.
- 4.29 A list of all sites (excluding brownfield/urban sites) which were subject to the initial sift and details of how they were assessed at Stage 1 are included within Appendices 1 & 2.

### **Stage 2 – Undertake SA/SEA of Sites**

- 4.30 All sites that were carried forward from Stage 1 of the assessment have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA). All sites assessed in the SA have been carried forward to stage 3 and account of the SA findings have been considered in Stage 7 of the site selection process. As such, the initial sift in Stage 1 considered which sites could be termed ‘reasonable alternatives’ to go forward for appraisal in the SA.

### **Stage 3: Assessment of Accessibility and Significant Non-Absolute Constraints**

- 4.31 The NPPF aims to promote patterns of development which make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling and which can minimise the need to travel. As such, Stage 3 of the methodology will consider the accessibility of sites to major service and employment centres as well as a range of services and facilities.
- 4.32 In order to consider the accessibility of sites, they will be assessed against a range of accessibility standards. For major service centres and major employment centres, accessibility will be based on journey time calculated by using the Council’s GIS mapping and details of public transport services and timetables including both buses and trains in peak hours. Journey times will be calculated by combining the walk time from a site to a public transport node (bus stop or rail station) with the time taken to reach the nearest major service or employment centre by that public transport mode including walk time from transport node to centre if applicable (End to End journey time). This will not include the time someone may have to wait for transport services unless part of the journey involves an interchange. Peak hours are defined as weekdays 7am-9am and 4pm-6pm.
- 4.33 For the purposes of this methodology a major service centre is one which contains a main town centre of primary/secondary regional importance. There are no centres at this level in Runnymede with the closest in neighbouring authority areas at Staines-upon-Thames, Windsor and Woking. In terms of centres of employment this again includes Staines-upon-Thames, Windsor and Woking as well as the Brooklands Estate in Woking/Elmbridge which lies adjacent to the Borough boundary to the south. Major employment centres within Runnymede are set out in Table 4-1 with an indication of their floorspace in square metres. This includes, Chertsey Town Centre and five areas to be designated as ‘Strategic Employment Sites’ in the Runnymede Local Plan including the Enterprise Zone at Longcross Park.

**Table 4-2: Major Employment Centres in Runnymede**

<b>Site</b>	<b>Floorspace (sqm)</b>
The Causeway & Pine Trees Business Park, Egham	107,444
Thorpe Industrial Estate, Thorpe	75,313
Weybridge & Bourne Business Park and Waterside Trading Estate, Addlestone	47,038
Hillswood Business Park, Ottershaw	21,571
Longcross Enterprise Zone	71,765
Chertsey Town Centre	45,245

- 4.34 In further refining this standard, account has also been had to the distance to a bus stop or rail station with a very good or good level of service. Whilst journey time is a good indicator of accessibility to major centres this may disguise the level of transport service provided and walkability to transport services more generally. The criteria for assessing the level of bus services has been taken from the Runnymede Centre Hierarchy paper and is set out in Table 4-3. This has also been used for major centres of employment. The criteria for bus service levels have also been applied to rail services. The Chartered Institute for Highways & Transportation indicate<sup>16</sup> accessible walking distances to a bus stop as 400m and rail station as 800m.
- 4.35 The 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service is considered to offer the most benefits for maximising sustainable transport options and as such bus stops or rail stations which only offer a limited or reasonable level of service have not been considered in the assessment of site accessibility. Any stop/station closer to a site than one with a 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service, will be noted for information. For potential employment sites, it will be the walk time from the nearest transport node with a 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service which will be calculated.

**Table 4-3: Bus Service Levels**

<b>No Service</b>	No bus or rail service.
<b>Limited Service</b>	One direct route to a major centre or major centre of employment  Monday – Friday  Service(s) commence after 9am.
<b>Reasonable Service</b>	One direct route to a major centre or major centre of employment  Monday- Friday and a limited service to a Saturday  Service(s) commence before 8.30am and run until after 6pm (Monday – Friday) with at least 1 service in the am & pm peak.

<sup>16</sup> Planning for Walking (2015) CIHT. Available at: <http://www.ciht.org.uk/en/document-summary/index.cfm/docid/082BEF1B-0FD2-44F4-90A0B31EB937899A>

<b>Good Service</b>	<p>One direct route to a major centre or major centre of employment</p> <p>Mon-Sat Service</p> <p>Service(s) commence before 8am and run until after 6.30pm (Monday – Friday) with at least 2 services in the am &amp; pm peak.</p>
<b>Very Good Service</b>	<p>More than one direct route to a major centre or major centre of employment</p> <p>Every day service (Mon-Sun)</p> <p>Service(s) commence before 7am and run until after 7pm with more than 2 services in the am and pm peak.</p>

- 4.36 For accessibility by cycling to potential employment sites, this has been based on assessing the approximate percentage of an urban area which lies within the radius of an employment site as measured from its centre. This is considered to give an indication of the potential population which live within standard cycle distances to an employment site and which could travel to work more sustainably. The standards used are set out in Table 4-4.
- 4.37 For more local services such as schools, health centres/GP surgeries and local shopping provision (day to day needs), accessibility will be based on walk times. Although cycling will form an important alternative travel mode, it is considered that for local services a walk time is more appropriate. This is because not everyone who will live at a potential site will be capable of cycling or it may not be appropriate for them to do so. For employment sites, accessibility to local schools has not been considered but accessibility to local health and retail facilities has. This is because it is now possible to register with a GP from where a person works and not necessarily where they live. Whilst some small retail facilities which provide for day to day needs could be provided within employment development, this may not be feasible or desirable and as such distance to local retail facilities has been included as people working at employment sites may wish to ‘top up’ shop during the day or purchase items for breaks in working hours.
- 4.38 Details of how the standards have been arrived at are contained within Table 4-4. For the accessibility of sites the distance to/from sites will be taken from the visual centre of each site including the calculation of journey time and based on following made roads/paths not ‘as the crow flies’ or unmade public footpaths.
- 4.39 Stage 3 also contains an assessment against significant non-absolute constraints. These will be based on the absolute constraints set out in Stage 1 where sites are in, but not entirely covered by an absolute constraint. Any significant but non-absolute constraints as identified in Table 5.9 of the Part 1 Green Belt Review have also been included along with a consideration of the degree of the constraint. As with accessibility, sites will be appraised against a range of standards for each constraint. The standards and how they have been arrived at are set out in Table 4-5. It should be noted that given the nature of the constraints, some may have a broader range of standards than others and some may be less of a constraint depending on the type of development.



- 4.40 Commentary on the overall suitability of a site focussing on accessibility and constraints have been made for each site appraised in stage 3 and a recommendation made as to whether they should be taken forward to stage 4. If, due to constraints a site would be reduced in size below the threshold set out in stage 1, the site will be automatically excluded.
- 4.41 In this stage, sites which only scored 'low' or 'low-medium' overall were excluded from further consideration and not taken forward to stage 4.

**Table 4-4: Accessibility Standards**

Selection Criteria	Standard & Score					Standard Derived From
<b>Journey Time to/from Major Centres or Centres of Employment in peak hours (Housing Sites Only)</b>	Within 30min journey time of 2 or more major centres or major employment centres in peak hours by public transport	Within 30min journey time of at least one major centre or employment centre in peak hours by public transport	Within 40min journey time of 2 or more major centres or major employment centres in peak hours by public transport	Within 40min journey time of at least one major centre or employment centre in peak hours by public transport	Over 40min journey time from any major or intermediate centre by public transport	Comparator methodologies. Peak hours considered to be 7am-9am and 4pm-6pm Mon-Fri.
<b>Distance to Bus Stop with Very Good or Good level of service (Housing &amp; Employment Sites)</b>	Within 400m	401m- 800m	801m-1.2km	1.21km –1.6km	Over 1.6km	Chartered Institute for Highways and Transportation (CIHT) <sup>14</sup> indicate acceptable walking distances for bus stops 400m and rail stations 800m. Runnymede Centre Hierarchy sets out criteria for level of bus service for ‘Very Good’ or ‘Good’ service and these definitions have been used in this methodology.
<b>Distance to Rail Station with Very Good or Good level of service (Housing &amp; Employment Sites)</b>	Within 800m	801m-1.2km	1.21km-1.6km	1.61km-2km	Over 2km	Chartered Institute for Highways and Transportation (CIHT) <sup>14</sup> indicate acceptable walking distances for bus stops 400m and rail stations 800m. Runnymede Centre Hierarchy sets out criteria for level of bus service for ‘Very Good’ or ‘Good’ service and these definitions have been used in this methodology.

Selection Criteria	Standard & Score					Standard Derived From
<b>Accessibility by Cycling (Housing Sites Only)</b>	Within 10 min (2.6km) cycle time of 2 or more major centres or major employment centres	Within 10 min (2.6km) cycle time of at least 1 major centre or major employment centre	Within 20 min (5.2km) cycle time of 2 or more major centres or major employment centres	Within 20 min (5.2km) cycle of at least 1 major centre or major employment centre	Over 20 min (5.2km) cycle from any major centre or major employment centre	Local Transport Note 2/08 <sup>17</sup> (Oct 2008) DfT – Cycling Infrastructure Design – para 1.5.1 – Many utility cycle trips under 3 miles (4.8km) with commuter journeys of 5 miles (8km) not uncommon. Standard walk and cycle speeds of 3mph and 10mph set out in Accessibility of Key Services Travel Time Calculation Method (2014) <sup>15</sup> . For cycling this equates to 1.3km in 5mins.
<b>Accessibility by Cycling (Employment Sites Only)</b>	50% of area within 2.6km radius of employment site falls within urban area	25% of area within 2.6km radius of employment site falls within urban area	50% of area within 5.2km radius of employment site falls within urban area	25% of area within 5.2km radius of employment site falls within urban area	Less than 25% of area within 5.2km radius of employment site falls within urban area	Local Transport Note 2/08 <sup>15</sup> (Oct 2008) DfT – Cycling Infrastructure Design – para 1.5.1 – Many utility cycle trips under 3 miles (4.8km) with commuter journeys of 5 miles (8km) not uncommon. Standard walk and cycle speeds of 3mph and 10mph set out in Accessibility of Key Services Travel Time Calculation Method (2014) <sup>15</sup> . For cycling this equates to 1.3km in 5mins.

<sup>17</sup> Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/...data/.../ltn-2-08\\_Cycle\\_infrastructure\\_design.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/...data/.../ltn-2-08_Cycle_infrastructure_design.pdf)

Selection Criteria	Standard & Score					Standard Derived From
<b>Distance to Primary School</b>	Within 10 min (800m) walk time	Within 15 min (1.2km) walk time	Within 20 min (1.6km) walk time	Within 25 min (2km) walk time	Over 25 min (2km) walk time	Manual for Streets <sup>18</sup> describes a walkable neighbourhood as having a range of services within 800m. Chartered Institute for Highways and Transportation (CIHT) <sup>19</sup> indicate suggested acceptable walking distances of 1km to schools and to elsewhere 800m.
<b>Distance to Secondary School</b>	Within 10 min (800m) walk time	Within 15 min (1.2km) walk time	Within 20 min (1.6km) walk time	Within 25 min (2km) walk time	Over 25 min (2km) walk time	See walk time to primary school
<b>Distance to Health Centre or GP Surgery</b>	Within 10 min (800m) walk time	Within 15 min (1.2km) walk time	Within 20 min (1.6km) walk time	Within 25 min (2km) walk time	Over 25 min (2km) walk time	See walk time to primary school
<b>Distance to Local Convenience Retail</b>	Within 10 min (800m) walk time	Within 15 min (1.2km) walk time	Within 20 min (1.6km) walk time	Within 25 min (2km) walk time	Over 25 min (2km) walk time	See walk time to primary school

<sup>18</sup> Manual for Streets (2007) DfT. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/manual-for-streets>

<sup>19</sup> Providing for Journeys on Foot (2000) CIHT. Available at [www.ciht.org.uk/download.cfm/docid/D66AD936-281C-4220-BF109289B5D01848](http://www.ciht.org.uk/download.cfm/docid/D66AD936-281C-4220-BF109289B5D01848)

**Table 4-5: Significant Non-Absolute Constraints**

Selection Criteria	Standard & Score					Standard Derived From
<b>Flood Risk</b>	SFRA appraisal identifies no flooding issues	SFRA appraisal identifies only limited and/or low risk flooding issues	SFRA identifies a number of flooding sources but with limited extent or low – medium risk	SFRA identifies a number of flooding sources with more than limited site coverage or medium-high risk	SFRA identifies a number of flooding sources over extensive areas or with a high level of risk	NPPF and PPG guidance on flood risk makes clear that sites should be subject to a strategic sequential test to ensure that development is directed to areas of lowest risk first. The Council has applied a sequential appraisal to all sites in the SLAA and the standards reflect this. The level of risk depends on frequency/probability of different type of flooding occurring and the type of development appraised i.e. housing or employment.
<b>Minerals/ Waste Safeguarding</b>	Not within any Safeguarding Area or within/adjacent to a waste site	Site lies adjacent to a safeguarding area or waste site but not a preferred area	Site lies adjacent to a safeguarding area or waste site identified as a preferred area or within a safeguarding area but not adjacent an identified preferred area	Site lies within a safeguarding area and adjacent to a preferred area and/or is constrained by previous or potential extraction	Site lies within a safeguarded area and preferred area or designated minerals or waste site.	Policy MC6 of the adopted Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy (2011) <sup>20</sup> designates some areas of Runnymede for safeguarding for future extraction of mineral resources. The NPPF states that mineral resources should not be sterilised.

<sup>20</sup> Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy DPD (2011) SCC. Available at: <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/environment-housing-and-planning/minerals-and-waste-policies-and-plans/surrey-minerals-plan-core-strategy-development-plan-document>

Selection Criteria	Standard & Score					Standard Derived From
<b>SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland</b>	Site not adjacent to SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Site adjacent to SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland but separation feature between site and SNCI/LNR/Ancient Woodland	Site adjacent to SNCI/LNR/Ancient Woodland or on site but with no loss of SNCI/LNR ancient woodland required	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland would be lost from part of the site	Majority of SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland lost from the site	NPPF gives general protection for local biodiversity and irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland. Standards reflect the proximity of a site to protected designations and the ability for indirect impacts.
<b>Agricultural Land Classification</b>	No loss or loss of grade 4 or lower		Loss of Grade 3		Loss of Grade 1 or 2	NPPF gives general protection to agricultural land. The loss of lower quality land should be preferred to areas of high quality.
<b>Heritage Assets</b>	Would not affect any heritage asset	Heritage asset adjacent to site with no harm to its setting or role	Heritage asset on site but no harm to setting or harm could be avoided	Would result in harm to the setting of a designated asset or loss of a non-designated heritage asset	Designated Heritage asset on or adjacent to site with harm to or the loss of the heritage asset	NPPF provides protection for heritage assets which should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Selection Criteria	Standard & Score					Standard Derived From
<b>Open Space</b>	Would not lead to the loss of an area of open space with potential to provide additional space on-site	Would not lead to the loss of an area of open space but no potential to provide additional space on-site		Would result in the loss of an area of open space but some space could be retained or re-provided on site to compensate	Would result in the total loss of an area of open space with no replacement	NPPF sets out that open space, sports and recreation buildings and land, including playing fields should not be built on subject to criteria and designated Local Green Spaces will only be subject to development in very special circumstances. Runnymede Open Spaces Study appraises quality/quantity of open space in the borough and has been used to define standards. Local Green Space designations have also been recommended by the Council.
<b>Topography</b>	Gradient less than 1:40		Gradient between 1:39-1:20		Gradient greater than 1:20	Runnymede Green Belt review identifies steep topography as a significant constraint.



#### Stage 4: Assessment Non Significant Non-Absolute Constraints

4.42 Stage 4 will concentrate on those non-significant non-absolute constraints, how each site performs against them and whether constraints could be overcome. This is the same for both residential and employment sites. Rather than assessing sites against a range of standards, each site will be considered qualitatively against each constraint. If the developable area of a site is reduced below the thresholds set out in stage 1 to account for constraints, the site will automatically be excluded. All sites not excluded from Stage 4 will be taken forward to Stage 5. The list of non-significant non-absolute constraints have been taken from Table 5.9 of the Part 1 Green Belt Review as well as additional constraints considered to be relevant. The approach to considering constraints are posed as questions with subsequent answers which are set out in Table 4-6.

**Table 4-6: Non-Significant Non-Absolute Constraints**

Question	Response		
Are there non-designated biodiversity areas on site?	Y Area is a Biodiversity Opportunity Area	Y* Within in a BOA but could be mitigated or enhanced	N
Are there Tree Preservation Orders/Protected Vegetation on site?	Y Would require significant loss or harm.	Y* but can be developed without significant loss or harm	N No TPO or protected vegetation
Is the site within a landscape character area?	Y could have significant impacts on landscape quality	Y* Within character area but could be mitigated or enhanced	N
Is the site compatible with neighbouring uses? Would it be affected by noise/odour?	Y Amenity would be significantly impacted	Y* but amenity concerns could be overcome	N
Is the site within an Air Quality Management Area?	Y	Y* but amenity concerns could be overcome	N
Is the site within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	Y		N
Does the site have a history of land contamination?	Y	P Potential for contamination	N
Are there Underground or Overground utility pipes/cables on site?	Y		N

Question	Response		
Does a Public Right of Way cross the site?	Y Would require significant diversion	Y* But could be diverted or retained in development	N

- 4.43 In terms of landscape areas, these have been identified from the Surrey Landscape Character Assessment<sup>21</sup>, specifically the section on Runnymede. The character assessment includes several landscape typologies and sets out their key characteristics, a landscape strategy and guidance, including for the built environment.
- 4.44 Landscape types in Runnymede include River Floodplain, River Valley Floor, Settled & Wooded Sandy Farmland and Sandy Woodland. The landscape types have been split into different units. For River Floodplain this includes units RF3: Thames, RF4: Northern Bourne and RF7: Lower Wey. River Valley Floor includes unit RV2: Thames and Settled & Wooded Sandy Farmland includes SS1: Cooper's Hill, SS2 Englefield Green West, SS3: Trumps Green to New Haw, SS4: Wentworth to Sheerwater and SS8: Chobham East. Sandy Woodland units include SW1: Virginia Water and SW3: Foxhill. The guidance set out in the character assessment will be considered in the performance of sites. It should be noted that the vast majority of areas which fall outside of the urban area in Runnymede are included within a landscape character type.
- 4.45 In terms of biodiversity this has been informed by Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOA) as set out by the Surrey Nature Partnership (SNP)<sup>22</sup>. The BOAs have been identified by taking into account already recognised protected sites but also as yet undesignated areas with priority habitat types.
- 4.46 The BOAs in Runnymede reflect those in the National Character Area (NCA), plus six river BOAs. The relevant NCAs include Thames Valley, Thames Basin Heaths, Thames Basin Lowlands, North Downs, Wealden Greensands and Low Weald. The NCAs within Runnymede include Thames Valley and Thames Basin Heaths. The Thames Valley units include TV01: Windsor Great Park, TV02: Runnymede Meadows & Slope and TV04: Thorpe & Shepperton, whilst the Thames Basin Heaths include units TBH01: Chobham Common North & Wentworth Heaths and TBH02 Chobham South Heaths. Policy statements for each BOA unit which identifies the features of biodiversity importance, and specific conservation objectives have been written by the SNP which will be considered where a site falls within a BOA. One River BOA unit is also partly located within Runnymede which is R04: River Wey.
- 4.47 Advice in the SNP publication does not discount development in these areas but does expect sites to provide enhancement at a scale proportionate to the site and could include restoration, maintenance, habitat creation and funding initiatives. A biodiversity survey would also be required on such sites which may also require Environmental Impact Assessment.
- 4.48 The issue of contaminated land has been informed by the Council's environmental health team.
- 4.49 If a site has constraints identified at Stage 4 which cannot be overcome without significant impact or which renders the developable area of a site less than the

<sup>21</sup> Surrey Landscape Assessment (2015) had. Available at: <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/environment-housing-and-planning/countryside/countryside-strategies-action-plans-and-guidance/landscape-character-assessment>

<sup>22</sup> Biodiversity Opportunity Areas: The basis for realising Surrey's ecological network (2015) Surrey Nature Partnership. Available at: <https://surreynaturepartnership.org.uk/our-work/>

threshold set out in Stage 1, the site will not be excluded from further consideration and not taken forward to stage 5.

### **Stage 5: Assessment of sites with Green Belt Review**

- 4.50 Prior to setting out the stages of this methodology and assessment, it is important to set out the role that the Runnymede Green Belt Reviews play in the selection of sites.
- 4.51 The Runnymede Green Belt Review has been considered in two stages. Part 1 considered the Green Belt in Runnymede as a series of separate, but reasonably large, land parcels. Each land parcel was reviewed against a number of criteria relating to Green Belt purposes as set out in the NPPF. The land parcels were then refined in a two stage process to take account of a series of absolute and non-absolute constraints. Any land within a parcel which was covered by an absolute constraint was discounted as a potential area which could support a release of Green Belt and taken no further.
- 4.52 The second stage of the refinement considered the remaining parcels of Green Belt against a series of non-absolute constraints in order to identify more or less preferential parcels of land for development. Land covered by a significant non-absolute constraint was considered to be less preferential and was taken no further.
- 4.53 Following the two stage assessment of land parcels against constraints, the remaining land was re-assessed against NPPF Green Belt purposes. The Part 1 Green Belt Review recommended that some land within parcels could be released where it weakly met or did not meet Green Belt purposes. These areas were identified as Resultant Land Parcels (RLPs).
- 4.54 Following consultation of the Local Plan Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches Document in 2016 a number of representations commented that the land parcels in the Part 1 GBR were too large to determine whether smaller areas could be released and a finer grained review should be undertaken.
- 4.55 As such, Runnymede commissioned Arup to undertake a finer grained review of the Green Belt (Part 2 GBR) to ensure that smaller parcels of land could be considered. However, the Part 2 GBR did not re-examine every land parcel from the Part 1 GBR but considered smaller parcels where they fell into defined buffer zones around existing urban settlements in Runnymede, which have also been used in this assessment. As noted earlier, some representors during Additional Sites & Options Consultation still felt that sub-areas were too large, however Arup have responded to these comments and considers that the sub-areas considered in the Part 2 GBR remain the most appropriate. The Council concurs with Arup's recommendations.
- 4.56 In reviewing Green Belt boundaries paragraph 84 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. Paragraph 85 bullet 1 of the NPPF sets out that boundaries should be defined to ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development.
- 4.57 As such, if sites in the Green Belt are allocated and hence an alteration to Green Belt boundaries made, consideration must be had to the achievement of sustainable development. This has to some degree already been considered through stages 3 and 4 of this assessment. However, whilst the consideration of environmental constraints

and accessibility are some of these considerations, further assessment is also required against other criteria so that sites are considered against a range of sustainability issues through a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and against other criteria such as patterns of development, physical limitations and deliverability. Assessment must also include how a site performs against the purposes of the Green Belt as set out within the NPPF so that sites can be considered in the round. This consideration would be drawn from the Runnymede Green Belt Review Parts 1 & 2. Therefore a site's performance against a range of constraints is not the only factor in determining which sites should be selected for allocation.

- 4.58 For the purposes of this assessment it is considered that areas of Green Belt which have been identified as performing the most strongly against Green Belt purposes in the Part 1 & 2 Green Belt Reviews also play a role in promoting sustainable patterns of development in accordance with paragraph 84 of the NPPF. This is because those areas which perform most strongly are fundamental to the overall role, integrity and function of the Green Belt in Runnymede and to the wider Green Belt which is already fragmented in nature. As such, strongly performing Green Belt is considered to maintain the pattern of settlements in the Borough and ensures that these remain as individual and distinct settlements with their own characteristics and identity.
- 4.59 Therefore when determining which sites in the Green Belt could be released, greater weight has been given to the protection of the strongest performing Green Belt parcels in terms of their contribution to the overall integrity, role and strategic function of the Green Belt.
- 4.60 Where sites perform only weakly/moderately against Green Belt purposes, consideration will be given to both the role they play in meeting the integrity and function of the local Green Belt and also to the wider strategic Green Belt. Therefore there may be a number of sites which perform only weakly/moderately well in the Stage 2 Green Belt review but which are important to the strategic function of the Green Belt. Paragraph 85 of the NPPF sets out a range of criteria which must be taken into consideration when defining Green Belt boundaries, including ensuring consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development. As such, to help in the identification of which sites could be released the following criteria were also considered:
- Cumulative impact when considered with other sites against the settlement hierarchy and/or whether the total or cumulative area of Green Belt for release is proportionate to the amount of land which is actually developable;
  - Whether the site forms a 'rounding off' of a settlement edge or is infill, to ensure settlements remain compact and protect the Green Belt from further fragmentation;
- 4.61 Professional judgement on the merits of each site will also play a role in selecting which sites to take forward to ensure that development supports the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development. However, where a site is finely balanced, greater weight will be attached to protecting the Green Belt. This is considered to be in accordance with the generally restrictive guidance for Green Belts set out in the NPPF and the Housing White Paper. As stated earlier, in a very few instances the Council does not agree with the findings of the Stage 2 Green Belt Review and this has been discussed and justified for each site where this is the case.
- 4.62 Further, where a site is partially developed but is not recommended for allocation through the Local Plan, there is still the opportunity for the developed part of the site to

be allocated through the brownfield register subject to para 1.21 and national planning policy.

- 4.63 Stage 5 will bring together the sites taken forward from stage 4 and the findings of the Green Belt reviews on how areas of the Borough perform against Green Belt purposes. This will lead to a qualitative discussion of each site in terms of their overall performance and whether they could be taken forward to stage 6.

**Stage 6: Consider the performance of sites in this assessment and the Sustainability Appraisal and recommend sites for allocation**

- 4.64 Stage 6 will consider the sites taken forward from stage 5 and the conclusions on each site from the Sustainability Appraisal. Only if a site performs poorly in the Sustainability Appraisal will it not be taken forward to Stage 7.

**Stage 7: Deliverability**

- 4.65 The suitability of each site for development will be assessed through Stages 1 & 3-6 of the assessment. Stage 7 will then confirm whether each site is deliverable/developable as required by the NPPF in terms of availability/achievability. The Local Plan viability work will feed into this stage as well as indications from land owners that their site is available.

*Ownership and Availability for Development:*

- 4.66 RBC officers will need to seek confirmation from land owners/promoters that sites are available for development. The Runnymede Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) has recently been undertaken and this gives the most up to date indication of site availability.

*Achievability*

- 4.67 The Local Plan viability assessment will be used as evidence to inform the achievability of sites.

**Stage 8: Site Capacity**

- 4.68 Once it has been established through stages 1-7 which sites to allocate in the Local Plan, an assessment of capacity will be undertaken to establish how much development a site can bring forward. This will depend on the type of development promoted, mix of units, density assumptions as well as any factors which will reduce the developable area such as provision for green space or avoiding floodplain and/or other areas of constraint.
- 4.69 In terms of site density this will be driven by the context of the local area but also by the need to make the most efficient use of land. Whilst there are areas of the Borough with very low densities this should not be a bar to a higher density development (relative to its context), as it should be assumed that all development will achieve a high quality of design. The mix of residential units will largely follow the split for affordable need and market demand as set out in the Runnymede & Spelthorne SHMA, although some sites will need to deviate from this depending on density.
- 4.70 The assessment of capacity is set out in a separate document along with the assumptions used to calculate individual site capacities.



## 5. Site Selection Assessments

### Stages 1 & 2 Assessment

- 5.1 Stage 1 of the site selection process involved an initial sift of sites. Appendices 1 & 2 set out the results of the initial sift against the range of absolute and other constraints as highlighted in section 4. The initial sift reduced the number of possible sites from 127 to 80 housing sites and from 33 to 12 employment sites.
- 5.2 The 80 possible housing sites and 12 possible employment sites were subject to Sustainability Appraisal as part of stage 2 which is a stand-alone and independent assessment and which will be taken into account at Stage 6. As such, all sites not sifted out at stage 1 were taken forward to stage 3 for the purpose of this assessment.

### Stage 3 Assessment

- 5.3 Stage 3 considered the performance of sites against a range of accessibility standards and a range of standards for various significant non-absolute constraints. Appendices 3 and 4 set out the commentary for each potential housing site and how they perform against accessibility considerations and significant non-absolute constraints. Table 5-1 summarises the overall performance of each potential housing site in terms of accessibility and constraints and also sets out which sites should be excluded for further consideration at this stage.
- 5.4 Stage 3 also considered the performance of potential employment sites and appendices 5 and 6 set out the commentary for each potential employment site and how they perform against accessibility considerations and significant non-absolute constraints. Table 5-2 summarises the overall performance of each potential employment site and whether this have been passed forward for further consideration.
- 5.5 Paragraph 2.3 of this assessment sets out the national planning policy context which needs to be taken into consideration when determining if development is sustainable. Further, paragraph 84 of the NPPF makes clear that when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries account should be taken of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and Paragraph 85 bullet 1, ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development.
- 5.6 When promoting sustainable patterns of development, this is not just about where development is located, but also how it performs in terms of its accessibility to local services and how it performs against constraints or designations which the NPPF seeks to protect.
- 5.7 As such, sites which performed 'low' or 'low-medium' at Stage 3 where mitigation could not overcome impacts or sequentially preferable sites were available, were not considered to promote sustainable patterns of development or meet Local Plan requirements for sustainable development and were excluded from further consideration and not taken forward to Stage 4.
- 5.8 Following stage 3 the number of housing sites was reduced from 80 to 52 and employment sites from 12 to 6.



**Table 5-1: Overall Performance of Housing Sites against Accessibility and Significant Non-Absolute Constraints**

SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
4 – Barrsbrook & Barrsbrook Cattery, Guildford Road, Chertsey	High	Low-Medium	Site accessibility is high for both public transport/cycling to major centres and also generally high for all local facilities. Only limited constraints on site which could be reduced or removed by suitable mitigation. Site scores <b>High</b> overall.	✓
13 – Stroude Farm, Stroude Road	Medium	Medium	Site accessibility is towards the mid-lower range for a number of local services. Good access to service centres by rail but not by bus. Access to services could be improved if health/retail facilities are located on site, but site is unlikely to be large enough to secure all of these improvements. Evidence on the impact of minerals constraint concludes that this is unlikely to impact development but agricultural value is grade 3 and sequentially preferable sites may be available, but this is not a bar at this stage. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
14 – Brox End Nursey, Ottershaw	Medium	Low-Medium	Site accessibility is generally good to a range of services as well as travel to service centres by public transport/cycling. Significant non-absolute constraints are limited although development would lose an area of natural/semi-natural greenspace. This site was designated as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan and can be taken forward to stage 4. A planning application for this site is currently under consideration. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
17 – Coombelands Lane, Rowtown	Medium	Low	Site accessibility is mixed with good accessibility to some local services but not others particularly access to health centres. There are no particular significant non-absolute constraints on site. Site was designated as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan and an application for 43 dwellings has been approved subject to S106. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓

SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
18 – Land North of Thorpe Industrial Estate, Egham	Low-Medium	Medium-High	Site accessibility is generally low, performing poorly against a range of standards to local services. This would only be improved if primary education/health and retail facilities were provided on site, but site is unlikely to be large enough to secure all of these improvements. A number of significant non-absolute constraints are evident but could be overcome, however one (minerals) may prevent development and further evidence is required to determine whether this could be overcome. Site proponent states investigations on-going, but minerals constraint remains. Although site would lead to loss of open space, some of this could be retained lessening the impact. Site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x
19 – Oak Tree Nurseries, Stroude Road	Low-Medium	Medium	Site accessibility is generally poor for bus services and reasonable for rail/cycling to major centres. Accessibility to local services is generally poor. Limited constraints on site but further evidence of minerals resource on site may be required. Based on accessibility, site scores Low-Medium overall.	x
22 – Land south of St David's Drive & Robert's Way, Englefield Green	Medium	Low-Medium	Site accessibility is mixed with good accessibility to some local services but not others particularly access to health centres. Limited significant non-absolute constraints on site but issues with ground and surface water flooding would have to be addressed. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
24 – Land at Prairie Road, Hatch Close & Hatch Farm, Addlestone	Medium-High	Medium	Site accessibility is good to a range of local services with performance against standards in the higher ranges. Limited significant non-absolute constraints on western part of site but is grade 3 agricultural land and sequentially preferable sites may be available, but this is not a bar at this stage. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
28 – Great Grove Farm, Murray Road, Ottershaw	Medium High	Low	Site accessibility is good to a range of local services with performance against standards in the higher ranges for most. No particular significant non-absolute constraints on site. Overall site performance is medium-high and can be taken forward to stage 4. Planning permission has been granted at the site for 6 dwellings. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
29 – Charnwood Nurseries, 33 The Avenue, Woodham	Medium High	Low	Site accessibility is generally good to a range of local services with performance against standards in the higher ranges for most. No particular significant non-absolute constraints on site. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
30 – CABI, Bakeham Lane, Egham	Medium	Low	Site accessibility is mixed with reasonable access to public transport and generally good access to local services. Only constraint on site is a limited potential for groundwater flooding. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓

SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
34 – Parklands, Parcel D, Chertsey Bittams	Medium	Low	Site accessibility is generally good to service centres but mixed to local facilities with poorer access to primary education. Only constraint is limited potential for groundwater flooding. Harm to grade II listed building off site can be avoided. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
36 – Sandylands Home Farm East, Blay's Lane, Englefield Green	Medium	Medium	Site accessibility is generally good to a range of local services with performance against standards in the higher ranges for most. Accessibility to service centres by rail/cycling is however poor. Site is within a mineral safeguarding area which may restrict development potential depending practicality of prior working. Site is also classified as grade 3 agricultural land and sequentially preferable sites may be available, but this is not a bar at this stage. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
42 – CEMEX Thorpe 1, Ten Acre Lane, Thorpe	Low-Medium	Medium	Site accessibility is mixed with good access to some local services but not others, specifically health. This would only be improved if health facilities were provided on site, but site is unlikely to be large/viable enough to secure these improvements. Accessibility to service centres is however poor by rail/bus given distance or limited services. A number of significant non-absolute constraints on site but evidence suggests minerals are of low quality and unlikely to restrict development. Agricultural land value is grade 3a and sequentially preferable sites may be available, but this is not a bar at this stage. However, based on accessibility site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	×
44 – CEMEX Thorpe 3, Ten Acre Lane, Thorpe	Medium	Medium-High	Site accessibility is mixed with good access to some local services but not others, specifically health. This would only be improved if health facilities were provided on site, but site is unlikely to be large enough to secure these improvements. Accessibility to service centres is however poor by rail/bus given distance or limited services. A number of significant non-absolute constraints are evident including one (minerals) which could severely restrict development or prevent it altogether. Site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	×
46 – Land at Great Grove Farm, Ottershaw	Medium-High	Low-Medium	Site accessibility is generally good to service centres and local facilities but with no rail. Limited number of significant non-absolute constraints on site however ground and surface water flooding would have to be addressed. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓

SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
46a – Land at Great Grove Farm (east)	Medium-High	High	Site accessibility is generally good to service centres and local facilities but with no rail. Limited but significant constraints on or adjacent site with site on highest grade agricultural land and adjacent to area of Ancient Woodland/SNCI. Land of lesser environmental value should be preferred and unknown whether suitable barrier to Ancient Woodland/SNCI would be effective. Sites scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x
48 – Hanworth Lane, Chertsey	High	Low-Medium	Site accessibility is generally good to all local services with performance against standards in the higher range and good accessibility to service centres by range of public transport. Limited number of significant non-absolute constraints on site. One would involve the loss of sports pitches, although this could be partially retained/replaced on site. Site is identified as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan and construction has started on northern parcel for 130 dwellings. Site scores <b>High</b> overall.	✓
50 – Brunel University Site, Cooper's Hill, Englefield Green	Medium	Medium	Site accessibility mixed with good accessibility to some local services but not others, specifically retail. Significant non-absolute constraints on site include an area of ancient woodland and an area of open space as sports pitches. Both of these could however be retained. Impact on listed buildings on site would need to be addressed. Planning permission has been granted on the partially developed areas of the site for 110 dwellings, 488 student bedspaces and 59 C2 bedrooms which is now under construction. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
51 – Byfleet Road, New Haw	Medium	Medium-High	Site accessibility is generally low, performing poorly/reasonably for all local services. However, accessibility to service centres is good by rail/cycling but not so good by bus. Accessibility to local services would only be improved if these were provided on site, but site is unlikely to be large enough to secure these improvements. Significant non-absolute constraints on site including areas of flood risk in zone 3a where the sequential and exceptions test would have to be passed. Some of these areas could be mitigated through use as green space but given extent of flood risk this may not be achievable and as such sequentially preferable sites are likely to be available for housing. Site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x
52 – Dial House, Northcroft Road, Englefield Green	Medium	Medium	Site accessibility generally good to local services and to service centres but no access to rail. Constraints are generally limited although borehole evidence of mineral quality/quantity may be required. Agricultural land value is grade 3a and sequentially preferable sites may be available, but this is not a bar at this stage. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓

SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
56 – Land at Green Lane/Norlands Lane & Chertsey Lane, Thorpe	Medium	High	Site accessibility is generally poor to local services but good to service centres by bus/cycling although no rail services. Over half of the site lies within functional floodplain and almost the rest within flood risk zone 3a as such sequentially preferable sites without the need for the exceptions test may be available. Unknown whether minerals safeguarding could be overcome. Based on constraints site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x
60 – Pycroft Road, Chertsey	Medium-High	Low-Medium	Site accessibility is generally good to most local services and service centres. Significant non-absolute constraints on site include areas of flood risk including in zones 3a & 3b however this could be mitigated as use for green space. The site is also classified as grade 3 agricultural land and sequentially preferable sites may be available, but this is not a bar at this stage. Site is designated as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan but has not been subject to a planning application. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
62 – Land at Adlestons Moor	High	Low	Site accessibility is good to all local services and to service centres. Only constraints on site are limited potential for ground and surface water flooding. Site scores <b>High</b> overall.	✓
77 – 232 Brox Road, Ottershaw	Medium-High	Low	Site accessibility is generally good to local services and service centres although no rail facilities. Limited significant non-absolute constraints on site. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
97 & 99 – Longcross Garden Village	Low	Low - Medium	Site accessibility is poor for all local services but accessibility to service centres is good by rail/cycling. This could be improved if primary education/health and retail facilities were provided on site. The DERA site south is large enough to secure on site local services and facilities which would improve accessibility. Only limited significant non-absolute constraints on site. Although heritage assets are located on site, harm could be avoided through design. Potential loss of open space but this could be retained, replaced or improved elsewhere on site. Based on limited constraints and that the site is large enough to improve accessibility to local services by securing facilities on site, site scores medium overall.	✓

SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
123 – CEMEX House, Coldharbour Lane, Thorpe	Low-Medium	Medium-High	Site accessibility to local services is generally poor, with access to service centres good by cycling but no rail and only reasonable access to bus services. Site is partially within the functional floodplain and flood risk zone 3a but impact could be avoided. Large area in flood zone 2 and sequentially preferable sites may be available. Whilst majority of site is grade 1/2 agricultural land, site is previously developed and value has been lost. Site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x
129 – Wey Manor Farm, Adlestone	Medium	Medium-High	Site accessibility is generally poor to most local services, although accessibility to service centres is good by all forms of transport. Accessibility would only be improved if primary education/health facilities were provided on site, but site is unlikely to be large/viable enough to secure these improvements. Significant non-absolute constraints include an area within flood zone 3a which equates to 2ha and would need to pass the sequential and exceptions test, although this could be avoided if used as green space. The site is also within a minerals safeguarding area and should not place future working at risk irrespective of whether a single company has no interest in the site. 8.9ha is identified as open space with visual amenity value, part of which, but not all could be retained on site. Site is classified by DEFRA as grade 1/2 agricultural land, but site assessment shows this as Grade 3. Even at Grade 3, other land of lesser value should be preferred providing they can overcome other constraints. Site continues to score <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x
154 – Land at Howard's Lane, Rowtown	Medium	Low	Site accessibility is mixed with accessibility to some good/reasonable and to others poor. Accessibility to service centres is good by bus but reasonable by cycling with no rail facilities. This could be improved if primary education were provided on site, but site is unlikely to be large/viable enough to secure these improvements. Limited significant non-absolute constraints but potential for groundwater and surface water would need to be addressed. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
156 – Blay's House, Blay's Lane, Englefield Green	Medium	Medium	Site has good accessibility to a range of local services and service centres by bus but poorer by rail/cycling. Significant non-absolute constraints include large areas of the site at risk from surface water flooding which would need to be addressed. Site is classified as grade 3 agricultural land but is already partially developed. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓

SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
158 – Land at Squires Garden Centre, Holloway Hill, Chertsey	Medium	Low-Medium	Site accessibility is generally good to service centres by bus/cycling but generally poor to local services. Site is within minerals safeguarding but resource of poor quality, although practicalities of prior working should be explored. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
167 – Land at Woburn Hill, Addlestone	Medium-High	Low	Site accessibility is generally good to service centres by all modes of public transport/cycling. Accessibility to local services is reasonable. Limited potential for groundwater flooding could be overcome. Site is partly within Woburn Hill Historic Park & Garden but constraint could be overcome through design. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
173 – Rodwell Farm Nursing Home, Rowtown	Low-Medium	Low	Site accessibility is generally poor to local services and poor/reasonable to service centres. Only constraint is limited potential for ground and surface water flooding which could be mitigated. Based on accessibility site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	×
205 – Crockford Bridge Farm, New Haw Road, Addlestone	Medium-High	Medium	Site accessibility is generally good to a range of local facilities and service centres. Significant non-absolute constraints include 2ha within the functional floodplain and a further 0.92ha in flood zone 3a but risk could be avoided if used as green space. Site is identified as open space and development would lead to a loss but some could be retained on site. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
212 – Home Farm, Stroude Road, Virginia Water	Medium-High	Low-Medium	Site accessibility is generally good to a range of local facilities and service centres although bus services are infrequent. Significant non-absolute constraints include parts of the site at risk from groundwater flooding at surface level which would need to be addressed. Majority of the site is within minerals safeguarding area but SCC would not object to its loss. Based on Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
217 – Land adjacent Wheelers Green, Parcel E, Chertsey Bittams	Medium-High	Low	Site accessibility is generally good to local services although distance to primary education only relates to infants school. Accessibility to service centres is good by bus/cycling although no rail services. Only constraint identified is adjacent grade II listed and locally listed buildings, but impact could be avoided through design. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓



SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
218 – Rusham Park, Whitehall Lane, Egham	Medium	Medium	Site accessibility reasonable/poor to most local services and only poor/reasonable access to service centres by bus/cycling, but access to rail is good. Part of site within flood risk zone 3a, but this is mostly on periphery of the site and could be avoided. Areas also within zone 2 but could also be avoided through use as green space, otherwise sequentially preferable sites may be available. Site is classified as grade 3 agricultural land but is already partially developed. Impact on safeguarded minerals site adjacent will need to be considered in detail. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
219 – Villa Santa Maria, St Ann's Hill, Chertsey	Medium	Medium	Site accessibility mixed with generally poor/reasonable accessibility to most local services. Accessibility to service centres is generally good by rail/cycle. Significant non-absolute constraints include parts of the site within flood zone 3a but could be avoided. Whole of the site is within a minerals safeguarding area but resource unlikely to be significant. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
220 – Norlands Landfill Site, Thorpe	Medium	Medium-High	Site accessibility is generally poor/reasonable to local services. Accessibility to service centres is mixed with good access by cycling but poorer by bus due to infrequent service and no rail. Limited area of site within functional floodplain and flood risk zone 3a which could be avoided. However, large area within flood zone 2 and more sequentially preferable sites could be available unless only a small area of site developed. Minerals could be major constraint and unknown whether this can be overcome. Impact to SNCI to east could be avoided through use of suitable buffer. Based on constraints site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	×
224 – Land adjacent 62 Addlestonemoor	Medium-High	Low	Sites accessibility is generally good to all local services and service centres. Only constraint is limited potential for ground and surface water flooding which could potentially be mitigated. Site scores <b>High</b> overall.	✓
225 – Land adjacent Sandgates, Guildford Road, Chertsey	Medium-High	Low-Medium	Site accessibility generally good to local services and good to service centres by all forms of transport. Significant non-absolute constraints include small areas of groundwater and surface water flood risk which would need to be addressed. Open space on site could be lost, but there may be opportunities to retain in part. Whole of the site is within a minerals safeguarding but is unlikely to increase constraint above those that already exist. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓



SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
226 – Land at 40 Crockford Park Road, Addlestone	High	High	Site is highly accessible to a range of local services and service centres. Significant non-absolute constraints include 52% of the site in flood zone 3b and a further 29% in flood zone 3a. Area within zone 3a would have to pass the sequential and exceptions test and at the moment this reduces site size to less than the 0.5ha site size threshold. Although accessibility is high the flood constraint makes the site score <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x
227 – Woburn Park Farm, Addlestone Moor	Medium-High	Medium	Site accessibility is good/reasonable to all local facilities with good access to service centres by all modes of transport. Small areas of site within functional floodplain and flood risk zones 2 and 3a but these lie on the periphery and could be avoided. Small area covered by minerals safeguarding but unlikely to constrain working. Impact to historic park & garden could be avoided through sensitive design. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
229 – Virginia Heights, Sandhills Road, Virginia Water	Medium	High-Medium	Site accessibility good/reasonable to most local services and good accessibility to service centres by rail/cycling, but poorer by bus given infrequent services. Site within mineral safeguarding area with defined resource and presumption against development. Limited potential for ground and surface water flooding could potentially be mitigated. Site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x
230 – Gove Nursery, Spinney Hill. Addlestone	Medium-High	High	Site accessibility generally good to all local services and generally good to service centres by most forms of transport. Limited constraints on site however land is grade 1/2 agricultural land and as such land of lesser value should be preferred. Site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x
231 – St Peter's Hospital	Medium High	Low-Medium	Site accessibility poor/reasonable to local services but good to service centres by bus/cycling. Small areas of site within flood zones 2 & 3a can be avoided, although ground and surface water flood risk will need to be addressed. Only a small section of site in minerals safeguarding but site is already largely developed. Impact to statutorily and locally listed buildings could be avoided through design. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
234 – Eden Farm, Virginia Water	Low-Medium	Low	Site accessibility is generally poor to local services and reasonable/poor to service centres, although journey times are good. Bus services are infrequent. Limited potential for ground and surface flooding could potentially be mitigated. Agricultural value is grade 3 and sequentially preferable sites may be available, but this is not a bar at this stage. Based on accessibility, site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x

SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
254 – Land Parcel B, Central Veterinary Laboratory, Rowtown	Medium	Low	Site accessibility is mixed for a range of local facilities with poorer access to health and secondary education. Accessibility to service centres is also mixed with good access/reasonable access by bus/cycling but no rail access. This would only be improved if health and retail facilities were provided on site, but site is unlikely to be large enough to secure these improvements. Limited potential for groundwater flooding could be potentially mitigated and impact to adjacent Grade II listed building could be mitigated through design. Site score is <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
255A – Parcel A, Chertsey Bittams	Medium-High	Low-Medium	Site accessibility is generally good to a range of local facilities and service centres although access to health facilities is low. Significant non-absolute constraints include a small area within flood zone 2 & 3a which could be avoided. Part of site within agricultural land classification grade 3 and sequentially preferable sites may be available, but this is not a bar at this stage. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
255B – Parcel B, Chertsey Bittams	Medium	Medium	Site accessibility is generally good to a range of local facilities although access to health facilities is low. Accessibility to service centres is good/reasonable by cycling/bus but poorer by rail. Significant non-absolute constraints include agricultural land classification grade 3 and sequentially preferable sites may be available, but this is not a bar at this stage. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
255C – Parcel C, Chertsey Bittams	Medium	Medium	Site accessibility is generally good to a range of local facilities although access to health facilities is low. Accessibility to service centres is good/reasonable by cycling/bus but poorer by rail. Significant non-absolute constraints include limited potential for groundwater and high risk of surface water flooding but these could potentially be mitigated. Site within agricultural land classification grade 3 and sequentially preferable sites may be available, but this is not a bar at this stage. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
256 – Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel A (Thorpe Lea Manor)	Medium-High	Low	Site accessibility is good to all local services. Accessibility to service centres is generally good/reasonable by all forms of public transport. Significant non-absolute constraints include potential for ground and surface water flooding but this could potentially be mitigated. Site is within agricultural land classification grade 3 but is already developed. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓

SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
256 – Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel A (Glenville Farm)	Medium-High	Low	Site accessibility is good to all local services. Accessibility to service centres is generally good/reasonable by all forms of public transport. Significant non-absolute constraints include potential for ground and surface water flooding but this could potentially be mitigated and small area within flood zone 3a (0.06ha) which could be avoided. Site is within agricultural land classification grade 3 but is already developed. Site score is <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
257 – Thorpe Lea Road West	Medium-High	Medium	Site accessibility is generally good/reasonable to a range of local facilities. Access to service centres is generally good/reasonable by all modes of public transport. Limited potential for ground and surface water flooding but this could potentially be mitigated and small area in flood zone 2 but could be avoided. Agricultural land classification grade 3 and sequentially preferable sites may be available, but this is not a bar at this stage. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
258 – Virginia Water North	Medium	Low-Medium	Site accessibility is generally good to a range of local facilities. Accessibility to service centres is generally reasonable by rail/cycling but poor by bus given infrequent service. Limited significant non-absolute constraints include locally listed building on site, where harm could be avoided through design. Some steeper gradients on site could reduce developable area but not enough to exclude sites. Impact to adjacent SNCI could be avoided through design. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
259 – Virginia Water West	Medium	Medium	Site accessibility mixed with good access to some local services but not others. Accessibility to service centres is mixed with good access by cycling but poorer access by bus/rail. Limited potential for ground and surface water flooding which can potentially be mitigated. However, potential harm to adjacent SNCI if suitable buffer cannot be implemented. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
261 – Virginia Water South	Medium	Low-Medium	Site accessibility mixed with good or reasonable access to some services but poorer to others. Accessibility to service centres generally good/reasonable by cycling/rail but poorer by bus given infrequent service. Limited potential for ground and surface water flooding which can potentially be mitigated. Potential harm to adjacent SNCI could be mitigated with suitable buffer. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
263 – Ottershaw East	Medium-High	Low	Site accessibility is generally good to a range of local facilities and generally good to service centres. Potential for ground and surface water flooding which can potentially be mitigated. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓

SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
268 – Land at 79-87a Woodham Park Road, Woodham	Medium	Low	Site accessibility is generally good to local services and reasonable by bus/cycling with poor access to rail. Limited potential for groundwater flooding which can potentially be mitigated. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
269 – Land East of Thorpe Industrial Estate	Medium	High	Site accessibility is generally poor to local services but generally good to services centres by all modes of transport except rail. Around a third of the site within functional floodplain or zone 3a where exceptions test will need to be passed. Almost all the site is within flood zone 2 and as such sequentially preferable sites may be available. Site also within minerals safeguarding area and constrained by previous extraction and unknown if this can be overcome. Open space will be lost but could be partly retained and impact to SNCI could be mitigated with suitable buffer. Based on constraints site scores <b>Low</b> overall.	×
273 – Land South of Great Grove Farm	Medium-High	High	Site accessibility generally good to all local services and to service centres except by rail. Limited potential for ground and surface water flooding which could potentially be mitigated. Loss of natural/semi-natural greenspace which is unlikely to be retained. Site within Grade 1/2 agricultural land and land of lesser value should be preferred. Based on constraints site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	×
274 – Allington & 37, 47, 57 Howard's Lane, Rowtown	Medium	Low	Site accessibility to local services is mixed with good access to some and poorer to others. Accessibility to service centres is generally good/reasonable by bus/cycling but poor by rail. Limited potential for ground and surface water flooding although small area at risk if higher probability, which can potentially be mitigated. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
277 – The Old Chalet, Callow Hill, Virginia Water	Medium	Low	Site accessibility is generally good to local services, but reasonable to service centres by cycling/rail and poor by bus given infrequent services. Limited potential for ground and surface water flooding which could potentially be mitigated and impact to adjacent Grade II and locally listed structures could be avoided through design. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
281 – Land at Clockhouse Lane East, Thorpe	Medium	High	Site accessibility to local services mixed with most performing poorly or reasonably. Accessibility to service centres is mixed with good accessibility by cycling but poorer by bus/rail. Potential for groundwater flooding at surface but limited potential for surface water. Loss of natural/semi-natural greenspace which is unlikely to be retained. Site within Grade 1/2 agricultural land and land of lesser value should be preferred. Based on constraints site scores <b>Low</b> overall.	×

SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
282 – Land East of Fishing Lake, Thorpe Lea Road	Medium	High	Site accessibility to local services mixed with most performing poorly or reasonably. Accessibility to service centres is mixed with good accessibility by cycling but poorer by bus/rail. Potential for groundwater flooding at surface but limited potential for surface water. Loss of natural/semi-natural greenspace which is unlikely to be retained. Site within Grade 1/2 agricultural land and land of lesser value should be preferred. Based on constraints site scores <b>Low</b> overall.	x
284 – Christmas Tree Site, Ottershaw	Medium-High	Low	Site accessibility is generally good to local services and to service centres except by rail. Limited potential for ground and surface water flooding with higher probability in some areas but which could potentially be mitigated. Impact to adjacent Grade II listed building could be avoided through design. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
285 – Sayes Court Kennels, Addlestone	Medium-High	Low-Medium	Site accessibility is generally good to local services and to service centres although poorer by rail. Limited potential for ground and surface water flooding which could potentially be mitigated and small area in zone 2 could be avoided. Site gradients may restrict developable area. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
287 – Land West of Bridge Lane, Virginia Water	Medium	High	Site accessibility is generally good to local services. Accessibility is mixed to service centres with good access by rail, reasonable access by cycling and poor access by bus due to infrequent service. Limited potential for ground and surface water flooding with small areas at higher probability but which could potentially be mitigated. Site within mineral safeguarding area but resource of poor quality and unlikely to be a constraint. Agricultural classification is grade 1/2 and land of lesser value should be preferred. Site score is <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x
289 – Webb's The Green, Englefield Green	Medium	Low-Medium	Site accessibility is generally good to local services. Accessibility to service centres is good/reasonable by bus cycling but poor by rail. Limited potential for ground and surface water flooding with small areas at higher probability but which could potentially be mitigated. Site within mineral safeguarding area but unlikely to be a constraint over and above existing urban area. Agricultural land classification grade 3 and sequentially preferable sites may be available, but this is not a bar at this stage. Impact to heritage assets could be mitigated through design. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓

SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
292 – Land East of Bishop's Way, Egham	High	High	Site accessibility is good to all local services and except for rail is good to service centres by all forms of transport. Over half of the site is within functional floodplain with 91% in flood zone 3a and whole site is zone 2. As such sequentially preferable sites will likely be available. Site also within minerals safeguarding area and constrained by previous extraction and unknown if this can be overcome. Site score is <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x
293 – Land North of Kings Lane, Englefield Green	Medium	Medium	Site accessibility generally good to local services. Accessibility to service centres is good/reasonable by bus/cycling but poor by rail. Limited potential for groundwater flooding with notable areas with some probability of surface water, but which could potentially be mitigated. Site within mineral safeguarding area but unlikely to be a constraint over and above existing urban area. Agricultural land classification grade 3 and sequentially preferable sites may be available, but this is not a bar at this stage. Mixed gradients could be overcome by design. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
300 – Land adjacent 70 Crockford Park Road, Addlestone	Medium-High	High	Site accessibility is generally good to local services and is good to service centres by all modes of transport. Nearly two thirds of site within functional floodplain and almost whole site within zone 3a where exceptions test would need to be passed. Area of floodplain unlikely to be avoided reduces site size below threshold. Based on constraints, site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x
312 – Jasmine Cottage and 1 & 2 Home Farm Cottages, Virginia Water	Medium	Medium	Site accessibility is generally good/reasonable to local services. Accessibility to service centres is good/reasonable by rail/cycling but poor by bus given infrequent service. Ancient woodland covers 33% of site and other non-designated areas of woodland may need to be retained to support integrity of ancient woodland thus reducing developable area of site. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
323 – Cacti Nursery, Bousley Rise, Ottershaw	Medium-High	Low-Medium	Site accessibility is generally good to local services and good to service centres by most forms of transport. No major constraints on site although surface water flood risk is prevalent. Site scores <b>High-Medium</b> overall.	✓
326 – Addlestone Quarry	Medium	High	Site accessibility is generally good by bus/cycle to service centres, but is poor to local services. This could be improved as site is large enough to accommodate local services on-site. Flood risk and minerals/waste a major constraint on site and may not be overcome. Site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x

**Table 5-2: Overall Performance of Employment Sites against Accessibility and Significant Non-Absolute Constraints**

SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
18 – Land North of Thorpe Industrial Estate, Egham	Low	Medium-High	Site accessibility is low, performing poorly against public transport with good or very good levels of service and generally poor access to health & retail. A number of significant non-absolute constraints are evident but could be overcome, however one (minerals) may prevent development and further evidence is required to determine whether this could be overcome. Site proponent states investigations on-going, but minerals constraint remains. Although site would lead to loss of open space, some of this could be retained lessening the impact. Site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x
42 – CEMEX Thorpe 1, Ten Acre Lane, Thorpe	Low-Medium	Medium	Site accessibility is low-medium, performing poorly against public transport with good or very good levels of service and generally poor access to health but good to retail. A number of significant non-absolute constraints on site but evidence suggests minerals are of low quality and unlikely to restrict development. Agricultural land value is grade 3a and sequentially preferable sites may be available, but this is not a bar at this stage. However, based on accessibility site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x
46 – Land at Great Grove Farm, Ottershaw	Medium	Low	Site accessibility is medium with good accessibility by bus with good or very good level of service but poor to rail. Poorer accessibility by cycling but good access to health and retail. Limited number of significant non-absolute constraints on site however ground and surface water flooding would have to be addressed. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
48 – Hanworth Lane, Chertsey	High	Low-Medium	Site accessibility is generally good with good access to both bus & rail with good or very good service as well as cycling & good access health and retail facilities. Limited number of significant non-absolute constraints on site. One would involve the loss of sports pitches, although this could be partially retained/replaced on site. Site is identified as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan and construction has started on northern parcel for 130 dwellings. Site scores <b>High</b> overall.	✓



SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
51 – Byfleet Road, New Haw	Medium	Medium	Site accessibility generally good by bus/rail with good or very good level of service and good accessibility by cycling. Access to health and retail is generally poor. Significant non-absolute constraints on site including areas of flood risk in zone 2 & 3a where the sequential test would have to be passed. Some of these areas could be mitigated through use as amenity/landscaping but unlikely to cover all risk areas. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
205 – Crockford Bridge Farm, New Haw Road, Addlestone	Medium-High	Medium	Site has a medium-high level of accessibility overall. Generally good accessibility by bus/rail with good or very good level of service and good accessibility by cycling. Good accessibility to both health and retail. Significant non-absolute constraints include 2ha within the functional floodplain and a further 0.92ha in flood zone 3a but risk could be avoided if used as amenity/landscaped areas. However, extent of zone 2 would reduce site size by half if sequential test could not be demonstrated. Site is identified as open space and development would lead to a loss but some could be retained on site. Site scores <b>Medium</b> overall.	✓
225 – Land adjacent Sandgates, Guildford Road, Chertsey	Medium-High	Low-Medium	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility by bus/rail with good or very good level of service and good accessibility by cycling. Good accessibility to retail but poorer to health facilities. Significant non-absolute constraints include small areas of groundwater and surface water flood risk which would need to be addressed. Open space on site could be lost, but there may be opportunities to retain in part. Whole of the site is within a minerals safeguarding but is unlikely to increase constraint above those that already exist. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓
269 – Land East of Thorpe Industrial Estate	Low-Medium	High	Site has low-medium accessibility overall. Good accessibility to bus with good or very good level of service but no rail. Good accessibility by cycling. Poor accessibility to health and retail services. Around a third of the site within functional floodplain with almost all the site within at least flood zone 2. As such, sequentially preferable sites may be available. Site also within minerals safeguarding area and constrained by previous extraction and unknown if this can be overcome. Open space will be lost but could be partly retained and impact to SNCI could be mitigated with suitable buffer. Based on constraints site scores <b>Low</b> overall.	×



SLAA Site	Accessibility Performance	Constraints Impact	Overall Performance	Take Forward to Stage 4?
273 – Land South of Great Grove Farm	Medium	High	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility by bus with good or very good level of service but no rail and poorer accessibility by cycling. Accessibility to health and retail is good. Limited potential for ground and surface water flooding which could potentially be mitigated. Loss of natural/semi-natural greenspace which is unlikely to be retained. Site within Grade 1/2 agricultural land and land of lesser value should be preferred. Based on constraints site scores <b>Low-Medium</b> overall.	x
281 – Land at Clockhouse Lane East, Thorpe	Medium	High	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Accessibility by bus/rail with good or very good level of service is generally poor, but accessibility by cycling is good. Accessibility to retail is good but poor to health facilities. Potential for groundwater flooding at surface but limited potential for surface water. Loss of natural/semi-natural greenspace which is unlikely to be retained. Site within Grade 1/2 agricultural land and land of lesser value should be preferred. Based on constraints site scores <b>Low</b> overall.	x
282 – Land East of Fishing Lake, Thorpe Lea Road	Medium	High	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Accessibility by bus/rail with good or very good level of service is generally poor, but accessibility by cycling is good. Accessibility to retail is good but poor to health facilities. Potential for groundwater flooding at surface but limited potential for surface water. Loss of natural/semi-natural greenspace which is unlikely to be retained. Site within Grade 1/2 agricultural land and land of lesser value should be preferred. Based on constraints site scores <b>Low</b> overall.	x
284 – Christmas Tree Site, Ottershaw	Medium	Low	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility by bus with good or very good level of service but no rail and poorer accessibility by cycling. Limited potential for ground and surface water flooding with higher probability is some areas but which could potentially be mitigated. Impact to adjacent Grade II listed building could be avoided through design. Site scores <b>Medium-High</b> overall.	✓



## Stage 4 Assessment

- 5.9 Stage 4 considered each of the sites from stage 3 against a range of non-significant, non-absolute constraints in qualitative terms as a series of questions which sought to ascertain whether a non-significant non-absolute constraint was present and the effect of this. Appendix 7 sets out the commentary for each site including for both housing & employment and Table 5-3 summarises this.
- 5.10 Following stage 4, 51 of the 52 housing sites and 5 of the 6 employment sites were taken forward to stage 5. It was considered that none of the constraints assessed in stage 4 were so insurmountable as to make a development undeliverable or undevelopable aside from 1 site which could have been allocated for housing or employment.

**Table 5-3: Performance against Non-Significant Non-Absolute Constraints**

Site	Performance	Take Forward to Stage 5?
4 – Barrsbrook & Barrsbrook Cattery, Guildford Road, Chertsey	Site within unit SS3 of Surrey Landscape Character Assessment but considered that site would not adversely affect principles or could be mitigated/enhanced through design. Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3 (GPZ) and will need to be taken into account through design.	✓
13 – Stroude Road Farm, Stroude Road, Virginia Water	North parcel within BOA unit TV01 and any proposal would be expected to set out how it mitigates/ enhances BOA objectives and targets. Within unit RV2 of SLCA. Site 13 could have adverse effects on RV2 principles, especially resisting urbanisation of open areas. This would need to be carefully considered through design but is not necessarily a reason to exclude at this stage. Potential noise from adjacent rail line could be mitigated through design.	✓
14 – Brox End Nursey, Ottershaw	Site is the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) but application for residential is currently being considered and impacts to TPO can be overcome. Site is designated as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan.	✓
17 – Coombelands Lane, Rowtown	Site is subject to a TPO but protected trees could be retained on site. Within unit SS3 of the SLCA but considered that site would not adversely affect these principles. Designated as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan and an application is currently under consideration.	✓
22 – Land south of St David's Drive & Robert's Way, Englefield Green	Site is within unit TV01 of a Thames Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA) and whilst not itself a nationally or locally designated site, there may be features within the site which reflect BOA objectives. This does not preclude development, but any proposal would be expected to set out how it mitigates/ enhances BOA objectives and targets. The site is also within unit SW1 of the SLCA but is not considered to adversely affect these principles, although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design.	✓

Site	Performance	Take Forward to Stage 5?
24 – Land at Prairie Road, Hatch Close & Hatch Farm, Addlestone	Within unit SS3 of the SLCA but considered that site would not adversely affect these principles although account should be taken of principles and enhanced through design as appropriate. Amenity could be affected by noise from St Peter's Way but could be mitigated. Electricity pylons and cables on part of site will need to be considered carefully in design and may reduce developable area. Within GPZ3 which will need to be taken into account through design.	✓
28 – Great Grove Farm, Murray Road, Ottershaw	Within unit SS3 of the SLCA but considered that site would not adversely affect these principles although account should be taken of principles and enhanced through design as appropriate. No other constraints.	✓
29 – Charnwood Nurseries, 33 The Avenue, Woodham	Within unit SS3 of the SLCA but considered that site would not adversely affect these principles although account should be taken of principles and enhanced through design as appropriate. No other constraints.	✓
30 - CABI, Bakeham Lane, Egham	No constraints on site. However site is adjacent BOA unit TV01 and any proposal should incorporate measures to enhance BOA features in general. Footpath 41 lies adjacent site to north of but would remain unchanged.	✓
34 – Parklands, Parcel D, Chertsey Bittams	Harm to trees covered by TPO 80 will need to be avoided. This does not preclude development but measures may reduce developable area. No other constraints.	✓
36 – Sandylands Home Farm East, Blay's Lane, Englefield Green	Site is within unit TV01 of a Thames Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA) and whilst not itself a nationally or locally designated site, there may be features within the site which reflect BOA objectives. This does not preclude development, but any proposal would be expected to set out how it mitigates/ enhances BOA objectives and targets. The site is also within unit SW1 of the SLCA but is not considered to adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design.	✓
46 – Land at Great Grove Farm, Ottershaw	Within unit SS3 of the SLCA but considered that site would not, in the main, significantly affect these principles, although development of the site would reduce the gap between Ottershaw and Chertsey Bittams to the north and design will need to incorporate/enhance features which make a positive contribution to landscape principles for unit SS3. Harm to trees covered by TPOs could be avoided through design and footpath on site could be retained.	✓

Site	Performance	Take Forward to Stage 5?
48 – Hanworth Lane, Chertsey	Within unit SS3 of SLCA but not considered site 48 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Noise impacts from adjacent employment area could be attenuated or avoided, and buffer may be required to residential if employment use pursued. Within GPZ 2 which will need to be considered through design. Footpath runs adjacent site on eastern boundary but can be retained. Site identified as housing reserve site in 2001 Local Plan and northern part of site has permission for 130 dwellings.	✓
50 – Brunel University Site, Cooper's Hill, Englefield Green	Partly within BOA unit TV02. Relevant objectives for this unit include priority habitat restoration and creation and priority species recovery. Site is large enough to retain BOA areas and as such there is the opportunity to mitigate/enhance BOA objectives and targets. TPO on site lies to the periphery and harm can be avoided. Site is partly within unit SS1 of SCLA, but not considered site 50 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. FP69 runs along Oak Lane adjacent site and can be retained without diversion.	✓
51 – Byfleet Road, New Haw (employment only)	within BOA unit R04 and whilst this does not preclude development, any proposal would be expected to set out how it mitigates/ enhances BOA objectives and targets. Within unit RF7 of SLCA and site and could adversely affect landscape principles and therefore design will need to be carefully considered. Site adjacent to M25 with noise and air quality potential issues which will require mitigation or avoidance. Several electricity pylons and overhead cables on site and Wey Navigation towpath lies on western boundary. As stated in stage 3 this site would only be appropriate for employment and although it was identified as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan, it has not yet been the subject of a planning application.	✓
60 – Pycroft Road, Chertsey	Within unit SS3 of SCLA but not considered to adversely affect landscape principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. TPO 235 on northern boundary could be retained. Within GPZ 2 & 3 which will need to be considered through design process.	✓
62 – Land at Addlestonemoor	TPO 370 located on site for individual Oak tree but harm can be avoided. Within unit SS3 of SCLA, but not considered site 62 would adversely affect landscape principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design if possible given size of site.	✓

Site	Performance	Take Forward to Stage 5?
77 – 232 Brox Road, Ottershaw	Within unit SS4 of SLCA. Not considered that Site 77 would adversely affect landscape principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design if possible given size of site. TPO 115 covers whole site but trees located mostly on periphery and harm could be avoided.	✓
97 & 99 – Longcross Garden Village	Within BOA unit TBH02 and whilst sites 97 & 99 are not themselves a nationally or locally designated site, there may be features within the site which reflect BOA objectives. Whilst this does not preclude development, any proposal would be expected to set out how it mitigates/enhances BOA objectives and targets and given size of site potential for priority habitat restoration. Within unit SS4 of SLCA but is not considered to adversely affect these principles but account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Noise could be attenuated and footpath could be retained. TPO6 runs along southern and eastern boundary of site and could be retained with harm avoided.	✓
154 – Land at Howard's Lane, Rowtown	TPO 180 on periphery of site and harm can be avoided. Footpath on periphery of site but can be retained. No other constraints.	✓
156 – Blay's House, Blay's Lane, Englefield Green	No constraints present.	✓
167 – Land at Woburn Hill, Addlestone	Site partly within GPZ 3 which will need to be considered through design process. No other constraints.	✓
205 – Crockford Bridge Farm, New Haw Road, Addlestone	Site within BOA unit R04 and whilst site 205 is not itself a nationally or locally designated site, there may be features within the site which reflect BOA objectives. This does not preclude development, but any proposal would be expected to set out how it mitigates/ enhances BOA objectives and targets and given size of site potential for priority habitat restoration. Within unit SS3 which could be adversely affected by potential merging of settlements. This would be subject to design. May be some potential for agricultural land contamination i.e. pesticides, but this could be remediated. Footpath runs east/west in southern part of site and along a trackway to the north and could be retained or if necessary diverted.	✓
212 – Home Farm, Stroude Road		✓
217 – Land at Wheeler's Green, Parcel E, Chertsey Bittams	TPO 16 on site but harm could be avoided. Within unit SS3 of SCLA, but not considered site 217 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Potential amenity issue from noise given proximity to St Peter's Way & Guildford Road, but this could be attenuated.	✓

Site	Performance	Take Forward to Stage 5?
218 – Rusham Park, Whitehall Lane	Within unit RV2 of SLCA. Site 13 is already largely developed and as such is unlikely to have greater impact than existing subject to design. Site partly within GPZ3 which will need to be considered through design process. Potential for laboratory waste on site and as such a land contamination survey may be required.	✓
219 – Villa Santa Maria, St Ann's Hill, Chertsey	Within unit SS3 of SLCA but not considered to adversely affect landscape principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design, especially with respect to retention of tree cover. Landfill within 250m and a site survey may be required. TPO 2 on site could be retained and as such harm avoided. Partly within GPZ 2 & 3 which will need to be considered through design process.	✓
224 – Land adjacent Addlestonemoor	Within unit SS3 of SLCA. Considered site 224 would not adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Within GPZ3 which will need to be considered through design process. Overhead electricity cables run over very small part of site in south east corner but should not affect developable area.	✓
225 – Land adjacent Sandgates, Guildford Road, Chertsey	Within unit SS3 of SLCA. Site 219 could adversely affect these principles especially retention of tree cover as the site is heavily wooded in parts. Woodland TPO 403 covers some 0.9ha leaving 0.54ha of developable area which would be further reduced by individually protected trees. Development would therefore either lead to the loss of protected trees or reduce the site to under 0.5ha. As such, the site should not be taken forward to stage 5 for housing or employment. Within GPZ 2 & 3 which will need to be considered through design process.	x
227 – Woburn Park Farm, Addlestonemoor	Area TPO 137 lies to the site frontage but harm to protected trees can be avoided through design. Within unit SS3 of SLCA and considered site 227 would not adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design, especially retention of protected trees on site. Partly within GPZ 2 & 3 which will need to be considered through design process. Overhead electricity cables run over the centre of the site from southwest to northeast which may reduce developable area.	✓
231 – St Peter's Hospital	TPO 244 on site covering both individually protected trees and a general area. Site is large enough for harm to be avoided through design. Potential for contamination related to hospital waste and as such a survey may be required.	✓

Site	Performance	Take Forward to Stage 5?
254 – Land Parcel B, Central Veterinary Laboratory, Rowtown	Within unit SS3 of SLCA but not considered to adversely affect landscape principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. TPO 216 and footpath adjacent east boundary of site could be retained.	✓
255 – Parcel A, Chertsey Bittams	Within unit SS3 of SLCA but considered site 255A would not adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Part of eastern parcel of land within M25 AQMA but could be avoided through design. Noise from M25 may be an issue but harm could be avoided through design. Within GPZ 3 which will need to be considered through design process	✓
255B – Parcel B, Chertsey Bittams	Within unit SS3 of SLCA but considered site 255A would not adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Noise from M25 may be an issue but harm could be avoided through design.	✓
255C – Parcel C, Chertsey Bittams	Within unit SS3 of SLCA but considered site 255A would not adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Part of eastern parcel of land within M25 AQMA but could be avoided through design. Noise from M25 may be an issue but harm could be avoided through design. Within GPZ 3 which will need to be considered through design process	✓
256A – Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel A (Thorpe Lea Manor)	Within GPZ 3 which will need to be considered through design process.	✓
256B – Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel B (Glenville Farm)	Within GPZ 3 which will need to be considered through design process.	✓
257 – Thorpe Lea Road West	TPO 98 on site covers individual trees and small areas which could be retained and harm avoided. Noise and air quality could be an issue given proximity to M25 but could be avoided or mitigated through design. Within GPZ 3 which will need to be considered through design process. Footpath runs along western boundary of site but could be retained.	✓
258 – Virginia Water North	Site within unit SW1 of SLCA and not considered to adversely affect landscape principles subject to careful design although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design.	✓
259 – Virginia Water West	TPO 20S & 77 on site but could be retained and harm avoided.	✓
261 – Virginia Water South	Within unit SS4 of SLCA but not considered to adversely affect landscape principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Part of site adjacent to rail line and within 70m of M3, however noise issues could be attenuated.	✓



Site	Performance	Take Forward to Stage 5?
263 – Ottershaw East	TPO 50 in west of site but could be retained. Within unit SS4 of SLCA but not considered to adversely affect landscape principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Footpath runs north-south through site and could be retained.	✓
268 – Land at 79-87a Woodham Park Road, Woodham	Site within 250m of potential waste source, so survey may be required.	✓
274 – Allington & 37, 47, 57 Howard's Lane, Rowtown	TPO 221 on part of site, but this could be retained and harm avoided. Site within 250m of potential contaminating site, so survey may be required. FP 24, 27 and 28 surround site but could be retained without diversion.	✓
277 – The Old Chalet, Callow Hill, Virginia Water	Site within BOA TV01. Whilst site 277 is not itself a nationally or locally designated site, it is predominantly wooded and its loss could have the potential to negatively affect BOA objectives and this would need to be carefully considered if constraint can be overcome. Site within unit SW1 of SLCA and although not covered by a TPO, the site is predominantly covered by woodland and development could also negatively affect principles and would need to be carefully designed to take these into account. An unidentified tank lies 10m to north of site which could have potential for contamination and a survey would likely be required. Whilst constraints are not a bar to development at this stage, they may impact upon site capacity and developability.	✓
284 – Christmas Tree Site, Ottershaw	Several TPOs on site, but these lie largely on the periphery and can be retained so harm can be avoided. Within units SS3 & SS4 of SLCA but considered site 284 would not adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Potential contamination site within 250m and a survey would likely be required.	✓
285 – Sayes Court Kennels, Addlestone	Within unit SS3 of SLCA but considered site 284 would not adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Western area of site within M25 AQMA but could be avoided through design. Noise from M25 may be an issue but harm could be avoided through design. Within GPZ 3 which will need to be considered through design process. Part of former landfill located on site and survey would be required to investigate potential extent of contamination whether any mitigation is possible.	✓

Site	Performance	Take Forward to Stage 5?
289 – Webb's, The Green, Englefield Green	TPO 168 on part of site, but can be retained and as such harm can be avoided. Within unit SS1 of SLCA, but not considered site 289 would significantly adversely affect these principles and will need to incorporate/enhance features which make a positive contribution to landscape principles, especially given site location adjacent The Green at Englefield Green which is one of the fundamental features in this landscape typology.	✓
293 – Land North of Kings Lane, Englefield Green	TPO 284 on site for individual tree which can be retained and as such harm avoided. Within unit SS2 of SLCA but considered site 293 would not significantly adversely affect these principles but will need to incorporate/enhance features which make a positive contribution to landscape principles. Potential contamination site within 250m and survey may be required. FP22 adjacent site can be retained without diversion.	✓
312 – Jasmine Cottage and 1 & 2 Home Farm Cottages	Within unit RV2 of SLCA but is not necessarily a reason to exclude at this stage. Land contamination status unknown, however is likely to be agricultural wastes and could be remediated.	✓
323 – Cacti Nursery, Bousley Rise, Ottershaw	Within unit SS4 of SLCA. but considered site 323 would not adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Footpath runs north-south west of site and could be retained. No other constraints,	✓

### Stage 5 Assessment

5.11 Stage 5 of the site assessment has considered how the 51 housing sites and 5 employment sites perform in terms of Green Belt purposes, as informed by the Runnymede Green Belt Review Parts 1 & 2. Appendix 8 sets out the commentary for each site and gives a recommendation as to whether the site should be taken forward to stage 6 on the performance against the Green Belt Reviews, while also taking account of the commentary from stages 3&4. A summary of this commentary is included in Table 5-4. The results of stage 5 are that 21 sites have been taken forward to Stage 6, 20 housing sites and 1 employment site.

**Table 5-4: Assessment of Sites from Stages 3 & 4 and Green Belt Reviews**

Site	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
4 – Barrsbrook & Barrsbrook Cattery, Guildford Road, Chertsey	High performing site against accessibility/constraints and Green Belt purposes weakly/moderately met. However, only 16% of land which would need release from Green Belt is developable and is considered disproportionate to level of development achievable. Greater weight attached to protection of the Green Belt.	×

Site	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
13 – Stroude Road Farm, Stroude Road	Site performs moderately against accessibility/constraints but Green Belt performs strongly. Greater weight attached to protection of Green Belt.	x
14 – Brox End Nursey, Ottershaw	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints and Green Belt purposes only weakly met. The site is already acceptable to develop in principle through the existing Local Plan and is subject to planning applications.	✓
17 – Coombelands Lane, Rowtown	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints and Green Belt purposes only weakly met. The site is already acceptable to develop in principle through the existing Local Plan and is subject to planning permission for 43 units subject to S106.	✓
22 – Land south of St David's Drive & Robert's Way, Englefield Green	Site performs moderately against accessibility/constraints, but Green Belt performs strongly. Greater weight attached to protection of the Green Belt.	x
24 – Land at Prairie Road, Hatch Close & Hatch Farm, Addlestone	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints, but Green Belt also performs strongly. Greater weight attached to protection of the Green Belt.	x
28 – Great Grove Farm, Murray Road, Ottershaw	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints, but Green Belt also performs strongly. Greater weight attached to protection of the Green Belt.	x
29 – Charnwood Nurseries, 33 The Avenue, Woodham	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints but Green Belt also performs strongly. Greater weight attached to protection of the Green Belt.	x
30 – CABI, Bakeham Lane, Egham	Medium-high performing site in terms of accessibility/constraints and moderately performing against Green Belt purposes but Green Belt has strategic importance in this area. Greater weight attached to protection of the Green Belt.	x
34 – Parklands, Parcel D, Chertsey Bittams	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints and only plays a limited role in wider Green Belt. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs.	✓
36 – Sandylands Home Farm East, Blay's Lane, Englefield Green	The site is medium performing in terms of accessibility/constraints but Green Belt performs strongly. Greater weight attached to protection of the Green Belt.	x
46 – Land at Great Grove Farm, Ottershaw	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints. Green Belt performs moderately over majority of site and is critical to maintain gap between Chertsey/Ottershaw, but southwest corner of site plays less fundamental role. Considered that release of site including southwest corner is not a 'rounding off' of the urban area pushing settlement boundaries north beyond existing defensible GB boundaries and physically closing gap between Ottershaw/Chertsey. Greater weight attached to protection of the Green Belt.	x

Site	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
48 – Hanworth Lane, Chertsey	High performing site against accessibility/constraints. Parcel was not taken forward for further refinement in Stage 1 Review and was recommended as a Green Belt extension. However, the site is designated as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan with 130 dwellings on the northern section of the site under construction. The site is already acceptable to develop in principle through the existing Local Plan and greater weight attached to meeting development needs.	✓
50 – Brunel University Site, Coopers Hill, Englefield Green	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints. Green Belt performs strongly on part of the site but weaker in other parts, most notably that currently under construction for residential development. However, area of site performing more weakly against Green Belt purposes unlikely to yield any more developable area than is already under construction and further development unlikely to be achievable. Greater weight attached to protection of the Green Belt.	x
51 – Byfleet Road, New Haw (employment only)	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints as an employment site. Further refinement of land parcel reveals that development would not compromise purpose 2 with no potential for sprawl. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs for employment.	✓
52 – Dial House, Northcroft Road, Englefield Green	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints but Green Belt performs strongly. Greater weight attached to protection of Green Belt.	x
60 – Pycroft Road, Chertsey	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints. Further refined parcel reveals that development would not compromise purpose 2 or 3 of Green Belt and area at Grange Farm plays lesser role in wider Green Belt. As such, greater weight attached to meeting development needs. Part of site is already acceptable to develop in principle through the existing Local Plan.	✓
62 – Land at Addleston Moor	High performing site against accessibility/constraints but Green Belt performs moderately and is integral to maintaining gap between settlements. Greater weight attached to protection of Green Belt.	x
77 – 232 Brox Road, Ottershaw	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints and Green Belt performs only weakly/moderately. However, considered that site would form an incongruous addition to urban area and is not a 'rounding off' of the settlement. Greater weight attached to protection of the Green Belt.	x

Site	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
97 & 99 – Longcross Garden Village	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints, although accessibility is low. However the site would be large enough to improve accessibility as it could provide on-site local services and facilities. Green Belt performance is weak aside from being moderate against one purpose, however, further refinement identifies potential for development at the site. The site is already partially developed and as such is not open in its entirety, which is one of the fundamental characteristics of the Green Belt. In this respect the site has already fragmented the Green Belt to some degree and the gaps to other settlements would not fragment Green Belt further. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs.	✓
154 – Land at Howard’s Lane, Rowtown	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints but Green Belt performance is strong. Greater weight attached to protection of Green Belt.	x
156 – Blay’s House, Blay’s Lane, Englefield Green	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints and Green Belt performs moderately but plays a limited role in meeting Green Belt purposes. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs.	✓
158 – Squires Garden Centre, Hollow Hill, Chertsey	Medium performing site in terms of accessibility/constraints but Green Belt performance is strong. Greater protection attached to protection of Green Belt.	x
167 – Land at Woburn Hill, Addlestone	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints but Green Belt performance is strong. Greater weight attached to protection of Green Belt.	x
205 – Crockford Bridge Farm, New Haw Road, Addlestone	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints but Green Belt performance is strong. Greater weight attached to protection of the Green Belt.	x
212 – Home Farm, Stroude Road	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints but moderate performance against Green Belt purposes and is considered to play an important role in preventing encroachment into a sensitive area of countryside. Greater weight attached to protection of the Green Belt.	x
217 – Land adjacent Wheeler’s Green, Parcel E, Chertsey Bittams	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints. Further refined land parcel and sub-area plays only a limited role in the wider Green Belt. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs.	✓
218 – Rusham Park, Whitehall Lane, Egham	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints with Green Belt performance generally weak and playing a limited role in wider Green Belt. However, only 11% of land which would need release from Green Belt is developable and is considered disproportionate to level of development achievable. Greater weight attached to protection of the Green Belt.	x

Site	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
219 – Villa Santa Maria, St Ann's Hill, Chertsey	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints but Green performance is strong. Greater weight attached to protection of the Green Belt.	x
224 – Land adjacent 62 Addlestonemoor	High performing site against accessibility/constraints with moderate Green Belt performance, but Green Belt plays integral role in maintaining gaps between settlements. Greater weight attached to protection of Green Belt.	x
227 – Woburn Park Farm, Addlestonemoor	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints but Green Belt performance is strong. Greater weight attached to protection of Green Belt.	x
231 – St Peter's Hospital	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints. Site plays limited role in meeting Green belt purposes 2 & 3. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs.	✓
254 – Land Parcel B, Central Veterinary Laboratory, Rowtown	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints. Further refined parcel would not compromise Green Belt purposes and sub-area performs weakly/moderately against purposes, although southwest part of sub-area plays a more critical role in wider Green Belt. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs for north section of sub-area, but greater weight attached to protecting Green Belt for southwest section of sub-area.	✓
255A – Parcel A, Chertsey Bittams	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints. Further refined parcel states that strong boundaries will prevent further sprawl, the strategic gap would not lead to merger of settlements and the semi-urban character has already compromised open countryside and its role in meeting purpose 3. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs.	✓
255B – Parcel B, Chertsey Bittams	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints. Further refined parcel states that strong boundaries will prevent further sprawl, the strategic gap would not lead to merger of settlements and the semi-urban character has already compromised open countryside and its role in meeting purpose 3. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs.	✓
255C – Parcel C, Chertsey Bittams	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints. Further refined parcel states that strong boundaries will prevent further sprawl, the strategic gap would not lead to merger of settlements and the semi-urban character has already compromised open countryside and its role in meeting purpose 3. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs.	✓
256 – Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel A (Thorpe Lea Manor)	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints with Green Belt performing weakly. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs.	✓

Site	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
256 – Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel B (Glenville Farm)	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints with Green Belt performing weakly. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs.	✓
257 – Thorpe Lea Road West	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints. Further refined parcel would not compromise Green Belt purposes 1 & 2 with sub-area performing weakly against purposes 2 & 3. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs.	✓
258 – Virginia Water North	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints. Refined parcel would not compromise Green Belt purposes 2 & 3 and sub-area performs weakly against purposes 1 & 2 and plays limited role in wider Green Belt. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs.	✓
259 – Virginia Water West	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints. Refined parcel would not compromise Green Belt purposes 2 & 3 and sub-area performs weakly against all three purposes and plays no role in wider Green Belt. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs.	✓
261 – Virginia Water South	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints. Refined parcel would not compromise Green Belt purposes 2 & 3 and sub-area performs weakly against purposes 1 & 2 and plays limited role in wider Green Belt. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs.	✓
263 – Ottershaw East	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints. Further refined parcel not considered to compromise any Green Belt purposes with western part of sub-area not considered to play a role in purpose 1 or 2. Eastern part of site considered to play fundamental role in purpose 2. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs on western part of site (west of public footpath) but greater weight attached to protection of Green Belt on eastern part of site (east of public footpath).	✓
268 – Land at 79-87a Woodham Park Road, Woodham	Medium performing site in terms of accessibility/constraints with Green Belt performing weakly/moderately. However, site plays a role in preventing sprawl and coalescence of settlements and performs strongly in wider Green Belt. Greater weight attached to protection of Green Belt.	x
274 – Allington & 37, 47 57 Howard's Lane, Rowtown	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints but Green Belt performance is strong. Greater weight attached to protection of Green Belt.	x
277 – The Old Chalet, Callow Hill, Virginia Water	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints but Green Belt performance is strong. Greater weight attached to protection of Green Belt.	x
284 – Christmas Tree Site, Ottershaw	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints but Green Belt performance is strong. Greater weight attached to protection of Green Belt.	x

Site	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
285 – Sayes Court Kennels, Addlestone	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints but Green Belt performance is strong. Greater weight attached to protection of Green Belt.	x
289 – Webb’s, The Green, Englefield Green	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints but Green Belt performance is strong. Greater weight attached to protection of Green Belt.	x
293 – Land North of Kings Lane, Englefield Green	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints but Green Belt performance is strong. Greater weight attached to protection of Green Belt.	x
312 – Jasmine Cottage and 1 & 2 Home Farm Cottages, Virginia Water	Medium performing site against accessibility/constraints, but performance against Green Belt purposes 2 & 3 is moderate and plays important role in protecting against encroachment into sensitive area of countryside. Greater weight attached to protection of the Green Belt.	x
323 – Cacti Nursery, Bousley Rise, Ottershaw	Medium-high performing site against accessibility/constraints and weak against Green Belt purposes. However, not considered that defensible and durable boundaries can be clearly distinguished on site which would threaten permanence of the Green Belt and therefore greater weight attached to retaining land in the Green Belt.	x

### Stage 6 Assessment

5.12 Stage 6 of the assessment considers the performance of each site taken forward from stage 5 against the findings of the sustainability appraisal as a sense check. Table 5-5 sets out a summary of the appraisal of each site as appraised in Appendix 2 of the Sustainability Appraisal which accompanied the Local Plan Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document and Appendix 2 of the Sustainability Appraisal which accompanied the Additional Sites & Options document. The Sustainability Appraisal Objectives are set out in full in Appendix 9. Only where a site is appraised as having significant negative effects which cannot be mitigated or reduced and/or balanced by positive effects will a site not be taken forward to Stage 7.

**Table 5-5: Performance of Sites in Sustainability Appraisal**

Site	Performance in SA	Comments
14 – Brox End Nursey, Ottershaw	Effects are uncertain on SA objectives 1, 2, 4 & 10 relating to biodiversity, health, water quality/efficiency and historic assets and neutral for objective 5 relating to climate change. Minor positive effects are recorded for objectives 7, 8 and 9 relating to greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth and provision of homes. Minor negative effects are recorded for objectives 3, 6 and 11 relating to soil resource, air/noise pollution and landscape character.	Considered that uncertain effects and most minor negative effects could be mitigated through the design process associated with an individual planning application or as set out in Local Plan allocation. Minor negative effect likely to remain to objective 3, but is balanced against other minor positives and mitigation to other negative effects.



Site	Performance in SA	Comments
17 – Coombelands Lane, Rowtown	Effects are uncertain on SA objectives 1, 2 & 4 relating to biodiversity, health and water quality/efficiency and neutral for objective 5 relating to climate change. Minor positive effects are recorded for objectives 7, 8, 9 and 10 relating to greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth, provision of homes and historic assets. Minor negative effects are recorded for objectives 3, 6 and 11 relating to soil resource, air/noise pollution and landscape character.	Planning application RU.16/0845 granted permission for 43 residential units subject to S106. Proposed plans and conditions attached to permission and potential S106 contributions should to some degree mitigate minor negative or uncertain effects, although minor effect to objective 3 likely to remain but is balanced against other minor positives and mitigation to other negative effects.
34 – Parklands, Parcel D, Chertsey Bittams	Effects are uncertain on SA objectives 2 & 4 relating to health and water quality and neutral for objective 5 relating to climate change. Minor positive effects are recorded against objectives 7, 8 9 and 10 relating to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth, providing homes and historic assets. Significant negative effect recorded against objective 6 air/noise pollution due to proximity to AQMA and A320 and minor negative effects are recorded against objectives 1, 3 and 11 relating to biodiversity, soil resource and landscape character.	Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. Significant negative effects on objective 6 will require an air/noise quality assessment relating to proximity to the AQMA/A320 with mitigation measures implemented if necessary. For objective 11 any allocation will need to implement a landscape strategy for the site and although site is not within a BOA, for the purposes of objective 1 pursue biodiversity enhancements on site. Minor negative effect on objective 3 likely to remain but is balanced against other minor positives and mitigation to other negative effects.
48 – Hanworth Lane, Chertsey	Effects are uncertain on SA objectives 4 & 11 relating to water quality/efficiency and landscape character with neutral effect from employment and uncertain effect from housing on objective 2 relating to health. Neutral effect for objective 5 relating to climate change. Minor positive effects are recorded for objectives 3, 7, 8, 9 and 10 relating to soil resource, greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth, provision of homes and historic assets but significant positive for objective 7 if developed for employment use. Minor negative effects are recorded for objectives 1 & 6 relating to biodiversity and air/noise pollution.	Planning application RU.15/0855 granted permission for 130 residential units with Reserved Matters approved under RU.16/1198 on northern section of site. Proposed plans and conditions attached to permission and S106 contributions should to some degree mitigate minor negative or uncertain effects. For southern section of site uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through requirements set out in Local Plan allocation. For objective 1, although not within an BOA, biodiversity enhancements could be sought and for objective 6 air/noise quality assessment with mitigation secured if necessary.

Site	Performance in SA	Comments
51 – Byfleet Road, New Haw (employment only)	Effects are uncertain on SA objective 2 & 4 relating to health and water quality/efficiency. Significant positive effect recorded against objective 8 relating to economic growth and minor positive effects are recorded for objective 7 relating to greenhouse gas emissions. Significant negative effects recorded against objective 5 climate change, due to flood risk and objective 6 air/noise pollution due to proximity to M25 & rail and AQMA. Minor negative effects recorded for objectives 1, 3, 10 and 11 relating to biodiversity, soil resource, historic assets and landscape character.	Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. Significant negative effects on objective 5 will need to be addressed through a site flood risk assessment and implemented through design. For objective 6 an air/noise quality assessment will be required with mitigation proposed as necessary although type of employment use may reduce effects. For objectives 1 & 11 any allocation will need to have regard to and implement Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA) & Surrey Landscape Character Assessment (SLCA) objectives. For objective 10, negative effects could be mitigated through design. Minor negative effect on objective 3 likely to remain but is balanced against other minor positives and mitigation to other negative effects.
60 – Pyrcroft Road, Chertsey	Effects are uncertain on SA objectives 1, 2 & 4 relating to biodiversity, health & water quality/efficiency. Minor positive effects are recorded for objectives 7, 8 & 9 relating to greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth and providing homes. Significant negative effect recorded against objective 5 climate change, due to flood risk with minor negative effects recorded for objectives 3, 6, 10 and 11 relating to soil resource, air/noise quality, historic assets and landscape character.	Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. Significant negative effects on objective 5 will need to be addressed through a site flood risk assessment, although development could come forward avoiding flood risk areas. For minor negative effect on objective 6 a noise quality assessment relating to proximity to rail line will be required and impacts could be attenuated. For objective 11 any allocation will need to have regard to and implement SLCA objectives. For objective 10 negative effects could be mitigated through design. Minor negative effect on objective 3 likely to remain but is balanced against other minor positives and mitigation to other negative effects.

Site	Performance in SA	Comments
97 & 99 – Longcross Garden Village	For parcels north & south of the M3 effects are uncertain on objectives 2 & 4 relating to health and water quality/efficiency. Minor positive effects are recorded against objectives 3, 5, 7, 8 & 9 relating to soil resource, climate change, greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth, providing homes with minor positive effect on objective 11 relating to landscape character on north parcel but a minor negative on southern parcel. Minor negative effects are recorded against objectives 1, 6 & 10 relating to biodiversity, air/noise quality and historic assets.	Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. For minor negative effect on objective 6 a noise/air quality assessment relating to proximity to rail line/motorway will be needed with mitigation measures proposed as appropriate. For objective 1 implementation of BOA objectives will need to be sought and for objective 10 design of site will need to be sympathetic to and enhance historic assets and their setting.
156 – Blay's House, Blay's Lane, Englefield Green	Effects uncertain on objectives 2, 4 & 10 relating to health, water quality/efficiency and historic assets. Minor positive effects on objectives 3, 5, 7, 8 & 9 relating to soil resource, climate change, greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth and providing homes. Minor negative effects recorded against objectives 1, 6 & 11 relating to biodiversity, air/noise quality and landscape character.	Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. For minor negative effect on objective 6 a noise/air quality assessment relating to proximity to A30 will be needed with mitigation measures proposed if necessary. For objective 11 any allocation will need to have regard to and implement SLCA objectives and although site is not within a BOA, for the purposes of objective 1 pursue biodiversity enhancements on site.

Site	Performance in SA	Comments
217 – Land adjacent Wheeler’s Green, Parcel E, Chertsey Bittams	Effects are uncertain on SA objectives 2 & 4 relating to health and water quality and neutral for objective 5 relating to climate change. Minor positive effects are recorded against objectives 7, 8, 9 and 10 relating to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth, providing homes and historic assets. Significant negative effect recorded against objective 6 air/noise pollution due to proximity to AQMA and A320 and objective 11 relating to landscape character given the greenfield nature of the site. Minor negative effects are recorded against objectives 1 & 3 relating to biodiversity & soil resource.	Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. Significant negative effects on objective 6 will require an air/noise quality assessment relating to proximity to the AQMA/A320 with mitigation measures implemented if necessary. For objective 11 any allocation will need to implement a landscape strategy for the site including retention of existing vegetation to limit impact to landscape character. Although site is not within a BOA, for the purposes of objective 1 biodiversity enhancements should be pursued on site. Minor negative effect on objective 3 likely to remain but is balanced against other minor positives and mitigation to other negative effects.
231 – St Peter’s Hospital	Effects uncertain on SA objectives 2 & 4 relating to health and water quality/efficiency and neutral effect on objective 1 for biodiversity. Minor positive effects recorded against objectives 3, 7, 8 and 9 relating to soil resources, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth and providing homes. Minor negative effects are recorded against objectives 5, 6, 10 and 11 relating to climate change, air/noise quality, historic assets and landscape character.	Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. For minor negative effect on objective 6 an air quality assessment relating to proximity to A320 will be needed with mitigation measures proposed if necessary. For objective 5, this is recorded as a minor negative due to flood risk, but no part of the site is outside of flood risk zone 1. For objective 10 negative effects could be mitigated through design. For objective 11 any allocation will need to implement a landscape strategy for the site including retention of existing and protected vegetation to reduce wider landscape impacts.

Site	Performance in SA	Comments
254 – Land Parcel B, Central Veterinary Laboratory, Rowtown	<p>Uncertain effects on objectives 2 &amp; 4 relating to health &amp; water quality/efficiency with neutral effects for objectives 5 &amp; 6 relating to climate change and air/noise quality. Minor positive effects recorded against objectives 7, 8 &amp; 9 relating to greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth and providing homes. Significant negative effect on objective 11 relating to landscape character and minor negative effects recorded against objectives 1, 3 and 10 relating to biodiversity, soil resource and historic assets.</p>	<p>Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. Significant negative effect on objective 11 will need to be mitigated through a suitable landscaping strategy having regard to the objectives of the SLCA and to the prominence of the site. However, effect may be reduced to a minor negative rather than fully mitigated. For objective 1, although the site is not within a BOA, biodiversity enhancements will need to be implemented. For objective 10 effect can be mitigated through design. Minor negative effect on objective 3 likely to remain. Remaining negative effects are balanced against other minor positives and mitigation to other negative effects.</p>
255A – Parcel A, Chertsey Bittams	<p>Effects are uncertain on SA objectives 2 &amp; 4 relating to health and water quality. Minor positive effects are recorded against objectives 7, 8, 9 and 10 relating to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth, providing homes and historic assets. Significant negative effect recorded against objective 6 air/noise pollution due to proximity to AQMA and A320 and objective 11 relating to landscape character given the greenfield nature of the site. Minor negative effects are recorded against objectives 1, 3 &amp; 5 relating to biodiversity, soil resource and climate change.</p>	<p>Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. Significant negative effects on objective 6 will require an air/noise quality assessment relating to proximity to the AQMA/A320 with mitigation measures implemented if necessary. For objective 11 any allocation will need to implement a landscape strategy for the site including retention of existing vegetation to limit impact to landscape character. Although site is not within a BOA, for the purposes of objective 1 biodiversity enhancements should be pursued on site. For objective 5 effects relate to small area of flood risk which can be avoided. Minor negative effect on objective 3 likely to remain but is balanced against other minor positives and mitigation to other negative effects.</p>

Site	Performance in SA	Comments
255B – Parcel B, Chertsey Bittams	Effects are uncertain on SA objectives 2 & 4 relating to health and water quality and neutral for objective 5 relating to climate change. Minor positive effects are recorded against objectives 7, 8, 9 and 10 relating to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth, providing homes and historic assets. Significant negative effect recorded against objective 6 air/noise pollution due to proximity to AQMA and A320 and objective 11 relating to landscape character given the greenfield nature of the site. Minor negative effects are recorded against objectives 1 & 3 relating to biodiversity & soil resource.	Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. Significant negative effects on objective 6 will require an air/noise quality assessment relating to proximity to the AQMA/A320 with mitigation measures implemented if necessary. For objective 11 any allocation will need to implement a landscape strategy for the site including retention of existing vegetation to limit impact to landscape character. Although site is not within a BOA, for the purposes of objective 1 biodiversity enhancements should be pursued on site. Minor negative effect on objective 3 likely to remain but is balanced against other minor positives and mitigation to other negative effects.
255C – Parcel C, Chertsey Bittams	Effects are uncertain on SA objectives 2 & 4 relating to health and water quality and neutral for objective 5 relating to climate change. Minor positive effects are recorded against objectives 7, 8, 9 and 10 relating to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth, providing homes and historic assets. Significant negative effect recorded against objective 6 air/noise pollution due to proximity to AQMA and A320 and objective 11 relating to landscape character given the greenfield nature of the site. Minor negative effects are recorded against objectives 1 & 3 relating to biodiversity & soil resource.	Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. Significant negative effects on objective 6 will require an air/noise quality assessment relating to proximity to the AQMA/A320 with mitigation measures implemented if necessary. For objective 11 any allocation will need to implement a landscape strategy for the site including retention of existing vegetation to limit impact to landscape character. Although site is not within a BOA, for the purposes of objective 1 biodiversity enhancements should be pursued on site. Minor negative effect on objective 3 likely to remain but is balanced against other minor positives and mitigation to other negative effects.

Site	Performance in SA	Comments
256 – Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel A (Thorpe Lea Manor)	Uncertain effects on objectives 2 & 4 relating to health and water quality/efficiency. Minor positive effects on objectives 1, 3, 7, 8 & 9 relating to biodiversity, soil resource, greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth and providing homes. Minor negative effects recorded on objectives 5, 6, 10 & 11 relating to climate change, air/noise quality due to proximity to M25, historic assets and landscape character.	Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. For objective 5 risk could be avoided through design or a flood risk assessment will be required with mitigation implemented as necessary. For objective 6 a noise quality assessment will be required due to aircraft noise zone and proximity to M25 with attenuation measures implemented where necessary. For objective 10 design of site will need to ensure no harm to setting of historic asset. For objective 11 the site is not within the SLCA and is already previously developed but features of importance could be retained or site landscaping improved.
256 – Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel B (Glenville Farm)	Uncertain effects on objectives 2 & 4 relating to health and water quality/efficiency. Minor positive effects on objectives 1, 3, 7, 8 & 9 relating to biodiversity, soil resource, greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth and providing homes. Minor negative effects recorded on objectives 5, 6, 10 & 11 relating to climate change, air/noise quality due to proximity to M25, historic assets and landscape character.	Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations.. For objective 5 risk could be avoided through design or a flood risk assessment will be required with mitigation implemented as necessary. For objective 6 a noise quality assessment will be required due to aircraft noise zone and proximity to M25 with attenuation measures implemented where necessary. For objective 10 design of site will need to ensure no harm to setting of historic asset. For objective 11 the site is not within the SLCA and is already previously developed but features of importance could be retained or site landscaping improved.

Site	Performance in SA	Comments
257 – Thorpe Lea Road West	Uncertain effects on objectives 2 & 4 relating to health and water quality/efficiency. Minor positive effects on objectives 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9 & 10 relating to biodiversity, soil resource, climate change, greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth, providing homes and historic assets. Minor negative effects recorded on objectives 6 & 11 relating to air/noise quality due to proximity to M25 and landscape character.	Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. For objective 6 a noise quality assessment will be required due to proximity to M25 with attenuation measures implemented where necessary. For objective 11 the site is not within the SLCA but features of importance could be retained or site landscaping improved.
258 – Virginia Water North	Uncertain effects on objective 4 relating to water quality/efficiency and neutral effect on objective 5 relating to climate change. Minor positive effects recorded against objectives 2, 7, 8 and 9 relating to health, greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth and providing homes. Significant negative effect recorded against objective 11 relating to landscape character with minor negative effects against objectives 1, 3, 6 & 10 relating to biodiversity, soil resource, air/noise quality and historic assets.	Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. Significant negative effect on objective 11 will need to be mitigated through a suitable landscaping strategy having regard to the objectives of the SLCA and to the change in site levels. However, effect may be reduced to a minor negative rather than fully mitigated. For objective 1, although the site is not within a BOA, biodiversity enhancements will need to be implemented. For objective 6 a noise quality assessment relating to proximity of rail line may be required with measures implemented if necessary. For objective 10 design of site will need to ensure no harm to setting of historic assets. Minor negative effect on objective 3 likely to remain, but remaining negative effects are balanced against other minor positives and mitigation to other negative effects.
259 – Virginia Water West	Uncertain effects on objectives 2, 4 & 10 relating to health, water quality/efficiency and historic assets and neutral effect on objective 5 relating to climate change. Minor positive effects on objectives 3, 6, 7, 8 and 9 relating to soil resource, air/noise quality, greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth and providing homes. Minor negative effects recorded against objectives 1 & 11.	Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. Although not in a BOA or within the SLCA, for objectives 1 & 11 biodiversity enhancements could be implemented on site with existing important landscape features retained or landscaping improved.



Site	Performance in SA	Comments
261 – Virginia Water South	<p>Uncertain effects on objectives 2 &amp; 4 relating to health and water quality/efficiency and neutral effect on objective 5 relating to climate change. Minor positive effects recorded against objectives 3, 7, 8, 9 and 10 relating to soil resource, greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth, providing homes and historic assets. Significant negative effect recorded against objective 11 relating to landscape character with minor negative effects against objectives 1 &amp; 6 relating to biodiversity and air/noise quality.</p>	<p>Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. Significant negative effect on objective 11 will need to be mitigated through a suitable landscaping strategy having regard to the objectives of the SLCA. However, effect may be reduced to a minor negative rather than fully mitigated. For objective 1, although the site is not within a BOA, biodiversity enhancements will need to be implemented. For objective 6 an air/noise quality assessment relating to proximity of M3 and rail line will be required with mitigation measures implemented if necessary.</p>
263 – Ottershaw East	<p>Uncertain effects on objectives 2 &amp; 4 relating to health and water quality/efficiency and neutral effect on objective 5 relating to climate change. Minor positive effects recorded against objectives 1, 7, 8 and 9 relating to biodiversity, greenhouse gas emissions, economic growth and providing homes. Significant negative effect on objective 11 relating to landscape character and minor negative effects on objectives 3, 6 &amp; 10 relating to soil resource, air/noise quality and historic assets.</p>	<p>Majority of uncertain or minor negative effects could be mitigated through design or by requirements set out in Local Plan policies or individual allocations. Significant negative effect on objective 11 will need to be mitigated through a suitable landscaping strategy having regard to the objectives of the SLCA. Restricting development to the west of the footpath with the east used as public open space may reduce negative effects further. For objective 6 an air/noise quality assessment relating to proximity of A320 will be required with mitigation measures implemented if necessary. For objective 10 design of site will need to ensure no harm to setting of historic assets. Minor negative effect on objective 3 likely to remain, but remaining negative effects are balanced against other minor positives and mitigation to other negative effects.</p>

5.13 All sites recorded a number of uncertain or minor negative effects to a range of sustainability objectives with some sites recording significant negative effects against one or two sustainability objectives. Where uncertain or negative effects arise, some of these may be mitigated or reduced through the generic policies of the Local Plan 2035 or where specific issues need to be addressed could be included within individual site requirements in the allocations in the Local Plan. For instance, most sites registered an uncertain effect against water quality/efficiency and this uncertainty could be removed

with generic policies on implementation of Sustainable Drainage Systems and/or water efficiency measures in the design of new development. On the other hand specific measures could be set out on a site by site basis where necessary including issues such as landscape, biodiversity, infrastructure and green infrastructure requirements and site capacity.

- 5.14 As such, although there will inevitably be some negative effects which will remain, it is considered that the majority of uncertain or negative effects can be mitigated or reduced and any remaining negative effects balanced by other positive effects. Therefore all 21 sites have been taken forward to stage 7.

### **Stage 7 Assessment**

- 5.15 Stage 7 of the assessment considers the deliverability/developability of sites and their availability. All sites are recommended for allocation in the draft Local Plan, unless it is considered that issues over availability/viability are unlikely to be resolved by the time of draft publication. In any event, all sites which were included after the initial sift have been the subject of sustainability appraisal.
- 5.16 In 2013 the Council were preparing a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) draft charging schedule alongside the previous Local Plan but which were both subsequently withdrawn in 2015. To support the preparation of a draft charging schedule the Council undertook a general viability appraisal of development at that time. The viability appraisal showed that residential development within Runnymede is viable and that there was scope to charge CIL.
- 5.17 Runnymede has now updated its viability evidence to support the Local Plan 2030 and a future CIL charging schedule. Each site from Stage 7 assessed to be available has been assessed in the updated whole plan viability evidence or the Longcross Garden Village Infrastructure & Viability Assessment which includes the impact of the policies of the Local Plan and any infrastructure requirements. In general, all of the residential sites are considered to be viable taking account of policy and infrastructure requirements and delivery of affordable housing.
- 5.18 Employment sites exhibit tighter viability margins, however, the one employment site available for allocation is generally considered to be viable.
- 5.19 Further, whilst there are a number of sites where proponents have stated the site could come forward for housing or employment, in reality, given the level of housing need in the Borough, only those sites not considered appropriate for housing have been allocated for employment. Mixed use developments have been discounted for each site because they are not considered large enough to accommodate both housing and employment development where the two uses would have to be in close proximity to one another potentially affecting sensitive receptors. The Longcross Garden Village site is large enough for mixed use, and the area north of the M3 is already accommodating 79,000sqm of employment space and as such is already a mixed use site.
- 5.20 The assessment of the availability/viability of sites is set out in Table 5-6. This shows that one site is not recommended to be taken forward into the draft Plan. This is for one potential housing site (Site 259) where the majority of site availability is unknown and is within multiple ownerships making site assembly more problematic and which therefore may never come forward over the plan period. There are two other sites (255B & C) where availability is unknown, however these are either in single or one or two ownerships and there is the possibility of these sites becoming available over the plan period without site assembly issues. One other site (Site 258) is largely available,

although the area where availability is unknown is again only in one or two ownerships and could therefore come forward over the plan period without land assembly issues.

5.21 The final number of sites recommended for allocation is 20 housing sites and 1 employment site.

**Table 5-6: Availability/Viability of Sites**

Site	Availability	Viability	Recommendation
14 – Brox End Nursey, Ottershaw	Planning applications reflect availability	Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Allocate Housing for
17 – Coombelands Lane, Rowtown	Planning permission reflects availability	Planning permission reflects viability	Allocate Housing for
34 – Parklands, Parcel D, Chertsey Bittams	Confirmed as available through 2016 IOPA consultation and pre-application submitted.	Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Allocate Housing for
48 – Hanworth Lane, Chertsey	Planning application reflects availability and pre-application submitted.	Planning application reflects viability. Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Allocate Housing for
51 – Byfleet Road, New Haw (employment only)	Confirmed as available through 2016 IOPA consultation.	Viability may be tight but considered to be generally viable.	Allocate Employment for
60 – Pyrcroft Road, Chertsey	Confirmed as available through 2016 IOPA consultation	Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Allocate Housing for
97 & 99 – Longcross Garden Village	Confirmed as available through 2016 IOPA consultation.	Confirmed viable in Longcross Infrastructure & Viability Assessment.	Allocate for Mixed Use
156 – Blay's House, Blay's Lane, Englefield Green	Confirmed as available through 2016 IOPA consultation.	Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Allocate Housing for
217 – Wheeler's Green, Parcel E, Chertsey Bittams	Confirmed as available through 2016 IOPA consultation.	Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Allocate Housing for
231 – St Peter's Hospital	Confirmed as available through 2016 IOPA consultation. Planning application submitted.	Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Allocate Housing for
254 – Land Parcel B, Central Veterinary Laboratory, Rowtown	Confirmed as available through 2016 IOPA consultation.	Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Allocate Housing for
255A – Parcel A, Chertsey Bittams	Confirmed as available through 2016 IOPA consultation.	Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Allocate Housing for

Site	Availability	Viability	Recommendation
255B – Parcel B, Chertsey Bittams	Unconfirmed but in single ownership and no site assembly issues	Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Possibility of coming forward over plan period due to single ownership. Allocate for Housing
255C – Parcel C, Chertsey Bittams	Unconfirmed but site only in one or two ownerships with no site assembly issues.	Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Possibility of coming forward over plan period due to low number of ownerships. Allocate for Housing
256 – Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel A (Thorpe Lea Manor)	Confirmed as available through 2016 IOPA call for sites	Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Allocate for Housing
256 – Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel B (Glenville Farm)	Confirmed as available through 2016 IOPA consultation	Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Allocate for Housing
257 – Thorpe Lea Road West	Confirmed as available through 2016 IOPA consultation	Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Allocate for Housing
258 – Virginia Water North	Merlewood and large portion of Kenwolde confirmed as available through 2016 IOPA consultation. Availability unknown on eastern section at Gorse Hill House & Gorse Hill Manor, but only in two ownerships with no assembly issues. Majority of site available.	Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Allocate whole site for Housing
259 – Virginia Water West	Majority of availability unknown at this time and site in multiple ownerships. Site assembly problematic	Appears viable	Do not allocate as land in multiple ownerships and vast majority of site not considered available.
261 – Virginia Water South	Confirmed as available through 2016 IOPA consultation	Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Allocate for Housing
263 – Ottershaw East	Confirmed as available through 2016 IOPA consultation	Confirmed viable in whole plan viability assessment.	Allocate for Housing

## **Appendix 1 - Initial Sift of Housing Sites**

SLAA No	Site	Within Buffer or Capable of own settlement	Entirely within Flood Risk Zone 3b	Entirely within Designated Site or is SANG	Entirely within 400m SPA/SAC	Ancient Woodland Covers Entire Site	Majority within Historic Park & Garden or Scheduled Monument	Physical Access	Capacity	Notes
04	Barrsbrook & Barrsbrook Cattery, Guildford Road, Chertsey	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
13	Stroude Farm, Stroude Road	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
14	Brox End Nursery, Ottershaw	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
17	Coombelands Lane, Row Town	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
18	Land north of Thorpe Industrial Estate	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
19	Oak Tree Nurseries, Stroude Road	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
22	Land South of St David's Drive & Roberts Way, Englefield Green	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Includes site 208
24	Land at Prairie Road, Hatch Close & Hatch Farm, Addlestone	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
28	Great Grove Farm, Murray Road, Ottershaw	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site adjacent urban area
29	Charnwood Nurseries, 33 The Avenue, Woodham	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
30	CABI, Bakeham Lane, Egham	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
34	Parklands, Parcel D, Chertsey Bittams	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Part PDL Site
36	Sandylands Home Farm East, Blays Lane, Englefield Green	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
42	CEMEX Thorpe 1, Ten Acre Lane, Thorpe	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	

SLAA No	Site	Within Buffer or Capable of own settlement	Entirely within Flood Risk Zone 3b	Entirely within Designated Site or is SANG	Entirely within 400m SPA/SAC	Ancient Woodland Covers Entire Site	Majority within Historic Park & Garden or Scheduled Monument	Physical Access	Capacity	Notes
44	CEMEX Thorpe 3, Ten Acre Lane, Thorpe	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
46	Land at Great Grove Farm, Ottershaw (west)	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
46a	Land at Great Grove Farm (east)	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
48	Hanworth Lane, Chertsey	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
50	Brunel University Site, Coopers Hill, Englefield Green	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site adjacent urban area
51	Byfleet Road, New Haw	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
52	Dial House, Northcroft Road, Englefield Green	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part within urban area
56	Land at Green Lane/Norlands Lane/Chertsey Lane, Thorpe	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
59	Land at Hurst Lane	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
60	Pycroft Road, Chertsey	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
62	Land at Addlestonemoor	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
75	85 Woodham Park Road, Woodham	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site. Site 268 includes site 75
76	Hogsters Farm, Stroude Road, Egham	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
77	232 Brox Road, Ottershaw	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
97 &	Longcross Garden Village	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL

SLAA No	Site	Within Buffer or Capable of own settlement	Entirely within Flood Risk Zone 3b	Entirely within Designated Site or is SANG	Entirely within 400m SPA/SAC	Ancient Woodland Covers Entire Site	Majority within Historic Park & Garden or Scheduled Monument	Physical Access	Capacity	Notes
99										site
100	Land adjacent Heather Drive/Shrubbs Hill Lane	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	
103	Stroude Road, Egham	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
115	Land at 18 & 19 Riverside, Egham	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
118	Lyne Lodge, Bridge Lane, Lyne (A)	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
119	Lyne Lodge, Bridge Lane, Lyne (B)	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
120	Hythe Farm, 81/83 Hythefield Avenue, Egham	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
121	Luddington Farm, Stroude Road, Egham	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
122	79 Woodham Park Road, Woodham	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Site 0.42ha & Part PDL. Site 268 includes site 122
<p>Site proponent for 122 has submitted an indicative site layout plan showing 11 dwellings (10 net) accommodated on the site. However, the Council do not consider that if site 122 was allocated and brought into the urban area, it would be capable of delivering 10 units on site given the overall size and shape of the site and location of on-site features such as trees worthy of retention. In line with para 4.27 of this SSMA, site 122 has been combined with site 268.</p>										
123	CEMEX House, Coldharbour Lane, Thorpe	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
129	Wey Manor Farm, Addlestone	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
154	Land at Howard's Lane, Rowtown	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site adjacent urban



SLAA No	Site	Within Buffer or Capable of own settlement	Entirely within Flood Risk Zone 3b	Entirely within Designated Site or is SANG	Entirely within 400m SPA/SAC	Ancient Woodland Covers Entire Site	Majority within Historic Park & Garden or Scheduled Monument	Physical Access	Capacity	Notes
										area
156	Blay's House, Blay's Lane, Englefield Green	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site adjacent urban area
158	Land at Squires Garden Centre, Holloway Hill, Chertsey	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
161	Curfew Bell Farm, Chertsey	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
164	Land at 507 Stroude Road	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
167	Land at Woburn Hill, Addlestone	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site. Includes site 266
168	Land adjacent Lyne Farm House, Almners Road, Lyne	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
172	Wheatsheaf Service Station, London Road, Virginia Water	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
173	Rodwell Farm Nursing Home	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL Site
199	Land to the north west of Almners Lane, Lyne	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
202	Pantiles, Almners Road, Lyne	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
204	Bellbourne Nursery, Hurst Lane, Egham	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
205	Crockford Bridge Farm, New Haw Road, Addlestone	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
206	Trys Hill Farm, Lyne Lane, Lyne	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
208	Land adjacent Ulverscroft, Bakeham Lane, Egham	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Part PDL site. Site

SLAA No	Site	Within Buffer or Capable of own settlement	Entirely within Flood Risk Zone 3b	Entirely within Designated Site or is SANG	Entirely within 400m SPA/SAC	Ancient Woodland Covers Entire Site	Majority within Historic Park & Garden or Scheduled Monument	Physical Access	Capacity	Notes
										0.35ha. Site 22 includes site 208
210	Primrose Cottage, Longcross Road, Chertsey	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
212	Home Farm, Stroude Road	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
215	Land r/o 294 Stroude Road	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Access not suitable
216	Land at Abbey River & Burway Ditch, Chertsey	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Access not suitable
217	Land adjacent Wheelers Green, Parcel E, Chertsey Bittams	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
218	Rusham Park, Whitehall Lane, Egham	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Part PDL site
219	Villa Santa Maria, St Ann's Hill, Chertsey	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
220	Norlands Lane Landfill Site, Thorpe	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
221	Longcross Barracks, Longcross Road	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
222	Land adjacent Accommodation Road, Longcross	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
223	Land West of Accommodation Road, Longcross	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Access can only be gained through SLAA

SLAA No	Site	Within Buffer or Capable of own settlement	Entirely within Flood Risk Zone 3b	Entirely within Designated Site or is SANG	Entirely within 400m SPA/SAC	Ancient Woodland Covers Entire Site	Majority within Historic Park & Garden or Scheduled Monument	Physical Access	Capacity	Notes
										site 222
224	Land adjacent 62 Addlestone Moor	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
225	Land adjacent Sandgates, Guildford Road, Chertsey	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
226	Land at 40 Crockford Park Road, Addlestone	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	0.57ha of site outside of flood zone 3b and part PDL
227	Woburn Park Farm, Addlestonemoor	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
228	Penton Hook Marina, Staines Road, Chertsey	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
229	Virginia Heights, Sandhills Lane, Virginia Water	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
230	Grove Nursery, Spinney Hill, Addlestone	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
231	St Peter's Hospital	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
233	6 Northcroft Road, Englefield Green	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Part PDL site
234	Eden Farm, Virginia Water	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
235	Willow Farm, Chobham Farm, Ottershaw	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
236	Longcross Manor, Longcross Road, Chertsey	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
238	Lynn's Park, Stonehill Road, Ottershaw	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
254	Land Parcel B, Central	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	

SLAA No	Site	Within Buffer or Capable of own settlement	Entirely within Flood Risk Zone 3b	Entirely within Designated Site or is SANG	Entirely within 400m SPA/SAC	Ancient Woodland Covers Entire Site	Majority within Historic Park & Garden or Scheduled Monument	Physical Access	Capacity	Notes
	Veterinary Laboratory, Rowtown, Addlestone (Rowtown West)									
254	Land Parcel C, Central Veterinary Laboratory, Rowtown, Addlestone	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Access not suitable
255A	Parcel A, Chertsey Bittams, St Peter's Way, Chertsey	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
255B	Parcel B, Chertsey Bittams, St Peter's Way, Chertsey	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
255C	Parcel C, Chertsey Bittams, St Peter's Way, Chertsey	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
256	Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel A (Thorpe Lea Manor)	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
256	Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel B (Glenville Farm)	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
257	Thorpe Lea Road, West	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
258	Virginia Water North	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
259	Virginia Water, West	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
260	Lyne Lane East & West and Land South of Sandhills Lane	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
261	Virginia Water South	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
262	Ottershaw West	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	
263	Ottershaw East	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
265	Lyne Hill Nursery	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
266	Land West of St Georges College, Woburn Hill	Y	N	N	N	N	N if combined with site 167	Y	Y	Included within site 167
267	Land at Sewage Treatment Works, Lyne Lane	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
268	Land at 79-87a Woodham Park Road, Woodham	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Includes sites 75

SLAA No	Site	Within Buffer or Capable of own settlement	Entirely within Flood Risk Zone 3b	Entirely within Designated Site or is SANG	Entirely within 400m SPA/SAC	Ancient Woodland Covers Entire Site	Majority within Historic Park & Garden or Scheduled Monument	Physical Access	Capacity	Notes
										& 122
269	Land East of Thorpe Industrial Estate	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
270	Land East of Accommodation Road	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
271	Five Oaks Farm, Lyne	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
272	Land at Great Fosters	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
273	Land South of Great Grove Farm	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
274	Allington & 37,47, 57 Howards Lane, Rowtown	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
276	Luddington House, Stroude Road	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
277	The Old Chalet, Callow Hill, Virginia Water	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
278	Redlands Farm, Bridge Road	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
281	Land at Clockhouse Lane East, Thorpe	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
282	Land East of Fishing Lake, Thorpe Lea Road	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
284	Christmas Tree Site, Ottershaw	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
285	Sayes Court Kennels, Addlestone	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
286	Thynne Lodge, Green lane	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
287	Land West of Bridge Lane, Virginia Water	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
289	Webbs, The Green, Englefield Green	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
290	The Field Nursery, Brox Lane, Ottershaw	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y if combined with site 263	Y	

SLAA No	Site	Within Buffer or Capable of own settlement	Entirely within Flood Risk Zone 3b	Entirely within Designated Site or is SANG	Entirely within 400m SPA/SAC	Ancient Woodland Covers Entire Site	Majority within Historic Park & Garden or Scheduled Monument	Physical Access	Capacity	Notes
291	Land rear of 436 Stroude Road	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
292	Land East of Bishops Way, Egham	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
293	Land north of Kings Lane, Englefield Green	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
296	Land adjacent Edale, Rowtown	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Part PDL site
300	Land adjacent to 70 Crockford Park Road, Addlestone	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
301	Laleham Golf Club, Chertsey	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	
304	Land West of Roccas Cottage, Great Grove Farm, Ottershaw	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Area of site minus access road is 0.35ha
310	Meadowlands Park, Weybridge Road	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Area of Site 0.135ha
312	Jasmine Cottage, 1 & 2 Home Farm Cottages, Stroude Road, Virginia Water	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
323	Cacti Nursery, Bousley Rise, Ottershaw	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
322	Padd Farm, Hurst Lane	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
325	King's Oak Fields, Row Town	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Included with site 254
326	Addlestone Quarry,	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
327	St Ann's Park, Virginia Water	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Area of site minus

SLAA No	Site	Within Buffer or Capable of own settlement	Entirely within Flood Risk Zone 3b	Entirely within Designated Site or is SANG	Entirely within 400m SPA/SAC	Ancient Woodland Covers Entire Site	Majority within Historic Park & Garden or Scheduled Monument	Physical Access	Capacity	Notes
										access road 0.48ha, but has been Included with Site 212

## **Appendix 2 - Initial Sift of Employment Sites**



SLAA No.	Potential Employment Site	Within Buffer or Capable of own settlement	Entirely within Flood Risk Zone 3b	Entirely within Designated Site or is SANG	Ancient Woodland Covers Entire Site	Majority within Historic Park & Garden or Scheduled Monument	Physical Access	Capacity	Notes
02	Woodcock Hall Farm, Thorpe	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Site under 1ha
18	Land north of Thorpe Industrial Estate	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
42	CEMEX Thorpe 1, Ten Acre Lane, Thorpe	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
46	Land at Great Grove Farm, Ottershaw	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
48	Hanworth Lane, Chertsey	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
51	Byfleet Road, New Haw	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
60	Pycroft Road, Chertsey	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	On-street parking along Pycroft Road makes site unsuitable location
97 & 99	Longcross Garden Village	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Over 5km to SRN
103	Stroude Road, Egham	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
168	Land adjacent Lyne Farm House, Almners Lane, Lyne	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Site under 1ha
199	Land north west of Almners Road, Lyne	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	

SLAA No.	Potential Employment Site	Within Buffer or Capable of own settlement	Entirely within Flood Risk Zone 3b	Entirely within Designated Site or is SANG	Ancient Woodland Covers Entire Site	Majority within Historic Park & Garden or Scheduled Monument	Physical Access	Capacity	Notes
204	Bellbourne Nursery, Hurst Lane, Egham	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Area not PDL under 1ha
205	Crockford Bridge Farm, New Haw Road, Addlestone	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
220 (part)	Norlands Lane Landfill Site, Thorpe	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
224	Land adjacent 62 Addlestone Moor, Addlestone	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Site under 1ha
225	Land adjacent Sandgates, Guildford Road, Chertsey	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
226	Land at 40 Crockford Park Road, Addlestone	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Site area outside of floodplain less than 1ha
227	Woburn Park Farm, Addlestone Moor	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
229	Virginia Heights, Sandhills Lane, Virginia Water	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Over 5km to SRN
254	Land Parcel C, Central Veterinary Laboratory, Rowtown, Addlestone	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Access not suitable and over 5km to SRN
258	Virginia Water North	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Over 5km to SRN

SLAA No.	Potential Employment Site	Within Buffer or Capable of own settlement	Entirely within Flood Risk Zone 3b	Entirely within Designated Site or is SANG	Ancient Woodland Covers Entire Site	Majority within Historic Park & Garden or Scheduled Monument	Physical Access	Capacity	Notes
260	Lyne Lane East & West and Land South of Sandhills Lane	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	
261	Virginia Water South	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Over 5km to SRN
267	Land at Sewage Treatment Works, Lyne Lane	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Site under 1ha
269	Land East of Thorpe Industrial Estate	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
271	Five Oaks Farm, Lyne	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
273	Land south of Great Grove Farm	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
278	Redlands Farm, Bridge Road	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
281	Land at Clockhouse Lane East, Thorpe	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
282	Land East of Fishing Lake, Thorpe Lea Road	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
284	Christmas Tree Site, Ottershaw	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
286	Thynne Lodge, Green Lane	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	
301	Laleham Golf Club, Chertsey	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	

## **Appendix 3 - Assessment of Site Accessibility (Housing)**

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
4 – Barrsbrook & Barrsbrook Cattery, Guildford Road, Chertsey	22mins to Staines & Woking & 10mins to Chertsey Town Centre	200m to route 446 serving Staines & Woking	500m to Chertsey Rail Station	Within 2.6km of Chertsey Town Centre & Hillwood Business Park	1.3km	650m	1.4km	1.2km	Site has high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by all modes of transport. Good or reasonable access to all local services	High
13 – Stroude Road Farm, Stroude Road, Virginia Water	19mins to Longcross Enterprise Zone & 21mins to Chertsey Town Centre	3.2km to route 8 or 441 serving Staines 300m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	1.2km to Virginia Water	3.5km to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 4km to Longcross Enterprise Zone	1.1km	3.8km	1.65km	1.3km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to service & employment centres but bus service is infrequent. Most other services in the mid to lower accessibility ranges.	Medium

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
14 – Brox End Nursery, Ottershaw	19mins to Woking, 9mins to Hillswood Business Park (bus)	180m to bus route 446 serving Staines & Woking	4.2km to Addlestone	2.7km to Hillswood Business Park & 4.2km to Woking Town Centre	1km	2.9km	990m	1.1km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall with good accessibility to service and employment centres and local services, but with no rail service in close proximity.	Medium
17 – Coombelands Lane, Row Town	20mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park, 19mins to Hillswood Business Park	700m to route 557 serving St Peter's/Hillswood Business Park & Chertsey Town Centre	2.6km to Addlestone	3km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 4km to St Peter's/Hillswood Business Park	720m	1.6km	2.2km	700m	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to service centres and some local facilities, but others in lower accessibility range and no rail.	Medium

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
18 – Land north of Thorpe Industrial Estate	6mins to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 36mins to The Causeway	1.7km to route 8/441 to Staines 520m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	2.3km to Egham	500m to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 2.5km to The Causeway/Pine Trees	1.6km	2.1km	2.1km	1.3km	Site has low-medium accessibility overall. Good journey times to centres, by public transport/cycling but served by infrequent bus service. Access to local services in lower ranges.	<b>Low - Medium</b>
19 – Oak Tree Nurseries, Stroude Road, Virginia Water	22mins to Longcross Enterprise Zone & 24mins to Chertsey Town Centre	3.16km to route 8 or 441 serving Staines 380m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	1.4km to Virginia Water	3.3km to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 4km to The Causeway/Pine Trees	1.3km	3.4km	1.8km	1.4km	Site has low-medium level of accessibility overall. Good journey time to centres but bus service is infrequent. Most other services in the mid to lower accessibility ranges.	<b>Low - Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
22 – Land South of St David's Drive & Roberts Way, Englefield Green	30mins to The Causeway/Pine Trees & 33mins to Staines	1.1km to route 8/441 to Staines & The Causeway/Pine Trees	2.8km to Egham	4km to The Causeway & 5.5km to Staines	700m	4.7km	1.3km	1.1km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good journey time to centres although bus services are 1km from site and no rail. Access to some local services good but some poor.	Medium
24 – Land at Prairie Road, Hatch Close & Hatch Farm, Addlestone	17mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 35 Minutes to Staines	500m to route 456 serving Staines	1.4km to Addlestone	1.68km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 2.11km to Chertsey Town Centre	900m	900m	1.1km	660m	Site has medium - high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to a range of local services and centres.	Medium - High
28 – Great Grove Farm, Murray Road, Ottershaw	15mins to Hillswood Business Park & 23mins to Chertsey Town Centre	410m to route 557 serving Chertsey Town Centre	2.9km to Addlestone	2.5km to Hillswood Business Park & 3.22km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park	820m	1.7km	1km	750m	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good access to centres and range of local services, with two in higher range, but no rail station.	Medium - High



SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
29 – Charnwood Nurseries, 33 The Avenue, Woodham	15mins to Brooklands & 19mins to Woking	620m to route 456 serving Woking 380m to route 592/593 serving Woking & Brooklands (Mon/Wed/Fri only and no service in peak or before 8am)	1.8km to West Byfleet	3.2km to Brooklands & 4.6km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park	130m	1.3km	2km	450m	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by bus services by only reasonable access by cycling and 1.8km to rail. However access to a range of local services is generally good.	<b>Medium - High</b>
30 – CABI, Bakeham Lane, Egham	30mins to The Causeway/Pine Trees & 33mins to Staines	1km to route 8/441 to Staines & The Causeway/Pine Trees	2.8km to Egham	3.8km to The Causeway & 5.2km to Staines	1.2km	4.7km	1.4km	1.2km	Site has medium level of accessibility. Good journey time to centres but 1km to nearest bus and 2.8km to rail. Accessibility by cycling is reasonable. Good access to some facilities but not others.	<b>Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
34 – Parklands, Parcel D, Chertsey Bittams	7 mins to Hillswood Business Park & 30mins to Woking	180m to route 446 serving Staines & Woking	2.1km to Chertsey	600m to Hillswood Business Park & 2.4km to Chertsey Town Centre	1km to infants only 1.9km to primary	1km	1.85km	1.4km	Site has medium level of accessibility. Journey time and access to centres is good, but access to most services is reasonable to poor.	<b>Medium</b>
36 – Sandylands, Home Farm East, Blays Lane, Englefield Green	27mins to Windsor & 32mins to Staines	390m to route 441 serving Staines & The Causeway	3km to Egham	3.9km to The Causeway & 5.3km to Staines	650m	4.9km	1km	1km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good access to centres by bus and some local services but poor access to other services and rail.	<b>Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
42 – Cemex Thorpe 1, Ten Acre Lane, Thorpe	2mins to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 36mins to Staines	2km to routes 446 & 456 serving Staines  230m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	3km to Egham	200m to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 2.8km to The Causeway/Pine Trees	700m	2.3km	2.3km	1.1km	Site has low-medium level of accessibility overall. Good journey times to centres but 2km to regular bus service and no rail. Good access to some local services, but poorer to others.	<b>Low-Medium</b>
44 – Cemex Thorpe 3, Ten Acre Lane, Thorpe	7mins to Thorpe Industrial Estate and 25mins to Staines	1.3km to routes 446 & 456 serving Staines  470m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	3.1km to Virginia Water	600m to Thorpe Industrial Estate 3.4km to The Causeway/Pine Trees	1km	3.3km	2.9km	1km	Site has low-medium level of accessibility overall. Good journey time to centres but 1.3km to regular bus service and no rail. Good access to some local services but poorer to others.	<b>Low-Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
46 – Land at Great Grove Farm, Ottershaw (west)	16mins to Hillswood Business Park & 25mins Chertsey Town Centre	670m to route 446 serving Staines & Woking	2.8km to Chertsey	1.26km to Hillswood Business Park & 3.1km to Chertsey Town Centre	1.1km	1.8km	1km	710m	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by bus/cycling but no rail. Generally good access to a range of local services.	Medium-High
46a – Land at Great Grove Farm (east)	17mins to Hillswood Business Park & 19mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park &	530m to routes 459 & 557 serving Weybridge & Bourne and Hillswood Business Parks	2km to Addlestone	2.3km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park and 2.7km to Hillswood Business Park	980m	800m	1.5km	910m	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by bus and cycling but poorer to rail. Generally good access to a range of services	Medium - High

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
48 – Hanworth Lane, Chertsey	12mins to Chertsey Town Centre & 26mins to Staines	560m to route 446 serving Staines & Chertsey Town Centre	660m to Chertsey	930m to Chertsey Town Centre & 2.8km to Hillswood Business Park	770m	1.5km	1.1km	480m	Site has high level of accessibility overall. Good access to centres by range of transport & good access to a range of local services.	High
50 – Brunel University Site, Coopers Hill, Englefield Green	21mins to Windsor & 28 Minutes to Staines	480m to bus route 8 serving Staines & Windsor	2.5km to Egham	3.4km to The Causeway & 4.8km to Staines	1.1km	4.5km	1.2km	1.4km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good access to centres by bus but no rail and reasonable access by cycling. Good accessibility to some local services but poorer to others.	Medium

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
51 – Byfleet Road, New Haw	16mins to Woking & 9mins to Brooklands	890m to route 456 serving Woking 320m to route 593 serving Woking & Brooklands (Mon/Wed/Fri only and no service in peak or before 8am)	550m to Byfleet & New Haw	620m to Brooklands & 3.3km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park	1.4km	3.2km	1.9km	1.4km	Medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by rail or cycling but not by regular bus service although Brooklands is within 620m. Access to local services in mid to lower ranges.	Medium
52 – Dial House, Northcroft Road, Englefield	22mins to Windsor & 44mins to Staines	480m to route 441 serving Staines and 520m to route 8 serving Windsor	2.7km to Egham	3.6km to The Causeway & 5km to Staines	620m	4.6km	830m	850m	Site has medium high level of accessibility overall. Good access to centres by bus but no rail and only reasonable access by cycling. Good access to a range of local services aside from secondary education.	Medium

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
56 - Land at Green Lane/ Norlands Lane/ Chertsey Lane, Thorpe	14mins to Staines & The Causeway/Pine Trees	280m to route 446 serving Staines & The Causeway/Pine Trees	3.7km to Chertsey	2.2km to The Causeway/Pine Trees & 2.7km to Staines	1.9km	2.9km	2.9km	570m	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by bus and cycling but no rail. Accessibility to range of services is generally poor.	<b>Medium</b>
60 – Pyrcroft Road, Chertsey	12mins to Chertsey Town Centre & 17mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park	870m to route 446 serving Staines & The Causeway/Pine Trees	900m to Chertsey	980m to Chertsey Town Centre & 3.75km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park	200m	2km	1.7km	1.2km	Site has medium-high level of accessibility. Good accessibility to centres by range of transport modes. Accessibility to local services mixed.	<b>Medium-High</b>

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
62 – Land at Addlestone Moor	10mins to Chertsey Town Centre & 12mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park	300m to route 446 serving Staines & Chertsey Town Centre	1.5km to Addlestone	1.6km to Chertsey Town Centre & 1.6km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park	1.1km	250m	1.1km	920m	Site has high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by range of transport and good accessibility to all local services.	High
75 – 85 Woodham Park Road, Woodham	Considered in site 268									
77 – 232 Brox Road, Ottershaw	10mins to Hillswood Business Park & 19 Minutes to Woking	150m to route 446 serving Woking & Hillswood Business Park	3.9km to Woking	2.3km to Hillswood Business Park & 4.1km to Woking	1.1km	3km	1km	1.1km	Site has medium-high level of accessibility. Good accessibility to centres but no rail service. Good accessibility to a range of local services with exception of secondary education.	Medium-High



SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
99 – Former DERA Site, Longcross Road (South)	15mins to Longcross Enterprise Zone & 26mins to Staines	4.5km to route 446 serving Staines 1.6km to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	1km to Longcross	700m to Longcross Enterprise Zone & 4.3km to Hillswood Business Park	2.1km	5km	3.5km	2.2km	Site has low-medium level of accessibility overall. Although accessibility to centres is good by rail & cycling, accessibility to centres by bus and to all local services is poor.	Low-Medium
122 – 79 Woodham Park Road, Woodham	Considered in site 268									
123 – Cemex House, Coldharbour Lane, Thorpe	20mins to Staines & 24mins to Chertsey Town Centre	900m to route 446 & 456 serving Staines	3.5km to Virginia Water	1.1km to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 3.2km to The Causeway/Pine Trees	1.4km	3.5km	3.5km	1.3km	Low-medium accessibility overall. Good access to centres by bus/cycle but no rail and bus service is 900m from site. Accessibility to local services is either reasonable or poor.	Low-Medium

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
129 – Wey Manor Farm, Addlestone	14mins to Brooklands & 29mins to Woking	400m to route 456 serving Woking	1.1km to Byfleet & New Haw	1.1km to Brooklands & 2.8km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park	1.9km	2.7km	2.2km	450m	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Accessibility to centres is good by a range of transport modes but accessibility to most local services is poor.	<b>Medium</b>
154 - Land at Howard's Lane, Row Town	12mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 16mins to Hillswood Business Park	240m to route 557 serving Hillswood Business Park & Chertsey Town Centre	3.1km to Addlestone	3.4km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 3.9km to Hillswood Business Park	1.2km	1.8km	2.3km	830m	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Accessibility to centres is good and cycling reasonable but no rail. Accessibility to local services is mixed.	<b>Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
156 – Blay's House, Blay's Lane, Englefield Green	27mins to Windsor & 32 Minutes to Staines	400m to route 441 serving Staines	3.1km to Egham	4km to The Causeway/Pine Trees & 5.4km to Staines	700m	4.7km	1km	580m	Site has medium level of accessibility. Good accessibility to centres by bus but not rail or cycling. Good access to a range of local services aside from secondary education.	Medium
158 – Land at Squires Garden Centre, Holloway Hill, Chertsey	5mins to St Peter's & Hillswood & 37mins to Staines	670m to route 446 serving Staines 390m to route 593 serving Staines (Mon/Wed/Fri only and no service in peak or before 8am)	1.8km to Chertsey	400m to St Peter's & Hillswood & 2.2km to Chertsey Town Centre	1.5km	750m	2.7km	2.3km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by bus and cycling but rail is 1.8km from site. Access to local services is relatively poor aside from secondary education.	Medium

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
167 – Land at Woburn Hill, Addlestone	12mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 17mins to Chertsey Town Centre	810m to route 456 serving Staines	1km to Addlestone	1km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 2.3km to Chertsey Town Centre	1.5km	980m	1.5km	1.3km	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by bus and cycling and 1km from rail. Reasonable accessibility to most local services.	<b>Medium - High</b>
173 – Rodwell Farm Nursing Home, Row Town	21mins to Hillswood Business Park & 29mins to Chertsey Town Centre	920m to route 557 serving Hillswood Business Park & Weybridge & Bourne Business Park 180m to routes 592/593 serving Staines (Mon/Wed/Fri only and no service in peak or before 8am)	2.8km to West Byfleet	3.5km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 4km to Hillswood Business Park	1.3km	2km	2.5km	970m	Site has low-medium level of accessibility overall. Reasonable accessibility to centres by bus/cycle but no rail service. Accessibility to local services mostly within lower ranges.	<b>Low-Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
205 – Crockford Bridge Farm, New Haw Road, Addlestone	Within 10mins of Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 26mins to Chertsey Town Centre	310m to route 456 serving Chertsey Town Centre 310m of route 593 serving Brooklands (Mon/Wed/Fri only and no service in peak or before 8am)	1.3km to Addlestone	720m to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 2.2km to Brooklands	700m	1.6km	1.1km	1.1km	Site has a medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by a range of transport modes and good accessibility to a range of local services.	Medium-High
212 – Home Farm, Stroude Road	12mins to Longcross Enterprise Zone and 14mins to Chertsey Town Centre	4km to 450m to route 8/441 serving Staines 450m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	670m to Virginia Water	3.15km to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 3.84km to Longcross Enterprise Zone	350m	4.6km	1.1km	1.1km	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres although bus service is infrequent. Good accessibility to a range of local services, with exception of secondary education.	Medium-High

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
217 – Land adjacent Wheelers Green, Parcel E, Chertsey Bittams	7mins to Hillswood Business Park & 12mins to Chertsey Town Centre	150m to route 446 serving Chertsey Town Centre	2km to Chertsey	530m to Hillswood Business Park & 2.4km to Chertsey Town Centre	1.2km	990m	1.9km	1.4km	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres although rail is 2km from site. Access to local services is generally good.	<b>Medium - High</b>
218 – Rusham Park, Whitehall Lane, Egham	11mins to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 13mins to The Causeway/Pine Trees	1.4km to route 8/441 serving Staines 820m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	1.1km to Egham	2.8km to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 3.4km to The Causeway/Pine Trees	1.1km	2.9km	1.4km	1.3km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by rail and reasonable by cycling. Accessibility to local services is mixed but generally reasonable.	<b>Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
219 – Villa Santa Maria, St Ann's Hill, Chertsey	13mins to Chertsey Town Centre & 29 Minutes to Staines	890m to route 446/456	1.1km to Chertsey	1.2km to Chertsey Town Centre & 4.5km to Thorpe Industrial Estate	250m	2km	2.2km	1.4km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by a range of transport modes. Mixed accessibility to local services.	<b>Medium</b>
220 – Norlands Lane Landfill Site, Thorpe	5mins to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 23mins to Staines	1km to route 446/456 serving Staines	3.3km to Egham	400m to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 2.5km to The Causeway/Pine Trees	1.5km	3.2km	3.2km	1.1km	Site has medium accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by bus/cycling but no rail service and 1km to bus route. Accessibility to local services is mixed but generally poor.	<b>Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
224 – Land adjacent 62 Addlestone Moor	12mins to Chertsey Town Centre & 15mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park	380m to route 456 serving Chertsey Town Centre	1.3km to Addlestone	1.3km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 1.7km to Chertsey Town Centre	1.3km	500m	1.2km	1.1km	Medium-high accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by bus/cycling although distance to rail is 1.3km. Accessibility to local services is generally good.	<b>Medium - High</b>
225 – Land adjacent Sandgates, Guildford Road, Chertsey	10mins to Chertsey Town Centre & 17mins to Hillswood Business Park	120m to route 446 serving Staines	410m to Chertsey	800m to Chertsey Town Centre & 1.9km to Hillswood Business Park	1.3km	640m	1.7km	1km	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by all modes of transport. Good or reasonable accessibility to most local services.	<b>Medium - High</b>



SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
226 – Land at 40 Crockford Park Road, Addlestone	12mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 26mins to Chertsey Town Centre	430m to route 456 serving Chertsey Town Centre	680m to Addlestone	960m to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 2.6km to Brooklands	320m	1.5km	650m	650m	Site has high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by all modes of transport. Good or reasonable accessibility to a range of local services.	High
227 – Woburn Park Farm, Addlestone Moor	15mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 15mins to Chertsey Town Centre	600m to route 456 serving Chertsey Town Centre	1.2km to Addlestone	1.2km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 2km to Chertsey Town Centre	1.5km	680m	1.4km	1.3km	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by all modes of transport. Accessibility to local services is generally reasonable.	Medium - High

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
229 – Virginia Heights, Sandhills Road, Virginia Water	17mins to The Causeway/Pine Trees (566 Bus) & 18mins to Staines (Rail)	3.5km to route 446 serving Staines  230m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	830m to Virginia Water	2.6km to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 4km to Longcross Enterprise Zone	380m	4.6km	1.2km	1.2km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good access to centres by rail/cycling by bus services are infrequent. Generally good/reasonable accessibility to local services with exception of secondary education.	Medium
230 – Grove Nursery, Spinney Hill, Addlestone	15mins to Hillwood Business Park & 16mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park	360m to route 459 & 557 serving Hillwood Business Park & Chertsey Town Centre	1.9km to Addlestone	2.1km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 3.4km to Hillwood Business Park	900m	700m	1.3km	720m	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by bus/cycling although rail services are 1.9km from site. Good accessibility to most local services.	Medium-High

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
231 – St Peter's Hospital	10mins to Hillswood Business Park & 12mins to Chertsey Town Centre	150m to route 446 serving Chertsey Town Centre	1.8km to Chertsey	800m to Hillswood Business Park & 2.2km to Chertsey Town Centre	1.3km	750m	2.1km	1.7km	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres although rail is 1.8km from site. Accessibility to local services is mixed.	<b>Medium - High</b>
234 – Eden Farm, Virginia Water	22mins to Longcross Enterprise Zone & 24mins to Chertsey Town Centre	4.3km to route 446 serving Chertsey Town Centre 930m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	1.4km to Virginia Water	3.6km to Longcross Enterprise Zone & 4.3km to Thorpe Industrial Estate	1.2km	4.8km	1.9km	1.9km	Site has low-medium level of accessibility overall. Accessibility to centres is poor by public transport and only reasonable by cycling. Accessibility to local services is generally poor.	<b>Low - Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
254 – Land Parcel B, Central Veterinary Laboratory, Row Town	21mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 24mins to Hillswood Business Park	730m to routes 459/557 serving Hillswood Business Park & Weybridge & Bourne Business Park	2.8km to Chertsey	3.1km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 3.5km to Hillswood Business Park	1.1km	1.7km	2.4km	700m	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres although rail is 2.8km from site. Accessibility to local services is mixed.	<b>Medium</b>
255 – Parcel A, Chertsey Bittams	18mins to Chertsey Town Centre & 23mins to Hillswood Business Park	690m to route 446 serving Chertsey Town Centre	1.7km to Chertsey	1.8km to Hillswood Business Park & 2km to Chertsey Town Centre	630m	690m	2km	1.4km	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres although rail is 1.7km from site. Generally good accessibility to most local services,	<b>Medium - High</b>

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
255 – Parcel B, Chertsey Bittams	18mins to Hillswood Business Park & 22mins to Chertsey Town Centre	990m to route 446 serving Chertsey Town Centre	2.2km to Chertsey	1.4km to Hillswood Business Park & 2.5km to Chertsey Town Centre	310m	1.1km	2.1km	1.4km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres although rail is 2.2km from site and bus stop 990m. Generally good accessibility to most local services.	Medium
255 – Parcel C, Chertsey Bittams	20mins to Hillswood Business Park & 22mins to Chertsey Town Centre	1km to route 446 serving Chertsey Town Centre	2km to Chertsey	1.6km to Hillswood Business Park & 2.4km to Chertsey Town Centre	150m	960m	2km	1.3km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres although rail is 2km from site and bus stop 1km. Generally good accessibility to most local services.	Medium

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
256 – Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel A	10mins to The Causeway/Pine Trees & 14mins to Thorpe Industrial Estate	830m to route 8/441 serving Staines  70m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	1.4km to Egham	1.1km to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 1.7km to The Causeway/Pine Trees	1km	1.2km	1.2km	380m	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Accessibility to both centres and local services is good, with reasonable access to bus/rail services	<b>Medium - High</b>
256 – Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel B	10mins to the Causeway/Pine Trees & 14mins to Thorpe Industrial Estate	700m to route 8/441 serving Staines  90m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	1.5km to Egham	1.1km to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 1.6km to The Causeway/Pine Trees	1km	1.1km	1.1km	270m	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Accessibility to both centres and local services is good, with reasonable access to bus/rail services	<b>Medium - High</b>

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
257 – Thorpe Lea Road West	10mins to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 11mins to The Causeway/Pine Trees	1km to route 8/441 serving Staines 170m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	1.5km To Egham	840m to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 1.9km to The Causeway/Pine Trees	1.3km	1.4km	1.4km	630m	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres with reasonable access to bus/rail. Accessibility to range of local services is generally reasonable	<b>Medium - High</b>
258 – Virginia Water North	21mins to Longcross Enterprise Zone & 24mins to Chertsey Town Centre	2.4km to route 8/441 serving Staines 1.2km to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	1.4km to Virginia Water	4.7km to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 5km to Longcross Enterprise Zone	1.2km	6km	1.2km	1.2km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by rail but with infrequent bus services. Generally good accessibility to local services.	<b>Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
259 – Virginia Water West	29mins to The Causeway/Pine Trees & 29mins to Longcross Enterprise Zone	3.6km to route 8/441 serving Staines 450m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	2km to Virginia Water	2.5km to Longcross Enterprise Zone & 4.9km to Thorpe Industrial Estate	860m	6.1km	1.8km	1.1km	Site has medium level of accessibility. Good accessibility to centres but 2km to rail and infrequent bus service. Accessibility to local services is mixed.	<b>Medium</b>
261 – Virginia Water South	18mins to Longcross Enterprise Zone & 30mins to Staines	4.6km to route 446 serving Chertsey Town Centre 720m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	1.4km to Longcross	1.5km to Longcross Enterprise Zone & 4.5km to Hillwood Business Park	1.2km	5km	2.5km	1.3km	Site has medium accessibility level overall. Good accessibility to centres by rail/cycling although bus services infrequent. Accessibility to local services is mixed.	<b>Medium</b>



SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
263 – Ottershaw East	13mins to Hillswood Business Park & 22mins to Woking	390m to route 446 serving Woking	3.9km to Addlestone	2.6km to Hillswood Business Park & 4.6km to Woking	680m	2.7km	710m	1km	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by bus/cycling but no rail. Accessibility to local services is generally good	<b>Medium-High</b>
266 – Land West of St Georges College, Woburn Hill	Considered in site 167									
268 – Land at 79-87a Woodham Park Road	27mins to Brooklands & 29mins to Woking	1.1km to route 456 serving Woking 210m to route 592/593 serving Brooklands (Selected days only and no service before 9am or after 3pm)	1.9km to West Byfleet	3.7km to Brooklands & 4.1km to Hillswood Business Park	850m	1.3km	2.1km	950m	Site has medium level accessibility overall. Reasonable accessibility to centres by bus/cycling. Accessibility to local services is generally good.	<b>Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
269 – Land East of Thorpe Industrial Estate	5mins to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 20mins to Staines	800m to route 446 serving Staines	3.5km to Egham	400m to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 2.3km to The Causeway/Pine Trees	1.5km	3.2km	3.2km	1.9km	Site has medium accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by bus/cycling but no rail. Accessibility to local services is generally poor.	<b>Medium</b>
273 – Land South of Great Grove Farm	13mins to Hillswood Business Park & 14mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park	140m to route 459/577 serving Hillswood Business Park	2.4km to Addlestone	1.9km To Hillswood Business Park & 2.7km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park &	600m	1.3km	930m	1.1km	Site has medium-high level of accessibility. Good accessibility to centres by bus/cycling but no rail. Accessibility to local services is generally good.	<b>Medium - High</b>

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
274 – Allington & 37,47,57 Howards Lane, Rowtown	13mins to Hillswood Business Park & 19mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park	540m to route 459/577 serving Hillswood Business Park 320m to route 592 serving Brooklands (Tue/Thur/Sat only and no service before 9am or after 3pm)	3km to Addlestone	2.8km to Hillswood Business Park & 3.3km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park	1.2km	1.9km	1.8km	860m	Site has medium accessibility overall. Good or reasonable accessibility to centres by bus/cycling but no rail. Accessibility to local services is mixed.	Medium
277 – The Old Chalet, Callow Hill, Virginia Water	23mins to Longcross Enterprise Zone & 25mins to Chertsey Town Centre	2.4km to route 8/441 serving Staines 1.4km to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	1.5km to Virginia Water	4km to Longcross Enterprise Zone & 4.8km to Thorpe Industrial Estate	770m	6.1km	1km	1km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good access to centres but bus service infrequent. Accessibility to local services is generally good.	Medium

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
281 – Land at Clockhouse Lane East, Thorpe	10mins to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 23mins to The Causeway/Pine Trees	1.3km to route 8/441 serving Staines 740m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	2km to Egham	760m to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 2.1km to The Causeway/Pine Trees	1.6km	1.7km	1.7km	880m	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Accessibility to centres is good although rail is 2km from site. Accessibility to local services is mixed.	Medium
282 – Land East of Fishing Lake, Thorpe Lea Road	5mins to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 23mins to The Causeway/Pine Trees	1.3km to route 8/441 serving Staines 730m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	2km to Egham	310m to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 2.2km to The Causeway/Pine Trees	1.6km	1.7km	1.7km	880m	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Accessibility to centres is good although rail is 2km from site. Accessibility to local services is mixed.	Medium

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
284 – Christmas Tree Site, Ottershaw	4mins to Hillswood Business Park & 19mins to Chertsey Town Centre	580m to route 446 serving Chertsey Town Centre	2.8km to Chertsey	310m to Hillswood Business Park & 3.2km to Chertsey Town Centre	1.2km	1.8km	1km	630m	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good access to centres but no rail. Accessibility to local services is generally good.	Medium-High
285 – Sayes Court Kennels, Addlestone	25mins to Hillswood Business Park & 26mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park	1.1km to route 459/557 serving Hillswood Business Park 480m to route 592 serving Brooklands (Tue/Thur/Sat only and no service before 9am or after 3pm)	1.7km to Addlestone	2km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 2.9km to Brooklands	570m	1.2km	1.5km	1.5km	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by bus/cycling although rail is 1.7km from site. Accessibility to local services is generally good.	Medium - High

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
287 – Land West of Bridge Lane, Virginia Water	14mins to Longcross Enterprise Zone & 16mins to Chertsey Town Centre	3.9km to route 446 serving Chertsey Town Centre 630m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	780m to Virginia Water	3.3km to Longcross Enterprise Zone & 3.7km to Thorpe Industrial Estate	850m	4km	1.2km	1.2km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by rail/cycling but infrequent bus service. Accessibility to local services is generally good.	Medium
289 – Webbs, The Green, Englefield Green	27mins to Windsor & 27mins to Staines	480m to route 8 serving Windsor	2.6km to Egham	3.7km to The Causeway/Pine Trees & 5km to Staines	720m	4.6km	830m	1km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by bus/cycling but no rail. Accessibility to local services is generally good.	Medium
290 – The Field Nursery, Brox Lane, Ottershaw	Considered in site 263									

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
292 – Land East of Bishops Way, Egham	9mins to The Causeway/Pine Trees & 12mins to Staines	260m to route 446/456 serving Staines	2.5km to Staines	740m to The Causeway/Pine Trees & 1.2km to Staines	710m	750m	750m	910m	Site has high level of accessibility. Good accessibility to centres by bus/cycling but no rail. Good accessibility to all local services.	High
293 – Land North of Kings Lane, Englefield Green	26mins to Windsor & 31mins to Staines	360m to route 441 serving Staines or 930m to route 8 serving Windsor	3km to Egham	4km to The Causeway/Pine Trees & 5.4km to Staines	1.3km	5km	800m	1km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by bus/cycling but no rail. Accessibility to local services is generally good.	Medium
296 – Land adjacent Edale, Rowtown	Considered in site 154									

SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
300 – Land adjacent 70 Crockford Park Road, Addlestone	11mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 10mins to Chertsey Town Centre	500m to route 456 serving Chertsey Town Centre	580m to Addlestone	860m to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 2.9km to Brooklands	580m	1.7km	930m	630m	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by all modes of transport. Accessibility to local services is generally good.	<b>Medium-High</b>
Land at Grange Farm, Pyrcroft Road, Chertsey	<b>Considered in site 60</b>									
312 – Jasmine Cottage and 1 & 2 Home Farm Cottages	15mins to Longcross Enterprise Zone & 25mins to Staines	3.75km to route 8/441 serving Staines & Windsor 444m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	790m to Virginia Water	3.7km to Thorpe Industrial Estate & 3.85km to Longcross Enterprise Zone	825m	4.25km	1.24km	890m	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to service centres by rail but poor by bus. Accessibility to local services mixed, but generally good.	<b>Medium</b>



SLAA Site	Major Centres & major centres of employment Journey Time (End to End) in peak hours	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with 'Very Good' or 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of major centre or major employment centre by Cycling	Primary School	Secondary School	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
323 – Cacti Nursery, Bousley Rise, Ottershaw	16mins to Hillswood Business Park & 25mins to Woking	685m to route 446 serving Woking	3.65km to Addlestone	2.6km to Hillswood Business Park & 4km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park	350m	2.5km	500m	870m	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by most modes of transport and accessibility to local services is generally good.	<b>Medium-High</b>
326 – Addlestone Quarry	13mins to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park & 20mins to Brooklands	850m to route 456 serving Woking	1.55km to Byfleet & New Haw	1km to Weybridge & Bourne Business Park and 1.56km to Brooklands	2.1km	3.25km	1.95km	1km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to centres by rail and bus. However accessibility to local services is generally poor, although site is large enough to provide its own local facilities which would improve accessibility.	<b>Medium</b>

## **Appendix 4 - Assessment of Significant Non-Absolute Constraints (Housing)**

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
4 – Barrsbrook & Barrsbrook Cattery, Guildford Road, Chertsey	Limited parts of site at risk from surface water flooding and limited area (18%) in Flood Zone 2. Potential for groundwater flooding below property level	100% of site within Minerals Safeguarding Area but not adjacent a preferred area	None on or adjacent site	Grade 4	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Majority of site has gradient of 1:40 or less	Site lies to the south west of Chertsey and east of the M25. A small proportion of the site is covered by flood risk zone 2 with additional possibility of surface/ground water flooding however, appropriate drainage/SuDS should mitigate this. Site is wholly within a Minerals Safeguarding Area but not adjacent a preferred area. Practicalities for prior working will need to be considered. No other relevant constraints on site. Constraints have a low-medium impact overall.	<b>Low - Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
13 – Stroude Road Farm, Stroude Road	Potential for groundwater flooding at surface and sizeable areas at risk from surface water flooding in 1:1000 year event	100% of site within minerals safeguarding area and adjacent safeguarded minerals site and preferred area of Whitehall Farm. However SCC has accepted evidence that on site resource is not economically viable.	Part of Site adjacent SNCI & Ancient Woodland albeit separated by rail line	Grade 3	2 Grade II listed buildings adjacent to site at 288-290 Stroude Road	No loss of open space	Majority of site has gradient of 1:40 or less	Site lies on the southern edge of Virginia Water in two parcels either side of a trackway. Whole site within minerals safeguarding area and adjacent to minerals preferred area and site at Whitehall Farm which is identified in the Surrey Minerals Plan Primary Aggregates DPD. This would normally be a major constraint to development but SCC have accepted evidence that resource on site is not economically viable although buffer of 100m to preferred minerals area will be required. The site also lies within Grade 3 agricultural land and as such other land of lesser value should be preferred providing they can overcome other constraints. Should other sites of lesser agricultural value not come forward or are unsuitable for other reasons then Grade 3 land could be appropriate. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding would need to be mitigated as would the impact on the setting of two listed buildings. Constraints have a medium impact overall.	Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
14 – Brox End Nursery, Brox Road, Ottershaw	Only limited potential for groundwater flooding	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Ungraded	Locally listed building adjacent site	Loss of Natural and Semi-Natural Urban Green Space	Gradient 1:40 or less	Site is located to the south of Ottershaw and is identified as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan. The site does not have any flood issues or would affect a designated site or Ancient Woodland. Potential impacts to an adjacent locally listed building could be mitigated. In terms of the loss of open space, the site is an existing housing reserve site where the principle of development is acceptable. Constraints have a low-medium impact overall.	<b>Low - Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
17 – Coombelands Lane, Rowtown	Only limited potential for groundwater and surface water flooding	No Safeguarding	None on site or adjacent	Grade 4 & 5	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Mix of gradients	Site is located to the south east of the Rowtown area of Addlestone and is identified as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan. The site does not have any flood issues or would affect a designated site or Ancient Woodland. Although there is a mix of gradients on site an application (16/0845) is currently under consideration for 43 residential units on the site. Constraints have a low impact overall. Site has been granted permission for 43 dwellings subject to S106 agreement by Committee dated 14.12.2016	Low

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
18 – Land North of Thorpe Industrial Estate	Majority of site has potential for groundwater flooding below surface with limited areas affected by surface water flooding at 1:1000 year event. 3% of site in flood zone 3a or 3b and 13% in flood zone 2	100% of site within minerals safeguarding area and constrained by previous extraction	None on or adjacent site	Ungraded	Area of high archaeological importance adjacent to site	Identified as Park or Garden. Potential to replace part but not all of open space	Majority of site has gradient 1:40 or less	<p>Site lies between the southern edge of Egham Hythe and Thorpe Industrial Estate. Some flood risks on site but these are largely outside of fluvial flood zones and could be mitigated by drainage /SuDS design. Archaeological importance could be dealt with by condition. Site identified within mineral safeguarding area constrained by previous extraction, which could be a major constraint and requires more in depth consideration. Whilst site proponent states investigations are ongoing it is not known at this time whether constraint could be overcome. Whole site considered to be open space which would be lost to development, although some of this could be retained on site.</p> <p>However, land of lesser environmental value should be preferred. Proponents state that FRA would be carried out prior to application as well as plans to maintain/protect archaeological features and plans to include areas of open space. These have been taken into account in this appraisal. Medium-High impact overall.</p>	Medium-High

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
19 – Oak Tree Nurseries, Stroude Road	Number of areas on site at risk of surface water flooding in 1:1000 year event but at southern end of site this is 1:30 year event. Potential for groundwater flooding at surface. 12% of the site in flood risk zone 2	100% of site within minerals safeguarding area and within 120m of safeguarded minerals site and preferred area of Whitehall Farm but not adjacent.	None on or adjacent site	Ungraded	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Majority of site has gradient 1:40 or less	<p>Site lies to the east of Stroude Road and to the north of Virginia Water. A number of areas on the site are at risk of surface water flooding in the 1:1000 year event, but at the southern part of the site the level of risk is 1:30 years.</p> <p>There is also potential for groundwater flooding at the surface and 12% of the site is in flood risk zone 2. Flood issues could be overcome however with suitably designed drainage/SuDS.</p> <p>Site is also wholly within a mineral safeguarding area but not adjacent to a preferred area or identified site although Whitehall Farm is 120m to the north west. SCC consider there to be a presumption against alternative development in the MSA, but this could be overcome if evidence can be provided that resource is not economically viable or prior working can be achieved. No impact on all other constraints. Constraints have medium impact overall.</p>	<b>Medium</b>



SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
22 - Land South of St David's Drive & Roberts Way, Englefield Green	Potential for groundwater below or at surface. Small area at high risk of surface water flooding. Sewerage flooding has occurred in postcode area	No Safeguarding	SNCI and Ancient Woodland adjacent site albeit separated by A30	Ungraded	Historic Park & Garden adjacent but separated by A30. Area of high archaeological potential and locally listed building adjacent	No loss of open space	Majority of site has gradient 1:40 or less	Site lies just south of the Egham Area and east of the A30. Some flood risks from ground or surface water which could be overcome with mitigation through drainage/SuDS. SNCI, Ancient Woodland and Grade I historic park and garden at Windsor Great Park adjacent site but separated by the A30 and if necessary a suitable buffer could be included on site. Locally listed building adjacent at Forest Court, Roberts Way but site design could mitigate any impacts Constraints have a low-medium impact overall.	Low-Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
24 - Land at Prairie Road, Hatch Close & Hatch Farm, Addlestone	No flood risk issues west of rail line, but area to the east at high risk of surface water flooding at 1:30 year extent	Safeguarding Area adjacent but in reality separated by A320 St Paters Way	SNCI adjacent site albeit separated by Green Lane	Grade 3	Locally listed Chertsey Road Bridge adjacent site and Grade II listed buildings adjacent eastern portion albeit separated by Chertsey Road	No loss of open space	Majority of site has gradient 1:40 or less	Site lies to north west of Addlestone and south of A320 St Peter's Way. Two site parcels split by rail line. Eastern parcel at high risk of surface water flooding but this could be mitigated by suitably designed drainage/SuDS. The site also lies within Grade 3 agricultural land and as such other land of lesser value should be preferred providing they can overcome other constraints. Should other sites of lesser agricultural value not come forward or are unsuitable for other reasons then Grade 3 land could be appropriate. Constraints have a medium impact overall.	Medium
28 - Great Grove Farm, Murray Road, Ottershaw	Only limited potential for groundwater flooding	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 4 or 5	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	No data for this site	Site lies north of Spinney Hill between Ottershaw and Rowtown. Part of the site is previously developed with no apparent constraints although potential for groundwater flooding would have to be considered and mitigated if necessary. Site has permission for 6 dwellings subject to S106.	Low

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
29 - Charnwood Nurseries, 33 The Avenue, Woodham	Only limited potential for groundwater flooding	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 4 or 5	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Mix of gradients	Site lies north of The Avenue in Woodham. No apparent constraints on site although potential for groundwater flooding would have to be mitigated through suitably designed drainage/SuDS where necessary. Constraints have low impact overall.	Low
30 - CABI, Bakeham Lane, Egham	Only limited potential for groundwater flooding and surface water flooding at 1:1000 year event	No Safeguarding	Ancient woodland to south east but off-site	Grade 4 or 5	Area of high archaeological potential to north	No loss of open space	Majority of site has gradient 1:40 or less	Site lies north of Virginia Water and to south east of Englefield Green and forms small research centre. Only limited potential for ground and surface water flooding on site which could be mitigated through appropriate drainage/SuDS design. No other constraints on site. Adjacent area of high archaeological potential could be dealt with by condition. Constraints have low impact overall.	Low

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
34 - Parklands, Parcel D, Chertsey Bittams	Only limited potential for groundwater flooding	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 4 or 5	Grade II listed building Wheeler's Green to south but separated by Bittams Lane	No loss of open space	No data for this site but appears to be gradient of 1:40 or less	Site lies within the area of Chertsey Bittams and part of site is under construction for a C2 residential home. Only limited potential for groundwater flooding identified which could be suitably mitigated. Grade II listed building to the south at Wheeler's Green is separated by Bittams Lane. Any harm to the listed building or its setting could be mitigated through design. No other constraints on or adjacent site. Constraints have low impact overall	<b>Low</b>

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
36 - Sandylands Home Farm East, Blays Lane, Englefield Green	Limited surface water flood issues in central area of site at 1:100 or 1:1000 year	100% in Minerals Safeguarding Area but not in or adjacent to a preferred area	SNCI adjacent albeit separated by Wick Road	Grade 3	Historic Park & Garden and locally listed building adjacent to site albeit separated by Wick Road and Blay's Lane respectively	No loss of open space	Majority of site has gradient 1:40 or less	Site lies just south of Englefield Green and west of reserve housing site. Site is fully within a minerals safeguarding area, although this is not identified as a preferred area and is unlikely to constrain potential working over and above the existing urban area. Borehole evidence of mineral quality/quantity will be required to assess practicality of prior working. The SNCI and Windsor Great Park Grade I historic park and garden lie adjacent the site to the south, but are separated by Wick Road. As such this would help to lessen harm but development could be designed to overcome harm and be respectful of its setting. The site also lies within Grade 3 agricultural land and as such other land of lesser value should be preferred providing they can overcome other constraints. Should other sites of lesser agricultural value not come forward or are unsuitable for other reasons then Grade 3 land could be appropriate. Constraints have medium impact overall.	Medium



SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
44 - CEMEX Thorpe 3, Ten Acre Lane, Thorpe	Majority of site has potential for groundwater flooding at the surface and numerous areas at risk from surface water flooding at 1:1000 year event. 2% of site in flood zone 2	100% of site within minerals safeguarding area and constrained by previous or potential extraction. Site is also a safeguarded waste site	None on or adjacent site	Small area to SW Grade 1 & 2 otherwise ungraded	Within the Thorpe Conservation Area and small area of high archaeological potential in SW corner	No loss of open space	Mix of gradients	Site lies to the east of the village of Thorpe. The majority of the site has potential for groundwater flooding at the surface with areas at risk from surface water flooding and a small area in flood zone 2, however this could be mitigated by suitably designed drainage/SuDS. The site is entirely within a minerals safeguarding area and has been the subject of extraction and restoration which could be a major constraint. This will require more in depth consideration, but at this time it is not known whether constraint could be overcome. The site is also a safeguarded waste site, although restoration of this site is ongoing/completed. The site lies within the Thorpe Conservation Area but suitable design could be implemented to mitigate impact. Only a small area of the site is Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. Constraints have medium-high impact overall.	Medium-High

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
46 - Land at Great Grove Farm, Ottershaw (west)	Limited potential for groundwater flooding and limited pockets of surface water flooding. 5 properties in postcode area affected by internal sewerage flooding in last 10 years	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 4 or 5	Locally listed Workhouse Chapel and Grade II listed Murray House adjacent site albeit separated by Murray Road	No loss of open space	No data for this site	Site is located north of Spinney Hill between Ottershaw and Rowtown, however only the area to the west of the site is considered from A320 Guildford Road to Great Grove Farm. Only limited flood risk issues which could be mitigated and no apparent constraints other than listed buildings which sit on the opposite side of the highway at Murray Road where harm could be overcome. Constraints have low-medium impact overall.	<b>Low</b>



SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
46a – Land at Great Grove Farm (east)	Limited potential for groundwater. North east corner has high probability of surface water flood risk with majority at low-medium risk.	No Safeguarding	SNCI & Ancient Woodland immediately adjacent site to north	Grade 1 or 2	No heritage assets present	Natural & Semi-Natural Urban Green Space. Potential to retain part but majority would be lost	Majority of site has gradient 1:40 or less	Site is located between Great Grove Farm and Grove Nursery fronting Spinney Hill. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. Site is immediately adjacent to an area designated as SNCI and Ancient Woodland to its northern boundary and it is unknown if an effective buffer between the site and the designations could be implemented. The site is also Natural/Semi-Natural Urban Green Space and the majority of this would be lost if the site is developed. The site is grade 1 or 2 agricultural land and as such land of lesser values should be preferred. Constraints have high impact overall.	High

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
48 - Hanworth Lane, Chertsey	Limited potential for groundwater flooding. South east corner at risk from surface water flooding	Site adjacent minerals safeguarding area but not a preferred area	Adjacent to SNCI	Ungraded	No heritage assets present	Outdoor sports facility. Potential to retain part but not all of open space on site	Gradient 1:40 or less	Site is located to south of Chertsey east of the Hanworth Lane Trading Estate. Identified as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan and north portion of the site has outline permission and reserved matters for 130 dwellings. Flood risk from surface water in south east corner of site would need to be addressed but could be mitigated. Opportunity to retain part of the site for open space which would lessen impact of overall loss and could be used to mitigate/avoid flood risks. Although site is not in a minerals safeguarding area SCC have indicated potential for prior working. Constraints have low-medium impact overall.	<b>Low-Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
50 - Brunel University Site, Coopers Hill, Englefield Green	2/3 of site has limited potential for groundwater and some limited potential for surface water flood risk	No Safeguarding	Adjacent to SSSI, SNCI and approx. 5ha of Ancient Woodland on site which could be retained	Ungraded	Small part of site within Englefield Green Conservation Area. Grade II listed buildings in SE corner of site and Grade II* Air Forces Memorial adjacent to site. Presidents Hall is Locally Listed Building on site.	Large area of site identified as outdoor sports facilities, which could be retained on site, although there may be losses	Majority of site has gradient 1:40 or less	Site located to south of Englefield Green and is partially developed as the former Brunel University Campus. Ancient woodland on site could be retained along with other areas of open space. A suitable buffer could be placed between any development and adjacent SSSI/SNCI if necessary. Some heritage assets on or adjacent the site which would need to be considered but design could avoid/mitigate harm. Site has permission for 110 dwellings, 488 student bedspaces and 59 C2 bedrooms. Constraints have medium impact overall.	Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
51 - Byfleet Road, New Haw	Limited potential for groundwater and surface water flooding but 36% of site in flood zone 3a and 17% in flood zone 2	No Safeguarding	Adjacent to Wey Navigation SNCI	Ungraded	Adjacent to Wey Navigation Conservation Area with small part on site	No loss of open space	Majority of site has gradient 1:40 or less	Site located to the south of New Haw and on the borough boundary with Woking BC. Identified as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan with no permission granted. 2.9ha (36%) of the site is within flood zone 3a where development would need to pass the sequential and exceptions tests, although risks could be avoided by using areas in zone 3a as green space if appropriate and through use of SuDS. Area outside flood zone 3a narrows to 60m in south of site which is likely to restrict capacity. Site also adjacent to Wey Navigation SNCI and conservation area to west boundary of site and consideration would have to be given to these constraints, but a suitable buffer could be introduced to avoid/mitigate harm. Constraints have medium impact overall.	Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
52 - Dial House, Northcroft Road, Englefield Green	Only limited potential for groundwater flooding	100% in Minerals Safeguarding Area and not in or adjacent to a preferred area	None on or adjacent site	Grade 3	No heritage assets present on site but Englefield Green Conservation area 25m to north east	No loss of open space	Majority of site has gradient 1:40 or less	Site located to north west of Englefield Green. Only limited potential for groundwater flooding identified which could be mitigated by suitably designed drainage/SuDS. Site is fully within a minerals safeguarding area, although this is not identified as a preferred area and is unlikely to constrain potential working over and above the existing urban area. Borehole evidence of mineral quality/quantity will be required to assess practicality of prior working. Any harm to the conservation area to north west could be avoided/mitigated through design. The site also lies within Grade 3 agricultural land and as such other land of lesser value should be preferred providing they can overcome other constraints. Should other sites of lesser agricultural value not come forward or are unsuitable for other reasons then Grade 3 land could be appropriate. Constraints have medium impact overall.	Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
56 - Land at Green Lane/ Norlands Lane/ Chertsey Lane, Thorpe	52% in functional floodplain with further 99% in Flood Zone 3a	Vast majority of site in Minerals Safeguarding Area	Small area of SNCI on site	Ungraded	No heritage assets present	Green Corridor on site (designated as SNCI)	Majority of site has gradient 1:40 or less	Site lies to the east of the village of Thorpe and just west of the A320 Chertsey Lane. 3.6ha of the site is functional floodplain and undevelopable. Aside from a very small area the rest of the site is within flood zone 3a. Whilst the area of floodplain could be used as green space, there is no guarantee that sequential/exceptions tests can be passed given extent of risk and more sequentially preferable sites are likely to be available first. The site is entirely within a minerals safeguarding area and has been the subject of extraction and restoration which could be a major constraint. This will require more in depth consideration, but at this time it is not known whether constraint could be overcome. Small area of SNCI located on site could be retained with suitable buffer introduced, although this may not be possible in the southern area of the site as it tapers. Constraints have high impact overall.	High

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
60 - Pycroft Road, Chertsey	Potential for limited surface water flood risk on SE boundary with potential for groundwater flooding below ground in north of site. 12% of site in functional floodplain, 17% in zone 3a & b and a further 1.2ha in zone 2. 69% of site within zone 1	Adjacent safeguarding area albeit separated by rail line & Ruxbury Road and not adjacent preferred area	None on or adjacent site	Southern area of site Grade 3	Grade II* Pycroft House, and Grade II Golden Grove Inn & Holland Cottage listed buildings adjacent site	No loss of open space	Gradient 1:40 or less	Site located to the west of Chertsey and part identified as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan No planning application for housing has been submitted for the site since its reserve status. 31% of the site lies outside of flood zone 1 where the sequential test would need to be passed. Exceptions test for land in zone 3a would need to be passed, although these areas could be used as green space to avoid risk and suitably designed drainage/SuDS could mitigate flood impacts. Harm to the setting of adjacent listed buildings could be avoided through design. The site also lies partly within Grade 3 agricultural land and as such other land of lesser value should be preferred providing they can overcome other constraints. However, the area of grade 3 land is mostly within the housing reserve site designation where the principle of residential development has already been established. Constraints have low-medium impact overall.	Low-Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
62 - Land at Addlestone Moor	Limited potential for groundwater flooding and surface water flooding	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Ungraded	No heritage assets present on site but Woburn Park historic park & Garden 105m to the east	No loss of open space	Gradient 1:40 or less	Site lies within Addlestone Moor. Only limited flood issues on site which could be mitigated through suitably designed drainage/SuDS. No other constraints on site and distance to historic park & garden should avoid harm. Constraints have low impact overall.	Low
75 - 85 Woodham Park Road, Woodham	Considered in site 268								
77 - 232 Brox Road, Ottershaw	Limited potential for groundwater and surface water flooding	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Ungraded	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Mix of gradients	Site lies towards the south of Ottershaw. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. No other constraints. Constraints have low impact overall.	Low



SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
99 - Former DERA site, Longcross Road (South)	Limited potential for groundwater flooding but several sizeable areas at risk from surface water flooding	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Ungraded	Heritage on site includes Grade II listed Barrowhills and its terrace, Bowlbarrow Scheduled Ancient Monument and two areas of high archaeological potential at Barrowhills and the Bowlbarrows SAM. Grade II Longcross Church lies adjacent the site to the south.	7ha of outdoor sports facilities identified which could be retained or replaced on site or replaced on site	Mix of gradients	Site lies to the south of Virginia Water and on the south side of the M3 to the DERA site north. The site is partially developed. Limited potential for flood risk and these could be mitigated with suitably designed drainage/SuDS. Several heritage assets on or adjacent the site, although there is the potential to avoid harm through design. 7ha of the site is identified as a small area of sports facilities forming a miniature golf course. This could be retained or replaced by other green spaces given the size of the site. Site is within 20m of designated waste site but would not result in its loss. Mix of gradients could be mitigated through design. Constraints have low-medium impact overall.	Low-Medium
122 - 79 Woodham Park Road, Woodham	Considered in site 268								

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
123 - CEMEX House, Coldharbour Lane, Thorpe	Potential for groundwater flooding at surface with limited areas of surface water flooding. 24% of the site is within functional floodplain (zone 3b) with further areas in flood risk zone 2	Lies adjacent to safeguarding area but not a preferred area	None on site but SNCI adjacent to the south	Majority of site Grade 1 or 2	Grade II* listed building on site comprising sunken offices with roof gardens. Part of site within Thorpe Conservation Area	No loss of open space	Gradient 1:40 or less	Site lies to the east of Thorpe Village and comprises existing office buildings. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding on site which could be mitigated through suitably designed drainage/SuDS. Area covered by functional floodplain and in zone 3a lie mainly to the peripheries of the site and could be avoided. Large area covered by flood risk zone 2 which would need to pass the sequential test and other sequentially preferable sites may be available. Minerals safeguarding lies adjacent site but is not an impact. Suitable buffer could be introduced between site and SNCI to avoid harm. Although part of the site is identified as grade 1 or 2 agricultural land, the site is largely previously developed and loss has already occurred. Grade II* listed building on site would have to remain. Whilst harm could occur either to the building or its setting through conversion or to the conservation area this could be avoided or mitigated through design. Constraints have a medium impact overall.	Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
129 - Wey Manor Farm, Addlestone	Limited potential for groundwater or surface water flooding. 16% of site in flood zone 3a and 5% in flood zone 2	100% in Minerals Safeguarding Area but not in or adjacent to a preferred area. Site proponent states that CEMEX have indicated no interest in the site. However, SCC will need to confirm whether site is still valuable as mineral resource or whether safeguarding required to enable preferred site at Addlestone Quarry Extension A.	None on or adjacent site	Identified by Defra as Grade 1 or 2. However Site proponent has submitted an agricultural land classification assessment for the site. Taking the assessment on face value, site is grade 3.	No heritage assets present	8.9ha of Natural/Semi Natural Urban Green Space which is inaccessible to the public. Part could be retained but majority would be lost.	Gradient 1:40 or less	Site lies to north of New Haw comprising two parcels. Whole of site within mineral safeguarding area and whilst not adjacent preferred area is around 150m from identified extension to Addlestone Quarry. Site would have to ensure that any future extraction of minerals is not placed at risk irrespective of whether a single company no longer has an interest in the site. 8.9ha of open space on site, some of which could be retained, but likely that a large proportion would be lost. Area in flood zone 3a is around 2ha, entirely on the southern parcel and sequential and exceptions test would need to be passed. Risks could be mitigated using the southern area as green space and ground/surface water mitigated through drainage/SuDS design. Defra classify site as grade 1/2 agricultural land, but site proponent states grade 3. Even at Grade 3, other land of lesser value should be preferred providing they can overcome other constraints. Constraints have a medium-high impact overall.	Medium-High

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
154 - Land at Howard's Lane, Rowtown	Limited potential for groundwater flooding and only limited area at risk from surface water flooding at 1:30 year event	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Ungraded	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Mix of gradients	Site lies to the south west of Row Town. Limited flood risk issues which could be mitigated through drainage/SuDS design. No other significant non-absolute constraints present. Constraints have low overall impact.	<b>Low</b>

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
156 - Blay's House, Blay's Lane, Englefield Green	Limited potential for groundwater but significant parts of the site at risk from surface water flooding	Adjacent safeguarding area but not preferred area	Adjacent SNCI and Ancient Woodland but separated by Wick Road	Grade 3	Adjacent to Locally listed building at Park House and adjacent Grade I historic Park & Garden at Windsor Great Park albeit separated by Wick Road	No loss of open space with potential to provide additional	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies just south of Englefield Green and adjacent reserve housing site. Areas of the site are at risk from groundwater and surface water flooding but these could be mitigated through appropriately designed drainage/SuDS. Site is adjacent to a minerals safeguarding area, although this is not identified as a preferred area. The SNCI and Windsor Great Park Grade I historic park and garden are adjacent the site, but separated by Wick Road. Development could be designed to ensure no harm to the heritage asset or SNCI with suitable buffers or landscaping. The site also lies within Grade 3 agricultural land and whilst other land of lesser value should be preferred, the site is previously developed with non-agricultural uses and in reality has already been lost. Constraints have medium impact overall.	Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
158 - Land at Squires Garden Centre, Holloway Hill, Chertsey	Limited potential for surface water and ground water flooding. Small area with potential for ground water flooding at surface	100% within safeguarding area but not adjacent a preferred area	Adjacent Ancient Woodland	Ungraded	Adjacent Grade II listed Silverlands. Area of high archaeological potential to north	No loss of open space with potential to provide additional	Mix of gradients	Site lies to the west of Chertsey and north of the St Peter's Hospital site. Limited potential for surface and groundwater flooding which could be mitigated by suitably designed drainage/SuDS. Wholly within a minerals safeguarding area but SCC consider resource to be of poor quality. Further borehole evidence would be required to consider the practicalities of prior working. Ancient woodland to north west of site but suitable buffer could be introduced to avoid/mitigate impact. Harm to adjacent listed building or its setting could be avoided through design and archaeological potential dealt with through conditions. Constraints have low-medium impact overall.	<b>Low-Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
167 - Land at Woburn Hill, Addlestone	Only limited potential for groundwater flooding	No safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Ungraded	Part within Woburn Hill Historic Park & Garden	No loss of open space	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies on north side of Woburn Hill and between Woburn Park Farm and St Georges College. Only limited potential for groundwater flooding which could be mitigated through suitably designed drainage/SuDS. Site is partly within the Woburn Hill historic park & garden but harm could be avoided through design. No other constraints on site. Constraints have low impact overall.	Low
173 - Rodwell Farm Nursing Home	Only limited groundwater and surface water flood risk	No safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 4 or 5	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to the south of Rowtown part of which has recently been developed for C2 use. Only limited potential for groundwater & surface water flooding which could be mitigated through suitably designed drainage/SuDS. No other constraints present. Constraints have low impact overall.	Low





SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
212 - Home Farm, Stroude Road	Northern part of site has potential for groundwater flooding below and above surface level. 10 properties in postcode areas affected either by internal or external sewer flooding. 8% of site in flood zone 2	Vast majority of site within minerals safeguarding area but SCC have confirmed no objection to its loss given quality/quantity of resource and location adjacent sensitive receptors.	Adjacent to Ancient Woodland in north east corner and site access route	Ungraded	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space with potential to provide additional	Mixed	Site lies to north west of Virginia Water and accessed from Stroude Road. Potential for groundwater and sewer flooding on site, but this could be mitigated through suitably designed drainage/SuDS. The site is almost entirely within a minerals safeguarding area containing defined resources but SCC have no objection to loss of site. Ancient woodland is present adjacent the site to the north and along part of the site access route but harm could be avoided through use of suitable buffers and design of access route. Constraints have low-medium impact overall.	Low-Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
217 - Land adjacent Wheelers Green, Parcel E, Chertsey Bittams	No flood risks identified	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Part grade 4 or 5 otherwise ungraded	Grade II listed Wheelers Green adjacent site and locally listed Barn at Church Farm adjacent site albeit separated by Guildford Road	No loss of open space with potential to provide additional	No data	Site lies to the south-west of Chertsey Bittams. Impact to setting of Grade II and locally listed buildings adjacent the site could be mitigated through design. No other constraints on site. Constraints have low impact overall.	<b>Low</b>

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
218 - Rusham Park, Whitehall Lane, Egham	Potential for groundwater flooding at surface and small areas at risk from surface water flooding. 29% of the site within flood zone 3a and 15% in zone 2	Adjacent Minerals Safeguarding Area and Preferred Area at Whitehall Farm	None on or adjacent site	Grade 3	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to the south of Egham and east of the Royal Holloway University of London site. 1.9ha of the site is within flood zone 3a and would need to pass the sequential and exception tests. However these areas are largely on the periphery and risk could be avoided if this were used as green space. Any development within zone 2 would need to pass the sequential test. Groundwater and surface water flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed drainage/SuDS which could also reduce fluvial risks on site. Site is adjacent preferred minerals site at Whitehall Farm and residential use could have impacts on future extraction operations. This is not insurmountable but would need to be considered in more detail. The site also lies within Grade 3 agricultural land and whilst other land of lesser value should be preferred, the site is previously developed with non-agricultural uses and in reality has already been lost. No other constraints on site. Constraints have medium impact overall.	Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
219 - Villa Santa Maria, St Ann's Hill, Chertsey	Potential for groundwater flooding in east of site below ground level. 4 properties affected by external sewer flooding in postcode area. South east corner at risk from surface water flood risk. 28% of site in flood zone 3a and 6% in zone 2	100% within safeguarded area	Ancient Woodland adjacent to site to the north	Ungraded	Two Grade II listed buildings adjacent at Golden Grove Inn and Mausoleum Chapel	No loss of open space	Mixed	Site lies to north west of Chertsey and is partially developed. Area in flood zone 3a is 1.17ha which would have to pass the sequential and exceptions test to be developable but risk could be avoided if used as green space. Any development in zone 2 will need to pass sequential test. Groundwater and surface water risk could be mitigated through suitably designed drainage/SuDS which could also reduce risk from fluvial flooding. Site is wholly within minerals safeguarding area however, SCC conclude that there are unlikely to be significant resources on site. Harm to ancient woodland to north could be avoided with suitable buffer or through design as could any harm to heritage assets. Constraints have medium impact overall.	Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
220 - Norlands Lane Landfill Site, Thorpe	Potential for groundwater flooding with limited surface water flooding risk. 10% of the site is within the functional floodplain and a further 4% in zone 3a. 63% of the site is in flood zone 2	100% within safeguarding area	SNCI in eastern area of site	Ungraded	Grade II listed Fleetmere and Thorpe Conservation Area adjacent site	No loss of open space with potential to provide additional	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to the east of the village of Thorpe and south east of Thorpe Industrial Estate. Area in functional floodplain and zone 3 is around 6ha but lie mostly on the periphery of the site and risk could be avoided by using as green space. Large proportion of the site is within flood zone 2 and will need to pass sequential test and there may be more sequentially preferable sites available first. Groundwater and surface water risks could be mitigated through suitably designed drainage/SuDS which could also mitigate some fluvial risks. The site is entirely within a minerals safeguarding area and has been the subject of extraction and restoration which could be a major constraint. This will require more in depth consideration, but at this time it is not known whether constraint could be overcome. Small area of SNCI located to eastern side of site but this could be retained with suitable buffer introduced. Harm to heritage assets could be avoided through design. Constraints have medium-high impact overall.	Medium-High

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
224 - Land adjacent 62 Addlestonemoor	Limited potential for groundwater with part of site at risk from surface water flooding at 1:1000 year	No safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Ungraded	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies at Addlestonemoor and west of Woburn Hill. Limited potential for groundwater and surface water flooding which could be mitigated by suitably designed drainage/SuDS. No other constraints on site. Constraints have low impact overall.	Low
225 - Land adjacent Sandgates, Guildford Road, Chertsey	Limited potential for groundwater flooding but northern corner has potential for flooding below surface level and limited pockets for surface water flooding at 1:1000 year event	100% within safeguarding area	None on or adjacent site	Grade 4 or 5	No heritage assets present	Around 0.7ha of the site is natural and semi-natural urban greenspace	Mixed	Site lies to west of Chertsey. Pockets of ground and surface water flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed drainage/SuDS. Site is wholly within a minerals safeguarding area but is unlikely to increase constraints above those that already exist although practicalities of prior working will need exploring. 0.7ha is identified as natural/semi natural greenspace which could be lost, but there may be potential to retain some of this. Constraints have low-medium impact overall.	Low-Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
226 - Land at 40 Crockford Park Road, Addlestone	Limited potential for groundwater and majority of site at risk from surface water flooding. 52% of the site within flood zone 3b, 29% in zone 3a and 17% in zone 2	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Ungraded	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to south of Addlestone. Area of site within flood zone 3b 0.63ha which would be inappropriate for any development. Area within flood zone 3a is 0.34ha where the sequential and exceptions test would need to be passed. Area outside of zone 3b is 0.6ha which is of a size which could be acceptable, if the exceptions test can be passed. Some of the highest flood risk areas could be used for green space or amenity to avoid risks but this would be a large proportion of the site. Given that the rest of the site is in zone 2 (aside from the access) there may also be sequentially preferable sites. Whilst surface water and groundwater could be mitigated by suitably designed drainage/SuDS this may not entirely mitigate fluvial flood risks. Constraints have a high impact overall unless sequential and exceptions test can be passed with delivery of a safe development evidenced through a site FRA.	High

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
227 - Woburn Park Farm, Addlestone Moor	Limited groundwater and surface water flood risk. 11% of site within functional floodplain with 3% in zone 3a and 8% in zone 2	Part of site within safeguarding area	SNCI adjacent site at Chertsey Meads	Ungraded	Whole site within Woburn Hill Historic Park & Garden	No loss of open space and potential for additional	Mixed	Site lies to the north of Woburn Hill. Areas of flood risk on site lie mainly to peripheries of site on its north eastern boundary with Chertsey meads and risk could be avoided by using these areas as green space. Groundwater and surface water risks can be mitigated through suitably designed drainage/SuDS. Part of the site lies in a minerals safeguarding area but is unlikely to significantly constrain mineral working, however borehole evidence will be required and practicalities of prior working explored. Impact to SNCI at Chertsey Meads to north of site could be mitigated by use of suitable buffer. Whole of the site is within the Woburn Hill historic park & garden but is already partly previously developed. As such, harm to the heritage asset could be avoided through sensitive design. Constraints have a medium impact overall.	Medium



SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
229 - Virginia Heights, Sandhills Lane, Virginia Water	Limited potential for groundwater flooding although potential to flood property at southern boundary. Limited surface water flood risk	100% within safeguarding area but not adjacent preferred area	None on or adjacent site	Ungraded	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies between Virginia Water and Thorpe Green. Limited potential for groundwater and surface water flooding which could be mitigated by suitably designed drainage/SuDS. Site is wholly within a minerals safeguarding area containing defined resources and a presumption against alternative development, but site partially developed already. Borehole evidence of the quality/quantity of resource would be required to consider the site further. No other constraints. Constraints have medium impact overall.	Medium
230 - Grove Nursery, Spinney Hill, Addlestone	Limited potential for groundwater and surface water flooding	No Safeguarding	SNCI & Ancient Woodland adjacent site	Grade 1 or 2	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to the north of Spinney Hill and west of the M25. Limited potential for groundwater and surface water flooding which could be mitigated by suitably designed drainage/SuDS. Suitable buffer to SNCI/Ancient Woodland or design features could be provided to avoid harm. Site is however grade 1 or 2 agricultural land and as such other land of lesser value should be preferred. Constraints have high impact overall	High

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
231 – St Peter’s Hospital	Potential for groundwater on 2/3 of site and potential for surface water flood risk. 6% of site is within flood risk zone 3a and 1% in zone 2.	Small part of site within safeguarding area	SNCI & SANG adjacent to site	Ungraded	2 locally listed building on site. Grade II* Botleys Mansion and Grade II Ivy Cottage, Arbon Cottage and Silverlands adjacent to site. Area of high archaeological potential adjacent site	No loss of open space and potential to provide additional	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to west of Chertsey Bittams and comprises large hospital complex. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding which could be mitigated by suitably designed drainage/SuDS. Area in flood zone 3a lies on eastern periphery of the site and will need to pass sequential and exceptions test, but risk could be avoided if used as green space as could area in zone 2. Although a small part of the site is within a safeguarding area, SCC do not consider this to be a constraint, but borehole evidence and assessment for prior working should be explored. Impact to heritage assets could be mitigated through design. Impact to SNCI and SANG could be overcome with suitable buffer. Constraints have low-medium impact overall.	<b>Low-Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
234 - Eden Farm, Virginia Water	Limited potential for groundwater and surface water flood risk	No safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 3	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to south of Virginia Water and east of Trumps Green. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding which could be mitigated by suitably designed drainage/SuDS. The site also lies within Grade 3 agricultural land and whilst other land of lesser value should be preferred, the site is previously developed with non-agricultural uses and in reality has already been lost. No other constraints on site. Constraints have low impact overall.	Low
254 - Land Parcel B, Central Veterinary Laboratory, Rowtown, Addlestone (Rowtown West)	Limited potential for groundwater only.	No Safeguarding	SNCI to south of site albeit separated by river Bourne	Part of site Grade 4 to 5 otherwise ungraded	Grade II listed Old Thatched Cottage at Old Road	No loss of open space and potential to provide additional including for SANG	Mixed	Site is located to the south of Rowtown and comprises land parcel B and land to north of Halls Farm. Only limited potential for groundwater flood risk which could be mitigated with suitable protection if required. This may need to be explored through a site FRA. Impacts to setting of Grade II listed building at Old Road could be mitigated through design. Topography is mixed but not a barrier to development. Constraints have low impact overall.	Low

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
255 – Parcel A, Chertsey Bittams, Chertsey	Limited potential for groundwater across whole site. Potential for surface water flooding on small area of the site. 0.07ha within zone 3a with further 0.3ha in zone 2	Safeguarding adjacent site but not preferred area	None on or adjacent site	Grades 3, 4 and 5	Area of high archaeological potential adjacent site to the north west	No loss of open space and potential to provide additional	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site is located to north of Chertsey Bittams and east of Salesian School. Small area of the site is affected by flood zone 3a where sequential and exceptions tests will need to be passed, however risk could be mitigated if areas used as green space. Western part of the site is grade 4 or 5 agricultural land whilst the east is grade 3. In terms of grade 3, other land of lesser value should be preferred providing they can overcome other constraints. However, to be developed comprehensively the whole site should be brought forward and loss in this instance may be acceptable and could form part of green space. Constraints have low-medium impact overall.	<b>Low-Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
255- Parcel B, Chertsey Bittams	Limited potential for groundwater and surface water flooding.	Safeguarding adjacent site but not preferred area	None on or adjacent site	Grade 3	No heritage assets	No loss of open space with potential for additional	Mixed	<p>Site located to south east of Chertsey Bittams adjacent A320 St Peter's Way. Limited potential for groundwater and surface water which could be mitigated through suitably design SuDS or other protection measures.</p> <p>Minerals safeguarding is on eastern side of M25 so is not an issue. The site also lies within Grade 3 agricultural land and as such other land of lesser value should be preferred providing they can overcome other constraints. Should other sites of lesser agricultural value not come forward or are unsuitable for other reasons then Grade 3 land could be appropriate. Constraints have medium impact overall.</p>	Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
255 – Parcel C, Chertsey Bittams	Limited potential for groundwater flooding but high risk of surface water flooding on northern section of site.	Safeguarding adjacent site but not preferred area	None on or adjacent site	Grade 3	No heritage assets	No loss of open space	Mixed	Site located to east of Chertsey Bittams adjacent M25. Potential for groundwater and surface water could be mitigated through suitably design SuDS or other protection measures. Minerals safeguarding is on eastern side of M25 so is not an issue. The site also lies within Grade 3 agricultural land and as such other land of lesser value should be preferred providing they can overcome other constraints. Should other sites of lesser agricultural value not come forward or are unsuitable for other reasons then Grade 3 land could be appropriate. Constraints have medium impact overall.	<b>Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
256 - Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel A (Thorpe Lea Manor)	Potential for groundwater flooding at surface. Limited potential for surface water flooding.	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 3	Locally listed building adjacent at Laurel Cottage albeit separated by Vicarage Road	No loss of open space	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to south of Egham. Potential for groundwater and surface water could be mitigated through suitably design SuDS or other protection measures. Impact to setting of listed building could be mitigated through design. The site also lies within Grade 3 agricultural land and whilst other land of lesser value should be preferred, the site is previously developed with non-agricultural uses and in reality has already been lost. No other constraints on site. Constraints have low impact overall.	<b>Low</b>

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
256 – Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel B (Glenville Farm)	Potential for groundwater flooding at surface. Limited potential for surface water flooding. 1% in flood zone 3b, 6% in zone 3a and 5% in zone 2	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 3	No heritage assets	No loss of open space	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to south of Egham. Potential for groundwater and surface water could be mitigated through suitably design SuDS or other protection measures. Area within floodplain and zone 3a is minimal and could be mitigated through use as green space. The site also lies within Grade 3 agricultural land and whilst other land of lesser value should be preferred, the site is previously developed with non-agricultural uses and in reality has already been lost. No other constraints on site. Constraints have low impact overall.	<b>Low</b>



SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
257 - Thorpe Lea Road, West	Potential for groundwater flooding at surface. Number of areas with potential for surface water flood risk at 1:1000 year event. 1% of site within flood zone 2	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 3	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space and potential to provide additional	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to the south and west of Egham. Potential for groundwater and surface water flood risk could be mitigated through appropriately designed SuDS or protection measures. The site also lies within Grade 3 agricultural land and as such other land of lesser value should be preferred providing they can overcome other constraints. Should other sites of lesser agricultural value not come forward or are unsuitable for other reasons then Grade 3 land could be appropriate. Constraints have medium impact overall.	Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
258 - Virginia Water North	Limited potential for groundwater and surface water flooding at 1:1000 year event	No Safeguarding	Only eastern most tip is adjacent SNCI	Ungraded	Locally listed building on site	No loss of open space and potential to provide additional	Mixed with steeper gradients to north	Site lies to north of Virginia Water. Only limited ground and surface water flooding which could be mitigated through suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. Site is adjacent to an SNCI but only the most western tip and harm could be avoided with implementation of suitable buffer. Steeper gradients to north of the site may reduce developable area. Impact to locally listed building on site could be mitigated by design. Constraints have a low-medium impact overall.	<b>Low-Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
259 - Virginia Water, West	Limited potential for groundwater and surface water flooding	No Safeguarding	SNCI to south and west of site	Ungraded	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space and potential to provide additional	Mixed	Site lies to the west of Virginia Water at Wellington Avenue. Only limited ground and surface water flooding which could be mitigated with suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. Site is adjacent to an SNCI along part of its western and southern boundaries. Harm could be avoided with implementation of an effective buffer but given proximity to SNCI and shape of western part of site it is unknown if this can be overcome. Some steeper gradients in centre of the site but should not be a constraint to development. Constraints have medium impact overall.	Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
261 - Virginia Water South	Limited potential for groundwater and surface water flooding at 1:1000 year event	No Safeguarding	SNCI to west of site	Ungraded	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space and potential to provide additional	Mixed	Site lies to the south of Virginia Water at Trumps Green. Only limited ground and surface water flooding which could be mitigated with suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. Impact to SNCI adjacent to west of site could be mitigated through implementation of suitable buffer which should be possible given size and shape of site. Constraints have low-medium impact overall.	Low-Medium
263 - Ottershaw East	Limited potential for groundwater flooding. Sizeable area to north at risk from surface water flooding at 1:30 year event with strip of land to west in 1:1000 year event.	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 4 or 5 or ungraded	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space and potential to provide additional	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to the east and south of Ottershaw. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. No other constraints on site. Constraints have low impact overall.	Low

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
200 - Land West of St Georges College, <del>Woodham Hill</del>	Considered in site 167								
268 - Land at 79-87a Woodham Park Road, Woodham	Limited potential for groundwater flooding. No other flood risk on site	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 4 or 5	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to west of Woodham. Potential for groundwater flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. No other constraints on site. Constraints have low impact overall.	Low



SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
273 - Land South of Great Grove Farm	Limited potential for groundwater with low probability of surface water flooding.	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 1 & 2	No heritage assets present	Identified as Natural & Semi-Natural Urban Green Space with limited scope to retain any on site	Mixed	Site lies to east of Great Grove Farm and north of Spinney Hill. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. Site is grade 1 or 2 agricultural land and as such land of lesser value should be preferred. The whole site is also considered to be open space which would be lost to development with only a small proportion which could be retained on site. Constraints have high impact overall.	High
274 - Allington & 37,47, 57 Howards Lane, Rowtown	Limited potential for groundwater and surface water although a small area is at high probability of surface water flooding	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 4 or 5 or ungraded	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Mixed	Site lies within north area of Howard's Lane in Rowtown. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. No other constraints identified. Constraints have low impact overall.	Low

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
277 - The Old Chalet, Callow Hill, Virginia Water	Limited potential for groundwater and surface water flooding	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Ungraded	Grade II listed structure at Christ Church and Locally Listed Hangmoor adjacent site	No loss of open space and potential to provide additional	Mixed	Site lies to west of Virginia Water and north of Christchurch Road. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. Impact to setting of heritage assets could be mitigated or avoided through design. No other constraints on site. Constraints have low impact overall.	Low
281 - Land at Clockhouse Lane East, Thorpe	Potential for groundwater flooding at surface across whole site. Limited potential for surface water.	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 1 or 2	Part of site an area of high archaeological potential	Identified as Natural & Semi-Natural Urban Green Space with limited scope to retain any on site	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to south of Clockhouse Lane East and north of Fishing Lake. Suitable mitigation against groundwater may not be achievable given its extent across whole site and at surface level. Site is grade 1 or 2 agricultural land and as such land of lesser value should be preferred. The whole site is also considered to be open space which would be lost to development with only a small proportion which could be retained on site. Constraints have high impact overall.	High



SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
282 - Land East of Fishing Lake, Thorpe Lea Road	Potential for groundwater flooding at surface across whole site. Limited potential for surface water.	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 1 or 2	Part of site an area of high archaeological potential	Identified as Natural & Semi-Natural Urban Green Space with limited scope to retain any on site	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to east of Fishing Lake and west of Thorpe Lea Road. Suitable mitigation against groundwater may not be achievable given its extent across whole site and at surface level. Site is grade 1 or 2 agricultural land and as such land of lesser value should be preferred. The whole site is also considered to be open space which would be lost to development with only a small proportion which could be retained on site. Constraints have high impact overall.	High

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
284 - Christmas Tree Site, Ottershaw	Limited potential for groundwater with some areas at high probability of surface water flooding.	No Safeguarding	SNCI adjacent site	Grade 4 or 5	Grade II listed No 2 Chobham Road adjacent site	No loss of open space and potential to provide additional	No data	Site lies to north west of Ottershaw, north of Foxhills Road and west of Guildford Road. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. SNCI adjacent site albeit separated by Foxhills Road. Site large enough to mitigate impact through implementation of effective buffer. Impact to Grade II listed building could be mitigated through design. No other constraints on site. Constraints have low impact overall.	<b>Low</b>

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
285 - Sayes Court Kennels, Addlestone	Limited potential for groundwater and surface water flooding. 5% of site within flood risk zone 2	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 4 or 5 or ungraded	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space and potential to provide additional	Mixed but mostly 1:20	Site lies south of Temple Field Close in Addlestone. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. Small area of site in flood risk zone 2 could be mitigated through use as green space. Engineering solutions may overcome gradient issues but without further information, it is assumed that gradients would reduce developable area. No other constraints on site. Constraints have low-medium impact overall.	Low-Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
287 - Land West of Bridge Lane, Virginia Water	Limited potential for groundwater and surface water although with some small areas at high probability of surface water flooding	100% within safeguarding area but not adjacent preferred area	Ancient Woodland on site & SNCI adjacent site	Grade 1 or 2	Locally listed Trumps Green Cottage adjacent site	No loss of open space and potential to provide additional	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to south east of Virginia Water and south of Bridge Lane. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. Wholly within a mineral safeguarding area but SCC consider resource to be of poor quality. Further borehole evidence would be required to consider the practicalities of prior working. Ancient woodland on site could be retained with suitable buffer to ensure protection and adjacent SNCI is separated by Bridge Road. Impact to locally listed building could be mitigated through design. Site is grade 1 or 2 agricultural land and as such land of lesser value should be preferred. Constraints have high impact overall.	High

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
289 - Webbs, The Green, Englefield Green	Limited potential for groundwater flooding with only small pockets shown to have a probability of surface water flooding	Majority within Minerals Safeguarding Area but not adjacent a preferred area	None on or adjacent site	Grade 3	Part within conservation area. Grade II listed Castle Farm Dairy and locally listed The Crown House adjacent	No loss of open space	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to north west of Englefield Green and adjacent The Green. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. Majority of site within a minerals safeguarding area, although this is not identified as a preferred area and is unlikely to constrain potential working over and above the existing urban area. Borehole evidence of mineral quality/quantity will be required to assess practicality of prior working. The site also lies within Grade 3 agricultural land and as such other land of lesser value should be preferred providing they can overcome other constraints. Should other sites of lesser agricultural value not come forward or are unsuitable for other reasons then Grade 3 land could be appropriate. Impact to heritage assets could be mitigated through appropriate design. Constraints have medium impact overall.	<b>Low-Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/ Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
290 - The Field Nursery, Brox Lane, Ottershaw	Considered in site 263								

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
292 - Land East of Bishops Way, Egham	Potential for groundwater flooding at surface across whole site. Limited potential for surface water. 59% of site within functional floodplain and 91% within zone 3a with whole site in zone 2	Majority within Minerals Safeguarding Area	SSSI adjacent site to south west	Ungraded	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space and potential to provide additional	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to south of Egham Hythe and adjacent A320. Suitable mitigation against groundwater may not be achievable given its extent across whole site and at surface level. Majority of site is within functional floodplain and 91% within flood zone 3a. Whilst some of these risks could be mitigated through use as green space, the extent of zone 3a means that some development will need to pass the exceptions test and all development would have to pass the sequential test. The area outside of floodplain and/or zone 3a is only around 3.5ha and would form an island in the middle of the site where safe access and egress in times of flood may not be guaranteed. The site is also identified within a mineral safeguarding area constrained by previous extraction. This could be a major constraint to development and will require more in depth consideration, but at this time it is not known whether constraint could be overcome. Impacts to the SSSI could be overcome through implementation of a suitable buffer. Constraints have high impact overall.	High

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
293 - Land north of Kings Lane, Englefield Green	Limited potential for groundwater with notable areas with some probability of surface water flooding	100% within minerals safeguarding area but not adjacent preferred area	None on or adjacent site	Part Grade 3 and part ungraded	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space and potential to provide additional	Mixed	Site lies to west of Englefield Green. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. Site is fully within a minerals safeguarding area, although this is not identified as a preferred area and is unlikely to constrain potential working over and above the existing urban area. Borehole evidence of mineral quality/quantity will be required to assess practicality of prior working. Gradients on site are mixed which may require engineering solutions for steepest areas. Majority of site is grade 3 agricultural land and as such other land of lesser value should be preferred providing they can overcome other constraints. Should other sites of lesser agricultural value not come forward or are unsuitable for other reasons then Grade 3 land could be appropriate, although southern portion of the site appears to be ungraded. Constraints have medium impact overall.	Medium



SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
296 - Land adjacent Edale, Rowtown	Considered in site 154								
300 - Land adjacent to 70 Crockford Park Road, Addlestone	Limited potential for groundwater flooding except north west corner with potential for flooding below floor level. Low probability of surface water flooding. 64% in functional floodplain and 95% in zone 3a with whole site in zone 2	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Ungraded	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to south of Addlestone and east of New Haw Road. Majority of site is within functional floodplain and 95% within flood zone 3a. Given size and shape of floodplain, unlikely that this could be used as residential amenity and therefore could not be mitigated. The extent of zone 3a means that majority of development will need to pass the exceptions test and all development would have to pass the sequential test. As such other more sequentially preferable sites should be taken forward. Mitigation through use of SuDS is unlikely to reduce fluvial flood risk. No other constraints on site. Constraints have high impact overall.	High
Land at Grange Farm, Pycroft Road, Chertsey	Considered in site 60								

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
312 – Jasmine Cottage and 1 & 2 Home Farm Cottages	Eastern area of site at risk from surface water flood risk at 1:1000 and majority of site at risk of groundwater flooding at surface level. Very small area of flood risk in zones 2&3a in far east of site.	Majority of site within safeguarding area. However SCC have confirmed that there is unlikely to be operator interest in underlying minerals due to quality and quantity.	2.88ha of site covered by ancient woodland (33%)	Ungraded	No heritage assets on site	No loss of open space	Majority 1:40 gradient or less, but far western side topography rises sharply	Site lies to north east of Virginia Water and north of site 212 and is accessed from Stroude Road. Only very small areas of fluvial flood risk on site but surface and groundwater will need to be addressed. Surrey County Council has confirmed no objection to loss of mineral safeguarding area. 33% of the site is designated ancient woodland which can be retained and will reduce developable area of site, especially given pattern of ancient woodland on site. However large areas of site covered by non-designated woodland which may be important for the integrity of ancient woodland further reducing developable area. Constraints have medium impact overall	Medium

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
323 Cacti Nursery, Bousley Rise, Ottershaw	Limited potential for groundwater but western area of site at risk from surface water flooding at 1:30. No risk of fluvial flooding on site.	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 4/5	No heritage assets present	No loss of open space	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to south of Ottershaw towards the southern end of Bousley Rise and east of Site 263 (Ottershaw East). Whole site located within zone 1 of fluvial flood risk. No other major constraints on site. Constraints have low impact overall.	<b>Low-Medium</b>

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
326 – Addlestone Quarry	Limited potential for groundwater with some pockets of surface water. 14.4ha (21%) in functional floodplain. 42.7ha (63%) in flood zone 3a and 61.5ha (90%) in zone 2	Whole site designated as a safeguarded minerals site and majority as safeguarded waste site. 7.14ha of the site is a preferred minerals site.	2.33ha of ancient woodland on site but could be retained	Large area of site Grade 1 or 2 with remaining area ungraded	Area of high archaeological potential on site and adjacent to River Wey Navigation Conservation Area	No loss of open space	Mixed but largely 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to the south of Addlestone and east of New Haw. 90% of the site is within fluvial flood zone 2 where the sequential test would need to be passed. 63% of site in flood zone 3a where exceptions test would need to be passed and 21% within floodplain. Whilst some areas could form open space, given the extent of flood risk, more sequentially preferable sites are available. Whole site is designated as minerals site and waste safeguarding site with preferred areas for minerals. SCC consider that safeguarding for the preferred area is still required and this remains a significant constraint. Areas of the site are designated ancient woodland which could be retained. Area of high archaeological importance could be protected by condition and heritage assets through design. Open space could be provided on site. Given flood risk and minerals constraints site considered to have a high impact overall.	High

## **Appendix 5 - Assessment of Site Accessibility (Employment)**

SLAA Site	Distance to Bus Stop with at least a 'Good' level of service	Distance to Rail Station with at least a 'Good' level of service	Accessibility of employment site from Urban Area by Cycling	Health Centre	Convenience Retail	Comments	Score
18 – Land north of Thorpe Industrial Estate	1.7km to route 8/441 to Staines  520m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	2.3km to Egham	Approx 35% within 2.6km radius	2.1km	1.3km	Site has low accessibility overall. Poor walk times from transport nodes with good or very good level of service although cycle accessibility is good. Distance to health and retail poor to moderate.	<b>Low</b>
42 – Cemex Thorpe 1, Ten Acre Lane, Thorpe	2km to routes 446 & 456 serving Staines  230m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	3km to Egham	Approx 35% within 2.6km radius	2.3km	1.1km	Site has low-medium accessibility overall. Poor walk times from transport nodes with good or very good level of service although cycle accessibility is good. Distance to health poor but good to retail.	<b>Low-Medium</b>
46 – Land at Great Grove Farm, Ottershaw (west)	670m to route 446 serving Staines & Woking	2.8km to Chertsey	Approx 20% in 2.6km radius & 40% in 5.2km radius	1km	710m	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility to bus with good or very good level of service but poor to rail. Poorer accessibility by cycling but good access to health and retail.	<b>Medium</b>

48 – Hanworth Lane, Chertsey	560m to route 446 serving Staines	660m to Chertsey	Approx 30% in 2.6km radius	1.1km	480m	Site has high level of accessibility overall. Good access to both bus & rail with good or very good service by range as well as cycling & good access health and retail facilities.	<b>High</b>
51 – Byfleet Road, New Haw	890m to route 456 serving Woking 320m to route 593 serving Woking & Brooklands (Mon/Wed/Fri only and no service in peak or before 8am)	550m to Byfleet & New Haw	Approx 50% in 2.6km radius	1.9km	1.4km	Medium level of accessibility overall. Generally good accessibility by bus/rail with good or very good level of service and good accessibility by cycling. Access to health and retail is generally poor.	<b>Medium</b>
205 – Crockford Bridge Farm, New Haw Road, Addlestone	310m to route 456 serving Woking & Staines	1.3km to Addlestone	Approx 50% in 2.6km radius	1.1km	1.1km	Site has a medium-high level of accessibility overall. Generally good accessibility by bus/rail with good or very good level of service and good accessibility by cycling. Good accessibility to both health and retail.	<b>Medium-High</b>
225 – Land adjacent Sandgates, Guildford Road, Chertsey	120m to route 446 serving Staines	410m to Chertsey	Approx 30% in 2.6km radius	1.7km	1km	Site has medium-high level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility by bus/rail with good or very good level of service and good accessibility by cycling. Good accessibility to retail but poorer to health facilities.	<b>Medium-High</b>
269 – Land East of Thorpe Industrial Estate	800m to route 446 serving Staines	3.5km to Egham	Approx 35% within 2.6km radius	3.2km	1.9km	Site has low-medium accessibility overall. Good accessibility to bus with good or very good level of service but no rail. Good accessibility by cycling. Poor accessibility to health and retail services.	<b>Low-Medium</b>

273 – Land South of Great Grove Farm	1km to route 446 serving Woking & Staines	2.4km to Addlestone	Approx 20% in 2.6km radius & 40% in 5.2km radius	930m	1.1km	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility by bus with good or very good level of service but no rail and poorer accessibility by cycling. Accessibility to health and retail is good.	<b>Medium</b>
281 – Land at Clockhouse Lane East, Thorpe	1.3km to route 8/441 serving Staines  740m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	2km to Egham	Approx 35% within 2.6km radius	1.7km	880m	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Accessibility by bus/rail with good or very good level of service is generally poor, but accessibility by cycling is good. Accessibility to retail is good but poor to health facilities.	<b>Medium</b>
282 – Land East of Fishing Lake, Thorpe Lea Road	1.3km to route 8/441 serving Staines  730m to route 566/7 to Staines (only operates 1 bus in am & pm peak Mon-Sat and after 8am)	2km to Egham	Approx 35% within 2.6km radius	1.7km	880m	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Accessibility by bus/rail with good or very good level of service is generally poor, but accessibility by cycling is good. Accessibility to retail is good but poor to health facilities	<b>Medium</b>
284 – Christmas Tree Site, Ottershaw	580m to route 446 serving Staines & Woking	2.8km to Chertsey	Approx 20% in 2.6km radius & 40% in 5.2km radius	1km	630m	Site has medium level of accessibility overall. Good accessibility by bus with good or very good level of service but no rail and poorer accessibility by cycling. Accessibility to health and retail services is good.	<b>Medium</b>



## **Appendix 6 – Assessment of Significant Non-Absolute Constraints (Employment)**

SLAA Site	Flood Risk	Minerals/Waste	SNCI/LNR or Ancient Woodland	Agricultural Land	Heritage	Open Space	Topography	Comments	Score
18 – Land North of Thorpe Industrial Estate	Majority of site has potential for groundwater flooding below surface with limited areas affected by surface water flooding at 1:1000 year event. 3% of site in flood zone 3a or 3b and 13% in flood zone 2	100% of site within minerals safeguarding area and constrained by previous extraction	None on or adjacent site	Ungraded	Area of high archaeological importance adjacent to site	Identified as Park or Garden. Potential to replace part but not all of open space	Majority of site has gradient 1:40 or less	Site lies between the southern edge of Egham Hythe and the Thorpe Industrial Estate. There are some flood risks on site but these are largely outside of fluvial flood zones and could be mitigated by drainage/SuDS design. Archaeological importance could be dealt with by condition. The site is identified within a mineral safeguarding area constrained by previous extraction. This could be a major constraint to development and will require more in depth consideration, but at this time it is not known whether constraint could be overcome. The whole site is also considered to be open space which would be lost to development. However development could retain some of this on site, but land of lesser environmental value should be preferred. Constraints have a medium-high impact overall.	<b>Medium-High</b>

<p>42 - CEMEX Thorpe 1, Ten Acre Lane, Thorpe</p>	<p>Potential for groundwater flooding at the surface with a number of areas to the boundaries of the site at risk from surface water flooding</p>	<p>100% of site within minerals safeguarding area and constrained by previous or potential extraction. However SCC has accepted evidence that on site resource is of low quality and small quantity</p>	<p>None on or adjacent site</p>	<p>Grade 1 or 2. Evidence now submitted by site proponents that agricultural classification is grade 3a</p>	<p>Adjacent to Thorpe Conservation Area</p>	<p>No loss of open space</p>	<p>Gradient 1:40 or less</p>	<p>Site lies between the village of Thorpe and the Thorpe Industrial Estate. Potential for groundwater flooding at the surface and areas around its boundaries affected by surface water flooding but this could be mitigated by appropriate drainage/SuDS design. Entirely within a minerals safeguarding area which is constrained by previous or potential extraction and considered a major constraint. However, SCC has agreed with a minerals reserve assessment submitted by the site proponents that the minerals on site are of low quality and small quantity. As such minerals are not a constraint but further investigation is required to determine whether prior extraction is economically viable. Site lies just northwest of the Thorpe Conservation Area and design would need to take this into account. Site is designated Grade 1/2 agricultural land, but agricultural land classification report by site proponents states that site is only grade 3a. Even taking the report on face value other land of lesser value should be preferred providing they can overcome other constraints. If other sites of lesser agricultural value do not come forward or are unsuitable for other reasons then Grade 3 land could be appropriate. Constraints have medium impact overall.</p>	<p><b>Medium</b></p>
<p>Runnym</p>									

46 - Land at Great Grove Farm, Ottershaw (west)	Limited potential for groundwater flooding and limited pockets of surface water flooding. 5 properties in postcode area affected by internal sewerage flooding in last 10 years	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 4 or 5	Locally listed Workhouse Chapel and Grade II listed Murray House adjacent site albeit separated by Murray Road	No loss of open space	No data for this site	Site is located north of Spinney Hill between Ottershaw and Rowtown, however only the area to the west of the site is considered from A320 Guildford Road to Great Grove Farm. Only limited flood risk issues which could be mitigated and no apparent constraints other than listed buildings which sit on the opposite side of the highway at Murray Road where harm could be overcome. Constraints have low-medium impact overall.	<b>Low</b>
48 - Hanworth Lane, Chertsey	Limited potential for groundwater flooding. South east corner at risk from surface water flooding	Site adjacent minerals safeguarding area but not a preferred area	Adjacent to SNCI	Ungraded	No heritage assets present	Outdoor sports facility. Potential to retain part but not all of open space on site	Gradient 1:40 or less	Site is located to south of Chertsey east of the Hanworth Lane Trading Estate. Identified as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan and north portion of the site has outline permission and reserved matters for 130 dwellings. Flood risk from surface water in south east corner of site would need to be addressed but could be mitigated. Opportunity to retain part of the site for open space which would lessen impact of overall loss and could be used to mitigate/avoid flood risks. Although site is not in a minerals safeguarding area SCC have indicated potential for prior working. Constraints have low-medium impact overall.	<b>Low-Medium</b>

51 - Byfleet Road, New Haw	Limited potential for groundwater and surface water flooding but 36% of site in flood zone 3a and 17% in flood zone 2	No Safeguarding	Adjacent to Wey Navigation SNCI	Ungraded	Adjacent to Wey Navigation Conservation Area with small part on site	No loss of open space	Majority of site has gradient 1:40 or less	Site located to the south of New Haw and on the borough boundary with Woking BC. Identified as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan with no permission granted. 36% of the site is within flood zone 3a and 17% within zone 2 where development for employment use would need to pass the sequential test. This could be avoided by using areas in zone 2 & 3a as amenity/landscaped areas if appropriate and through use of SuDS, but this unlikely to cover all risk areas. Site also adjacent to Wey Navigation SNCI and conservation area to west boundary of site and consideration would have to be given to these constraints, but a suitable buffer could be introduced to avoid/mitigate harm. Constraints have medium impact overall.	<b>Medium</b>
----------------------------	---	-----------------	---------------------------------	----------	--	-----------------------	--	--	---------------

205 - Crockford Bridge Farm, New Haw Road, Addlestone	Limited potential for groundwater flooding and surface water flooding. 10% of the site is within flood zone 3b, 5% in zone 3a and 28% in zone 2	No Safeguarding	Adjacent to Wey Navigation SNCI	Ungraded	Adjacent to Wey Navigation Conservation Area	100% within allotments, community gardens or city (urban) farm and small area in green corridor	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies between Addlestone and New Haw. Area of site within the functional floodplain is around 2ha and area within zone 3a is 0.92ha. Area within zones 2 & 3a would need to pass sequential test to be developable but could be avoided if these areas were used for amenity/landscaped areas. However, Zone 2 area would reduce site size by almost half leaving a substantial gap to edge of settlement along New Haw Road. Surface water and groundwater risk could be mitigated through suitably designed drainage/SuDS and this could mitigate some fluvial risks. 100% of the site is open space which if developed could be partially retained or replaced on site. Site lies adjacent to Wey Navigation SNCI and conservation area and would need to take these into account but a suitable buffer could be introduced to avoid or mitigate harm. Constraints have medium impact overall.	<b>Medium</b>
---	---	-----------------	---------------------------------	----------	--	---	--------------------------------	---	---------------

225 - Land adjacent Sandgates, Guildford Road, Chertsey	Limited potential for groundwater flooding but northern corner has potential for flooding below surface level and limited pockets for surface water flooding at 1:1000 year event	100% within safeguarding area	None on or adjacent site	Grade 4 or 5	No heritage assets present	Around 0.7ha of the site is natural and semi-natural urban greenspace	Mixed	Site lies to west of Chertsey. Pockets of ground and surface water flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed drainage/SuDS. Site is wholly within a minerals safeguarding area but is unlikely to increase constraints above those that already exist although practicalities of prior working will need exploring. 0.7ha is identified as natural/semi natural greenspace which could be lost, but there may be potential to retain some of this. Constraints have low-medium impact overall.	<b>Low-Medium</b>
---	---	-------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----------------------------	---	-------	--	-------------------

<p>269 - Land East of Thorpe Industrial Estate</p>	<p>50% of site shown to have potential for groundwater flooding at surface with remainder of site below ground level. Low probability of surface water flooding. 31% in functional floodplain, 39% in Zone 3a and 91% in zone 2</p>	<p>100% of site within minerals safeguarding area and constrained by previous extraction</p>	<p>SSSI adjacent to east &amp; eastern tip adjacent SNCI</p>	<p>Ungraded</p>	<p>Area of high archaeological potential on site</p>	<p>Identified as Park or Garden. Potential to replace part but not all of open space</p>	<p>Mixed</p>	<p>Site lies to the east of Thorpe Industrial Estate west of Green Lane. Potential for groundwater could be mitigated through appropriate protection measures but the extent of groundwater flooding at surface may not make this achievable. A third of the site lies in the floodplain where no redevelopment is acceptable in principle. The area of the site covered by zone 3a is almost all floodplain. These areas could be mitigated if used as greenspace, but this would be a third of the site. Rest of the site is almost entirely within zone 2 and as such the whole site would have to either avoid development in the floodplain or pass the sequential test. This being the case there may be sequentially preferable sites with lower risk. Archaeological importance could be dealt with by condition. Site is identified within a mineral safeguarding area constrained by previous extraction. This could be a major constraint to development and will require more in depth consideration, but at this time it is not known whether constraint could be overcome. Whole site is also open space which would be lost to development but some could be retained on site. Adjacent to SSSI and SNCI but suitable buffer could be implemented given extent of floodplain adjacent to the SSSI/SNCI. Constraints have high impact overall.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>
<p>Runnym</p>									



273 - Land South of Great Grove Farm	Limited potential for groundwater with low probability of surface water flooding.	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 1 & 2	No heritage assets present	Identified as Natural & Semi-Natural Urban Green Space with limited scope to retain any on site	Mixed	Site lies to east of Great Grove Farm and north of Spinney Hill. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. Site is grade 1 or 2 agricultural land and as such land of lesser value should be preferred. The whole site is also considered to be open space which would be lost to development with only a small proportion which could be retained on site. Constraints have high impact overall.	<b>High</b>
281 - Land at Clockhouse Lane East, Thorpe	Potential for groundwater flooding at surface across whole site. Limited potential for surface water.	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 1 or 2	Part of site an area of high archaeological potential	Identified as Natural & Semi-Natural Urban Green Space with limited scope to retain any on site	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to south of Clockhouse Lane East and north of Fishing Lake. Suitable mitigation against groundwater may not be achievable given its extent across whole site and at surface level. Site is grade 1 or 2 agricultural land and as such land of lesser value should be preferred. The whole site is also considered to be open space which would be lost to development with only a small proportion which could be retained on site. Constraints have high impact overall.	<b>High</b>

282 - Land East of Fishing Lake, Thorpe Lea Road	Potential for groundwater flooding at surface across whole site. Limited potential for surface water.	No Safeguarding	None on or adjacent site	Grade 1 or 2	Part of site an area of high archaeological potential	Identified as Natural & Semi-Natural Urban Green Space with limited scope to retain any on site	Majority 1:40 gradient or less	Site lies to east of Fishing Lake and west of Thorpe Lea Road. Suitable mitigation against groundwater may not be achievable given its extent across whole site and at surface level. Site is grade 1 or 2 agricultural land and as such land of lesser value should be preferred. The whole site is also considered to be open space which would be lost to development with only a small proportion which could be retained on site. Constraints have high impact overall.	<b>High</b>
284 - Christmas Tree Site, Ottershaw	Limited potential for groundwater with some areas at high probability of surface water flooding.	No Safeguarding	SNCI adjacent site	Grade 4 or 5	Grade II listed No 2 Chobham Road adjacent site	No loss of open space and potential to provide additional	No data	Site lies to north west of Ottershaw, north of Foxhills Road and west of Guildford Road. Potential for groundwater and surface water flooding could be mitigated through suitably designed SuDS or other protection measures. SNCI adjacent site albeit separated by Foxhills Road. Site large enough to mitigate impact through implementation of effective buffer. Impact to Grade II listed building could be mitigated through design. No other constraints on site. Constraints have low impact overall.	<b>Low</b>

## **Appendix 7 – Assessment of Non-Significant Non Absolute Constraints**

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
4 – Barrsbrook & Barrsbrook Cattery, Guildford Road, Chertsey	N	N	Y*	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 4 would adversely affect these principles. Site within GPZ3 which would need to be taken into consideration through design. No other constraints.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
13 – Stroude Road Farm, Stroude Road, Virginia Water	Y*	N	Y*	Y*	N	N	N	N	N	<p>North parcel of site within BOA TV01. Relevant objectives for this unit include priority habitat restoration and creation and priority species recovery. Whilst site 13 is not itself a nationally or locally designated site, there may be features within the site which reflect BOA objectives. This does not preclude development, but any proposal would be expected to set out how it mitigates/ enhances BOA objectives and targets for TV01. Within unit RV2 of SLCA. Built development strategy for RV2 seeks to, amongst other things retain distinct character of settlements and avoid merging through linear development, maintain rural gaps, maintain vegetated boundaries, retain pattern of houses facing onto commons and open areas, limit impacts to rural views, development sympathetic to wider pattern of settlements and resist urbanisation of open areas. Site 13 could have adverse effects on some of these principles especially resisting urbanisation of open areas. This would need to be carefully considered through design but is not necessarily a reason to exclude at this stage. Amenity could be affected through noise from adjacent rail line, but design measures could reduce impact.</p>

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
14 – Brox End Nursery, Ottershaw	N	Y*	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Area TPO 384 on site. Identified as a housing reserve site in 2001 Local Plan. Application for 40 dwellings deferred (15/1285) to amend housing numbers to 14. Still awaiting decision.
17- Coombelands Lane, Rowtown	N	Y*	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Individual TPO 187 on site covers a number of trees. Site within unit SS3 in the SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 17 would adversely affect these principles. No other constraints present. Identified as a housing reserve site in 2001 Local Plan and application currently under consideration.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
22 – Land South of St David’s Drive & Robert’s Way, Englefield Green	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Within BOA unit TV01. Relevant objectives for this unit include priority habitat restoration and creation and priority species recovery. Whilst site 22 is not itself a nationally or locally designated site, there may be features within the site which reflect BOA objectives. This does not preclude development, but any proposal would be expected to set out how it mitigates/ enhances BOA objectives and targets for TV01. Within unit SW1 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SW1 seeks to, amongst other things conserve a sense of seclusion with sparse settlement enclosed by woodland and to maintain wooded and undeveloped skyline. It is not considered site 22 would adversely affect these principles but any proposal would to take account of these principles and mitigate/enhance features. No other constraints present although footpath runs adjacent to site on its southern boundary.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
24 - Land at Prairie Road, Hatch Close & Hatch Farm, Addlestone	N	N	Y	Y*	N	Y	N	Y	N	Within unit SS3 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 24 would adversely affect these principles, but any proposal would need to take account of these principles and mitigate/enhance features where appropriate. Amenity could be affected by noise from A320 St Peter's Way but could be attenuated or avoided. Within GPZ 3 and electricity pylons cross the site in north west corner and through centre of east parcel which would need to be taken into account in design.
28 - Great Grove Farm, Murray Road, Ottershaw	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Within unit SS3 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 28 would adversely affect these principles although account should be taken of principles and enhanced through design as appropriate. No other constraints.



SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
29 - Charnwood Nurseries, 33 The Avenue, Woodham	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Within unit SS3 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. Considered that site would not adversely affect these principles although account should be taken of principles and enhanced through design as appropriate. No other constraints.
30 - CABI, Bakeham Lane, Egham	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No constraints on site. However site is adjacent BOA unit TV01 and any proposal should incorporate measures to enhance BOA features in general. Footpath 41 lies adjacent site to north of but would remain unchanged.
34 - Parklands, Parcel D, Chertsey/Bittams	N	Y*	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	TPO 80 on site formed from several individual trees and several groups of trees. Any proposal will need to take account of TPO and avoid harm to protected trees. This may reduce developable area but would not preclude development. No other constraints.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
36 - Sandylands Home Farm East, Blay's Lane, Englefield Green	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Site is within unit TV01 of a Thames Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA) and whilst not itself a nationally or locally designated site, there may be features within the site which reflect BOA objectives. This does not preclude development, but any proposal would be expected to set out how it mitigates/ enhances BOA objectives and targets. The site is also within unit SW1 of the SLCA. Built development strategy for SW1 seeks to, amongst other things conserve a sense of seclusion with sparse settlement enclosed by woodland and to maintain wooded and undeveloped skyline. It is not considered site 36 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
46 – Land at Great Grove Farm, Ottershaw	N	Y*	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	<p>Within unit SS3 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 46 would significantly adversely affect these principles subject to design and will need to incorporate/enhance features which make a positive contribution to landscape principles for unit SS3. TPO 97 on parts of site along western boundary and north east of site. Footpath runs through site north/south from Murray Road to Guildford Road</p>

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
48 – Hanworth Lane, Chertsey	N	N	Y	Y*	N	Y	N	N	N	<p>Within unit SS3 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 48 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Noise impacts from adjacent employment area may be an issue for residential but could be attenuated or avoided. However, noise impacts from employment to residential, especially on northern parcel will need to be considered in terms of types of use and appropriate buffer areas. Within GPZ 2 and this will need to be considered through design process. Footpath runs adjacent site on eastern boundary. Site identified as housing reserve site in 2001 Local Plan and northern part of site has permission for 130 dwellings.</p>

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
50 – Brunel University Site, Cooper's Hill, Englefield Green	Y*	Y*	Y*	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Partly within BOA unit TV02. Relevant objectives for this unit include priority habitat restoration and creation and priority species recovery. Whilst site 50 is not itself a nationally or locally designated site, it is predominantly wooded with ancient woodland and losing this part of the site to development will likely have a significant negative affect on BOA objectives and targets. However, the site is large enough to retain BOA areas and as such there is the opportunity to mitigate/enhance BOA objectives and targets. TPO on site lies to the periphery and harm can be avoided. Site is partly within unit SS1 of SCLA. Built development strategy for SS1 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 50 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. FP69 runs along Oak Lane adjacent site and can be retained without diversion.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
51 – Byfleet Road, New Haw	Y*	N	Y*	Y*	Y*	N	N	Y	Y	Part of site within BOA R04, River Wey & Tributaries). Relevant objectives for this unit include priority habitat restoration and creation and priority species recovery. Whilst site 51 is not itself a nationally or locally designated site, there may be features within the site which reflect BOA objectives. This does not preclude development, but any proposal would be expected to set out how it mitigates/ enhances BOA objectives and targets. Within unit RF7 of SLCA. Built development strategy for RF7 seeks to, amongst other things ensure development is sensitively sited, retain undisturbed rural character of river Wey Valley, avoid development on the course of the Wey and avoid visually intrusive new large mass or bulky structures. Site 51 could adversely affect these principles and therefore design will need to be carefully considered with potential for a buffer along the Wey Navigation. Site is adjacent the M25 and noise could be an issue but could be attenuated. The AQMA for the M25 also falls over small part of the site and could be avoided. Several electricity pylons and overhead cables on site and Wey Navigation towpath lies on western boundary. As stated in stage 3 this site is not appropriate for housing although it was identified as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan, but has not been the subject of a planning application since designation.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
60 - Pycroft Road, Chertsey	N	Y*	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Within unit SS3 of SCLA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 60 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. TPO 235 on northern boundary adjacent Pycroft Road could be retained. Within GPZ 2 & 3 which will need to be considered through design process.
62 – Land at Adlestone Moor	N	Y*	Y*	N	N	Y	N	N	N	TPO 370 located on site for individual Oak tree but harm can be avoided. Within unit SS3 of SCLA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 62 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design if possible given size of site. Within GPZ 3 which will need to be considered through design process.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
77 – 232 Brox Road, Ottershaw	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Within unit SS4 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS4 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered that Site 77 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design if possible given size of site. TPO 115 covers whole site but trees located mostly on periphery and harm could be avoided.



SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
99 – Former DERA site, Longcross Road (South)	Y	Y*	Y	Y*	N	N	N	N	Y	<p>Within BOA unit TBH02. Relevant objectives for this unit include priority habitat restoration and creation and priority species recovery. Whilst site 99 is not itself a nationally or locally designated site, there may be features within the site which reflect BOA objectives. This does not preclude development, but any proposal would be expected to set out how it mitigates/ enhances BOA objectives and targets and given size of site potential for priority habitat restoration. Within unit SS4 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS4 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 99 would adversely affect these principles but account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Noise impacts may be an issue adjacent to the M3 but could be attenuated or avoided. Footpath runs across south east part of site and under M3 but could be retained/diverted. TPO6 runs along southern and eastern boundary of site but impacts could be avoided.</p>

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
154 – Land at Howard's Lane, Rowtown	N	Y*	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	TPO 180 on periphery of site and harm can be avoided. Footpath on periphery of site but can be retained. No other constraints.
155 – Blay's House, Blay's Lane, Englefield Green	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No constraints present. Site is partially developed.
167 – Land at Woburn Hill, Addlestone	N	N	N	N	N	Y*	N	N	N	Site partly within GPZ 3 which will need to be considered through design process. No other constraints.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
205 - Crockford Bridge Farm, New Haw Road, Addlestone	Y*	N	Y	N	N	N	Y*	N	Y	<p>Site within BOA unit R04. Relevant objectives for this unit include priority habitat restoration and creation and priority species recovery. Whilst site 205 is not itself a nationally or locally designated site, there may be features within the site which reflect BOA objectives. This does not preclude development, but any proposal would be expected to set out how it mitigates/ enhances BOA objectives and targets and given size of site potential for priority habitat restoration. Within unit SS3 of the SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover.</p> <p>Site 205 could adversely affect these principles in terms of merging settlements but this would be subject to design. May be some potential for agricultural land contamination i.e. pesticides, but this could be remediated. Footpath runs east/west in southern part of site and along a trackway to the north and could be retained or if necessary diverted.</p>

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
212 – Home Farm, Stroude Road	N	N	Y*	N	N	N	P	N	N	<p>Within unit RV2 of SLCA. Built development strategy for RV2 seeks to, amongst other things retain distinct character of settlements and avoid merging through linear development, maintain rural gaps, maintain vegetated boundaries, retain pattern of houses facing onto commons and open areas, limit impacts to rural views, development sympathetic to wider pattern of settlements and resist urbanisation of open areas. Site 212 could have adverse effects on some of these principles especially resisting urbanisation of open areas. This would need to be carefully considered through design but is not necessarily a reason to exclude at this stage.</p> <p>Land contamination status unknown, however is likely to be agricultural wastes and could be remediated.</p>

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
217 – Land adjacent Wheeler’s Green, Parcel E, Chertsey Bittams	N	Y*	Y*	Y*	N	N	N	N	N	TPO 16 on site but harm could be avoided. Within unit SS3 of SCLA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 217 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Potential amenity issue from noise given proximity to St Peter’s Way & Guildford Road, but this could be attenuated.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
218 – Rusham Park, Whitehall Lane, Egham	N	N	Y*	N	N	Y*	P	N	N	Within unit RV2 of SLCA. Built development strategy for RV2 seeks to, amongst other things retain distinct character of settlements and avoid merging through linear development, maintain rural gaps, maintain vegetated boundaries, retain pattern of houses facing onto commons and open areas, limit impacts to rural views, development sympathetic to wider pattern of settlements and resist urbanisation of open areas. Site 13 is already largely developed and as such is unlikely to have greater impact than existing subject to design. Site partly within GPZ3 which will need to be considered through design process. Potential for laboratory waste to be on site given existing R&D use and as such a land contamination survey may be required.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
219 – Villa Santa Maria, St Ann's Hill, Chertsey	N	Y*	Y*	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Within unit SS3 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 219 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design, especially with respect to retention of tree cover. TPO 2 on site which could be retained and as such harm avoided. Partly within GPZ 2 & 3 which will need to be considered through design process.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
224 – Land adjacent 62 Adlestone Moor	N	N	Y*	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Within unit SS3 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 224 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Partly within GPZ 2 & 3 which will need to be considered through design process. Overhead electricity cables run over very small part of site in south east corner and should not effect developable area.



SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
225 – Land adjacent Sandgates, Guildford Road, Chertsey	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	<p>Within unit SS3 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. Site 219 could adversely affect these principles especially retention of tree cover as the site is heavily wooded in parts and subject to two TPOs. Woodland TPO 403 covers some 0.9ha leaving 0.54ha of developable area. This reduces site size below threshold for employment use and as such site will not be taken forward for employment. However the woodland TPO also covers individual species along the frontage of Guildford Road which should be retained and therefore further limits the developable area on site. Development would therefore either lead to the loss of protected trees or reduce the site to under 0.5ha. Whilst part of the area covered by the woodland TPO could form areas of public/private amenity on site, this may have a detrimental impact on the protected vegetation and lead to pressure from new households to carry out works to protected trees in future. Further, to avoid impact to protected trees, development of the site would have to form a ribbon like development along Guildford Road. As such, the site should not be taken forward to stage 5. Within GPZ 3 GPZ 2 &amp; 3 which will need to be considered through design process.</p>
Runnymede Local Plan 2030: Final Site Selection Methodology and Assessment (Dec 2017)									233	

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
227 – Woburn Park Farm, Addlestonemoor	N	Y*	Y*	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Area TPO 137 lies to the site frontage and covers an area of some 0.8ha. Site is large enough for harm to protected trees to be avoided through design. Within unit SS3 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 227 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design, especially retention of protected trees on site. Partly within GPZ 2 & 3 which will need to be considered through design process. Overhead electricity cables run over the centre of the site from southwest to northeast which may reduce developable area.
231 – St Peter's Hospital	N	Y*	N	N	N	N	P	N	N	TPO 244 on site covering both individually protected trees and a general area. Site is large enough for harm to be avoided through design. Potential for contamination related to hospital waste and as such a survey may be required.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
254 – Land Parcel B, Central Veterinary Laboratory, Rowtown	N	N	Y*	N	N	N	N	N	N	Within unit SS3 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 254 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. TPO 216 and footpath adjacent east boundary of site could be retained.
255A – Parcel A, Chertsey Bittams	N	N	Y*	Y*	Y*	Y	N	N	N	Within unit SS3 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 255A would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Part of eastern parcel of land within M25 AQMA but could be avoided through design. Noise from M25 may be an issue but harm could be avoided through design. Within GPZ 3 which will need to be considered through design process

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
255B – Parcel B, Chertsey Bittams	N	N	Y*	N	N	N	N	N	N	Within unit SS3 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 255B would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Noise from M25 may be an issue but harm could be avoided through design.
255C – Parcel C, Chertsey Bittams	N	N	Y*	Y*	Y*	Y	N	N	N	Within unit SS3 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 255B would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Part of eastern parcel of land within M25 AQMA but could be avoided through design. Noise from M25 may be an issue but harm could be avoided through design. Within GPZ 3 which will need to be considered through design process.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
230 - Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel A (Thorpe Lea Manor)	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Within GPZ 3 which will need to be considered through design process.
230 - Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel B (Glenville Farm)	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Within GPZ 3 which will need to be considered through design process.
257 - Thorpe Lea Road West	N	Y*	N	Y*	Y*	Y	N	N	Y	TPO 98 on site covers individual trees and small areas which could be retained and harm avoided. Noise and air quality could be an issue given proximity to M25 and M25 AQMA but could be avoided or mitigated through design. Within GPZ 3 which will need to be considered through design process. Footpath runs along western boundary of site but could be retained.
258 - Virginia Water North	N	N	Y*	N	N	N	N	N	N	Site within unit SW1 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SW1 seeks to, amongst other things conserve a sense of seclusion with sparse settlement enclosed by woodland and to maintain wooded and undeveloped skyline. It is not considered site would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design, especially retention of more wooded area toward west of site. No other constraints present.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
259 – Virginia Water West	N	Y*	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	TPO 20S & 77 on site but could be retained and harm avoided. No other constraints on site.
261 – Virginia Water South	N	N	Y*	Y*	N	N	N	N	N	Within unit SS4 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS4 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 261 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Part of site adjacent to rail line and within 70m of M3, however noise issues could be attenuated.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
263 – Ottershaw East	N	Y*	Y*	N	N	N	N	N	Y	TPO 50 in west of site but could be retained and harm avoided. Within unit SS4 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS4 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 263 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Footpath runs north-south through site and could be retained.
200 Central 79-87a Woodham Park Road, Woodham	N	N	N	N	N	N	P	N	N	Site within 250m of potential waste source, so survey may be required.
274 – Allington & 37, 47, 57 Howard's Lane, Rowtown	N	Y*	N	N	N	N	P	N	Y	TPO 221 on part of site, but this could be retained and harm avoided. Site within 250m of potential contaminating site, so survey may be required. FP 24, 27 and 28 surround site but could be retained without diversion.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
277 – The Old Chalet, Callow Hill, Virginia Water	Y*	N	Y*	N	N	N	P	N	N	Site within BOA TV01. Relevant objectives for this unit include priority habitat restoration and creation and priority species recovery. Whilst site 277 is not itself a nationally or locally designated site, it is predominantly wooded and its loss to development could negatively affect BOA objectives and this will need to be carefully considered. Site within unit SW1 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SW1 seeks to, amongst other things conserve a sense of seclusion with sparse settlement enclosed by woodland and to maintain wooded and undeveloped skyline. Although not covered by a TPO, the site is predominantly covered by woodland and development could negatively affect principles and will need to be carefully designed. Whilst not a bar to development at this stage, level of constraints on site will reduce developable area. An unidentified tank lies 10m to north of site which could have potential for contamination and a survey would likely be required.



SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
284 – Christmas Tree Site, Ottershaw	N	Y*	Y*	N	N	N	P	N	N	Several TPOs on site, but these lie largely on the periphery and can be retained so harm can be avoided. Within units SS3 & SS4 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 & SS4 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 284 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Potential contamination site within 250m and a survey would likely be required.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
285 – Sayes Court Kennels, Addeystone	N	N	Y*	Y*	Y*	Y	Y	N	N	Within unit SS3 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS3 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 284 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Western area of site within M25 AQMA but could be avoided through design. Noise from M25 may be an issue but harm could be avoided through design. Within GPZ 3 which will need to be considered through design process. Part of former landfill located on site and survey would be required to investigate potential extent of contamination and whether any mitigation is possible.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
289 – Webb's, The Green, Englefield Green	N	Y*	Y*	N	N	N	N	N	N	TPO 168 on part of site, but can be retained and as such harm can be avoided. Partly within unit SS2 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS2 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 289 would significantly adversely affect these principles and will need to incorporate/enhance features which make a positive contribution to landscape principles for unit SS2, especially given its location adjacent The Green at Englefield Green which is one of the fundamental features in this landscape typology.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
293 – Land North of Kings Lane, Englefield Green	N	Y*	Y*	N	N	N	P	N	Y	TPO 284 on site for individual tree which can be retained and as such harm avoided. Within unit SS2 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS2 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 293 would not significantly adversely affect these principles but will need to incorporate/enhance features which make a positive contribution to landscape principles. Potential contamination site within 250m and survey may be required. FP22 adjacent site can be retained without diversion.

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
312 – Jasmine Cottage and 1 & 2 Home Farm Cottages	N	N	Y*	N	N	N	P	N	N	<p>Within unit RV2 of SLCA. Built development strategy for RV2 seeks to, amongst other things retain distinct character of settlements and avoid merging through linear development, maintain rural gaps, maintain vegetated boundaries, retain pattern of houses facing onto commons and open areas, limit impacts to rural views, development sympathetic to wider pattern of settlements and resist urbanisation of open areas. Site 316 could have adverse effects on some of these principles especially resisting urbanisation of open areas. This would need to be carefully considered through design but is not necessarily a reason to exclude at this stage.</p> <p>Land contamination status unknown, however is likely to be agricultural wastes and could be remediated.</p>

SLAA Site	BOA	TPO	Landscape	Amenity	AQMA	GPZ	Contaminated Land	Utilities	PROW	Comments
323 – Cacti Nursery, Bousley Rise, Ottershaw	N	N	Y*	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Within unit SS4 of SLCA. Built development strategy for SS4 seeks to, amongst other things retain pattern of villages/hamlets or short rows of dwellings facing onto roads/commons, conserve greens and commons, avoid merging settlements through linear development and retention of tree cover. It is not considered site 323 would adversely affect these principles although account will need to be taken of principles and enhanced through design. Footpath runs north-south west of site and could be retained.

## **Appendix 8 - Performance of Sites & Green Belt**

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
4 – Barrsbrook & Barrsbrook Cattery, Guildford Road, Chertsey	High performing site overall with high accessibility and low-medium constraints.	GB Review Part 1 scored the wider parcel strongly against purposes 1a and against purpose 3 finding that it prevented encroachment into the countryside. Green Belt Review Part 2 found that sub-parcel 50 performs a lesser role in preventing sprawl and encroachment and its containment would limit potential harm to the wider GB. Loss of the sub-parcel would not harm integrity of surrounding GB if considered in a wider parcel with sub-area 51.	Site performs highly against accessibility and low-medium against constraints. Sub-area performs moderately in terms of Green Belt purpose 1 and weakly/relatively weakly against purposes 2 & 3, but as it is considered to play a lesser role in preventing sprawl and encroachment the site could be released for development. The site is located on the edge of Chertsey but with a gap formed from a school, school playing fields and public open space between it and the urban boundary. The sub-area containing the school, school playing fields and open space (51) has been identified as a weaker performing parcel in terms of GB purposes, and the Stage 2 Green Belt Review suggests that the site could be considered in conjunction with sub-area 51 and considered for removal from the Green Belt. This approach would help prevent site 4 becoming an 'island' of development in the GB. However, the site area of sub-areas 50 & 51 of the GB Review Part 2 amount to some 7.5ha, with sub-area 50 contributing some 1.2ha and therefore only 16% of the land area would be developable for housing. As such, it is considered that the amount of GB that would need to be released to accommodate what would be a limited amount of developable land is disproportionate. Whilst the site performs well against constraints and accessibility and relatively weakly against Green Belt purposes, because of the disproportionate nature of the GB release, it is not considered to promote sustainable patterns of development as required by paragraph 84 of the NPPF. As such greater weight has been given to protection of the Green Belt in this instance.	x



SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
13 – Stroude Road Farm, Stroude Road	Medium performing site for both accessibility and constraints.	GB Review Part 1 scored the wider parcel (9) relatively highly against purpose 3 preventing encroachment into the countryside, moderately against purpose 1a and weakly against purpose 2. The GB review Part 2 divides the site into two sub-areas, 72 (south parcel) and 77 (north parcel). Sub-area 72 only scored weakly against purposes 1 & 2 but scored strongly against purpose 3. Also, although the overall role of the sub-area against purpose 2 was limited, cumulatively a substantial loss would begin to harm the gap between Virginia Water & Egham at a strategic level. Sub-area 77 also scored strongly against purpose 3 and more strongly against purpose 2 than sub-area 72.	Site performs medium in terms of accessibility and constraints, but also scores strongly against Green Belt purposes locally and to some degree at a strategic level in terms of preventing encroachment into the countryside and cumulatively against reducing the gap between Virginia Water & Egham. Whilst the site could help to meet needs and is moderately accessible with medium constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.	x
14 – Brox End Nursery, Ottershaw	Medium-high performing site with medium accessibility and low-medium constraints.	Within parcel D of GB Review Part 1 and whilst scoring highly against purpose 3, scored very weakly against purposes 1 & 2. Further refinement of the land parcel found that it does not form a strategic gap and would not result in significant encroachment into the countryside if placed into the urban area.	Site is identified as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan The overall sustainability credentials of this site are considered to outweigh its weak performance against Green Belt purposes and as such the site could be allocated. The site is already acceptable to develop in principle through the existing Local Plan and two planning applications are under consideration at the time of writing this assessment. Greater weight therefore given to meeting development needs.	✓

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
17 – Coombelands Lane, Rowtown	Site scored medium-high overall with medium accessibility and low constraints.	Within land parcel E of GB Review Part 1 which scored relatively highly against purpose 2 but only weakly against purposes 1 & 3.	Site is identified as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan. The overall sustainability credentials of this site are considered to outweigh its relatively weak performance against Green Belt purposes and as such the site could be allocated. The site is already acceptable to develop in principle through the existing Local Plan and permission for 43 units has been granted subject to S106. Greater weight therefore given to meeting development needs.	✓
22 – Land south of St David's Drive & Robert's Way, Englefield Green	Medium performing site overall with medium accessibility and low-medium constraints.	Within land parcel 8 in GB Review Part 1 and scored weakly against purposes 1 & 2, but relatively strongly against purpose 3. Further refined parcel indicates development of the site could compromise the ability of the Green Belt to meet purpose 3 and risk damage to the gap between Egham and Virginia Water. The GB Review Part 2 scored the site strongly against preventing sprawl, encroachment in the countryside and moderately in maintaining gaps and considers the sub-area important in maintaining general scale of openness at a strategic level with loss resulting in harm to Green Belt.	Site performs medium against accessibility with low-medium constraints overall, However, the site does perform strongly against Green Belt purposes both at a local and wider level. Whilst the site could help to meet needs and is moderately accessible with low-medium constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.	x

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
24 – Land at Prairie Road, Hatch Close & Hatch Farm, Addlestone	Medium-high performing overall with medium-high accessibility and medium constraints.	Within land parcel 40 of GB Review Part 1 and scored relatively highly against purposes 1&2 and highly against purpose 3. Further refined parcel indicates development of the site could lead to erosion of the gap between Addlestone & Chertsey and its role in protecting open countryside. GB Review Part 2, scored the sub-area (39) moderately against purposes 1 & 3 and strongly against purpose 2 with the site comprising the majority of the narrow gap between Addlestone & Chertsey. Sub-area 39 considered to play fundamental role in wider strategic Green Belt.	The site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility and medium against constraints. However, the site also performs strongly against Green Belt purposes, playing a fundamental role in preventing the coalescence of settlements. Whilst it is noted that the site performs medium-high against accessibility with medium constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.	x
28 – Great Grove Farm, Murray Road, Ottershaw	Site performs medium-high overall with medium-high accessibility and low constraints.	Within land parcel 41 of GB Review Part 1 and scores highly against purposes 2 & 3 but relatively weakly against purpose 1. This site was excluded from the refined land parcel.	The site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility and low against constraints, but also highly against Green Belt purposes especially purposes 2 &3, to prevent neighbouring towns merging and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Whilst the site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility with low constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.	x

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
29 – Charnwood Nurseries, 33 The Avenue, Woodham	Site performs medium-high overall with medium-high accessibility and low constraints.	<p>Within land parcel 28 of GB Review Part 1 which scores very highly against purpose 1 and relatively highly against purposes 2 &amp; 3. Further refined parcel indicates development could risk merging settlements. GB Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (2), strongly against all 3 purposes and finds that at the local level the sub-area acts as the wider parcel in preventing outward sprawl, but also more locally in preventing encroachment. At a strategic scale it is considered fundamental to maintaining scale and openness in what is a narrow gap between settlements. Overall, loss would be harmful.</p>	<p>The site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility with low constraints, but also strongly against all Green Belt purposes especially maintaining gaps between settlements. Whilst accessibility is medium-high and constraints low, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.</p>	x

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
30 – CABI, Bakeham Lane, Egham	Site performs medium-high overall with medium-high accessibility and low constraints.	<p>Within land parcel 8 in GB Review Part 1 and scored weakly against purposes 1 &amp; 2, but relatively strongly against purpose 3. GB Review Part 2 scores the sub area (90) moderately against purpose 1 to prevent sprawl but weakly against purposes 2 &amp; 3. However, it is considered that overall that loss of the sub-area would harm the wider strategic GB, promoting a loss of openness in a gap between settlements which is already fragmented.</p>	<p>The site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility and low against constraints. However, the site plays a strategic role in preventing encroachment and maintaining the gap between settlements. Whilst accessibility is high and constraint low, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.</p>	x

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
34 – Parklands, Parcel D, Chertsey Bittams	Site performs medium-high overall with medium accessibility and low constraints.	<p>Within land parcel 25 of GB Review Part 1 which scores strongly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 &amp; 3. Analysis of further refined parcel finds that as part of a wider strategic gap, development would not lead to the merging of settlements and with an existing semi-urban character its role in meeting purpose 3 has already been compromised. GB Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (36) moderately against purposes 1 &amp; 3 but weakly against purpose 2, preventing merging of settlements. However the sub-area has a sense of containment, would not see outward expansion or significantly reduce the gap between settlements and as such overall plays a limited role with respect to the wider Green Belt and loss would not be harmful.</p>	<p>The site performs medium in terms of accessibility with low constraints. The refined land parcel in the GB review Part 1 states that the parcel's strong boundaries will prevent further sprawl. It further states that the strategic gap would not lead to merger of settlements and that the semi-urban character has already compromised open countryside and its role in meeting purpose 3. The sub-area is also only considered to play a limited role in the wider Green Belt. As such, given the sites moderate level of accessibility and limited impact on constraints, it is considered that the delivery of development needs on the site outweighs Green Belt protection. It is not considered that development would adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt and would promote sustainable patterns of development.</p>	✓

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
36 – Sandylands Home Farm East, Blay's Lane, Englefield Green	Site performs medium against both accessibility and constraints.	Within land parcel 5 in GB Review Part 1 which scores highly against purpose 3, relatively highly against purpose 1 and relatively weakly against purpose 2. This site was excluded from the refined land parcel. GB Review Part 2 scored the sub-area (96) strongly against purpose 3, moderately against purpose 1 and weakly against purpose 2. The sub-area is considered to play a fundamental role in preventing sprawl and encroachment into the countryside. Its loss is judged to harm the wider GB by promoting loss of openness in the gap between Englefield Green & Virginia Water.	The site performs medium in terms of accessibility and constraints but performs strongly against Green Belt purposes especially purpose 1 to restrict sprawl and 3 to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Whilst the site performs medium in terms of accessibility and constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.	x

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
46 – Land at Great Grove Farm, Ottershaw	Site performs medium-high overall with medium-high accessibility and low-medium constraints.	<p>Within land parcel 41 in GB Review Part 1 which scores highly against purposes 2 &amp; 3 but relatively weakly against purpose 1. Further refined parcel finds that development could compromise purpose 1 and could lead to merger between settlements and interrupt the openness of the countryside. GB Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (25) moderately against purposes 2 &amp; 3 and weakly against purpose 1. The Part 2 GB Review considers that the majority of the sub-area plays a critical role with respect to the gap between Ottershaw &amp; Chertsey, but a small portion in the southwest corner (10.8ha) plays a diminished role and does not represent the largely unspoilt rural character of the rest of the parcel. The north/west of the sub-area is considered to be sensitive as a result of openness and its role in maintaining gaps, but south west corner plays a lesser role in strategic terms and loss would have lesser harm on wider GB subject to robust mitigation to establish a defensible boundary.</p>	<p>The site performs medium-high against accessibility with low-medium constraints. The refined land parcel in the GB Review Part 1 finds that development could interrupt the openness of countryside and lead to towns merging. However, the GB Review Part 2 finds that a more developed area to the southwest of the sub-area performs a diminished role in preventing encroachment and is less fundamental to maintaining openness. Whilst the GB Review Part 2 sets out the possibility of releasing a smaller area of GB to the southwest of sub-area 25 (sub-area 25i), it is considered that release of either the smaller area (25i) or wider area (25) would not promote sustainable patterns of development. This is one of a very few instances where the Council disagrees with Arup’s conclusions. The release of development north of Murray Road would not be a simple ‘rounding-off’ of the existing settlement and as such the overall urban pattern of development will begin to push northwards beyond Murray Road and the eastern side of Guildford Road which already serve as strong, durable and defensible boundaries to the Green Belt. Whilst the GB Review Part 2 considers that the southwest area (25i) does not fully represent the unspoilt rural characteristics of the wider area, nevertheless the effect of pushing a more intense form of development northwards will lead to a physical closing of the gap between Ottershaw and Chertsey and although Ottershaw is not a large built up area, pushing development northwards will inevitably lead to sprawl which is currently contained by the strong boundaries of Murray Road/Guildford Road. Whilst the site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility and low-medium for constraints and could help to meet needs either for housing or employment, on balance, greater weight has been attached to protection of the Green Belt in this instance given the role of the sub-area in preventing the northwards push of development and characteristics of the settlement pattern.</p>	x



<b>SLAA Site</b>	<b>Stage 3&amp;4</b>	<b>Green Belt Review</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Take Forward to Stage 6?</b>
48 – Hanworth Lane, Chertsey	High performing site overall with high accessibility and low-medium constraints.	Within land parcel C of GB Review Part 1 which scores highly against purposes 1 & 3 but not at all against purpose 2. This site is not included as a refined parcel and the Green Belt review indicates it as a Green Belt extension parcel.	The site performs highly against both accessibility and constraints and also against Green Belt purposes 1 & 3. However, the parcel does not score at all against purpose 2, to prevent neighbouring towns merging. The parcel was not taken forward for further refinement but was recommended as a Green Belt extension with concerns over the loss of open space. However, the site is designated as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan with development for 130 dwellings under construction on the northern section of the site with the southern section remaining undeveloped at this time. Greater weight attached to meeting development needs in this instance either for housing or employment.	✓

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
50 – Brunel University Site, Coopers Hill, Englefield Green	Medium performing site against both accessibility and constraints.	<p>Within land parcel 4 of GB Review Part 1 which scores highly against purpose 3 but weakly against purposes 1 &amp; 2. GB Part 2 scores the sub-area 106 moderately against purposes 1 &amp; 2 but weaker against 3 with sub-area 107 performing more strongly against purposes 2 &amp; 3. At the local level sub-area 106 plays a role in preventing outward sprawl however as the sub-area is already built out on its western boundary and contained on the eastern side by built form and wooded areas the risk of sprawl is reduced. Sub-area 106 performs moderately but physical features reduce the risk of harm to Green Belt. Sub-area 107 is considered to be important at a strategic level in preventing encroachment into the countryside and loss would integrity of wider GB.</p>	<p>The site performs medium against both accessibility and constraints. Although at a strategic level the site is considered to perform weakly against Green Belt purposes 1 &amp; 2, at the local level the site performs moderately well against purposes 1 &amp; 2 for sub-area 106 and strongly against purposes 2 &amp; 3 for sub-area 107. Sub-area 107 also plays a more important role in the integrity of the wider GB. Given the strong performance against purposes 2 &amp; 3 and moderate performance against accessibility and constraints, greater weight has been given to protection of the Green Belt for the area of the site within sub-area 107. In terms of the part of the site within sub-area 106, this already benefits from planning permission and is under construction for residential development as a previously developed site in the Green Belt. Whilst this means that that part of site 50 in sub-area 106 plays a lesser role in meeting Green Belt purposes, release of this land is unlikely to yield any further development than is already under construction and as such it is not considered reasonable to release from the Green Belt.</p>	x

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
51 – Byfleet Road, New Haw	<p>Medium performing site for employment use. Performance against both accessibility and constraints is medium.</p>	<p>Within land parcel F of GB Review Part 1 which performs strongly against purposes 2 &amp; 3 and relatively strongly against purpose 1. Further refined parcel finds that site is completely surrounded by urban development and no potential for urban sprawl and that its role in meeting purpose 2 has already been compromised.</p>	<p>The site performs medium in terms of both accessibility and constraints for an employment use. The site performs relatively strongly against all Green Belt purposes, but further refinement reveals that development would not compromise purpose 2 and the site is surrounded by urban development with no potential for sprawl. As such, it is considered that the development of the site for employment needs outweighs protection of the Green Belt as in this instance releasing the site would not adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt. The site is identified as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan but has limited potential for housing given the constraints on site and which limits its capacity. However, the site has potential to deliver 'less vulnerable' uses from a flood risk perspective and therefore lends itself to a potential employment site.</p>	✓
52 – Dial House, Northcroft Road, Englefield Green	<p>Medium performing site against both accessibility and constraints.</p>	<p>Within land parcel 5 of GB Review Part 1 which scored weakly against purpose 2, moderately against purpose 1 and strongly against purpose 3. GB Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (104) weakly against purpose 2 but strongly against purposes 1 and 3. The site performs strongly against preventing sprawl and is unspoilt in character, with loss resulting in harm to the wider strategic Green Belt.</p>	<p>Site performs medium in terms of both accessibility and constraints but performs strongly against Green Belt purposes, especially purposes 1 &amp; 3 playing a strong role in preventing sprawl. Whilst the site performs medium in terms of accessibility and constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.</p>	x

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
60 – Pyroft Road, Chertsey	Medium-High performing site overall with medium-high accessibility and low-medium constraints.	<p>Within land parcel B in GB Review Stage 1 which performs relatively highly against purpose 3, relatively weakly against purpose 1 and not at all against purpose 2. Further refined parcel finds that development would not have an adverse effect of the strategic gap between Chertsey &amp; Egham or cause further encroachment into the countryside including a small enlargement to the reserve site from a triangular piece of land to the south west. GB Review Part 2 considered further enlargement of the site to accommodate Grange Farm (sub-area 56) which performed weakly against purposes 2 &amp; 3 and moderately against purpose 1 playing a lesser role in the wider Green Belt as a result of limited openness and loss would not harm integrity of surrounding GB.</p>	<p>The site performs medium-high against accessibility with low-medium constraints. The reserve site extended by a triangular piece of land to the south west performs relatively weakly or not at all against Green Belt purposes 1 &amp; 2 to check unrestricted sprawl and prevent neighbouring towns merging but relatively strongly against Green Belt purpose 3 to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. However, further refinement reveals that development would not compromise purpose 2 or 3. At a local level, including the area at Grange Farm, the site plays a lesser role in the wider Green Belt and its release would not harm integrity of the Green Belt. As such, it is considered that the development of the site for sustainable development needs outweighs protection of the Green Belt as in this instance releasing the site would not adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt and would promote sustainable patterns of development. The site is partly identified as a housing reserve site in the 2001 Local Plan.</p>	✓

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
62 – Land at Addlestone Moor	High performing site in terms of both accessibility and constraints.	Within land parcel 35 of GB Review Part 1 and performed moderately against purposes 1 & 2 and weakly against purpose 3. The GB Review Part 2 also scores the sub-area (46) moderately against purposes 1 & 2 and weakly against purpose 3. The site is considered to be integral in strategic terms to maintaining the gap between Chertsey & Addlestone and openness with loss harming wider strategic Green Belt.	Site performs highly against both accessibility and constraints, but performs moderately against Green Belt purposes and is considered to be integral to maintaining the gap between Addlestone and Chertsey. Whilst it is noted that the site is highly accessible with low constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development. Release would have a significant negative impact on the general pattern of urban areas and maintaining the distinction/individual characteristics of different settlements of the Borough.	x
77 – 232 Brox Road, Ottershaw	Medium-high performing site overall with medium-high accessibility and low constraints.	Within land parcel 28 of Green Belt Review Part 1 which scores very highly against purpose 1 and relatively highly against purposes 2 & 3. However, at the local level the Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (13) weakly against purposes 1 & 2 and moderately against purpose 3 because the sub-area does not prevent sprawl and makes a lesser contribution to overall openness and gap between settlements, with loss unlikely to harm wider strategic Green Belt, although boundaries would need strengthening.	The site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility with low constraints and at a local level performs a lesser role in the wider strategic Green Belt. However, the site is located to the south west of Ottershaw, is small in scale and would form backland development between Brox Road and Guildford Road. It is considered that this would appear as incongruous to the general settlement pattern and would not form a rounding off of the settlement, especially given that the land to the north of the site is not recommended through either of the Green Belt Reviews as suitable for removal from the Green Belt (which would be required to form a more logical extension to the urban area by bringing the settlement edge up to the A320 Guildford Road). As such, whilst the site performs well in terms of accessibility and constraints, it is considered on balance that greater weight should be given to protection of the Green Belt given the characteristics of the settlement pattern in this area.	x

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
97 & 99 – Longcross Garden Village	Medium performing site overall with low accessibility and low constraints.	<p>Area north of the M3 within land parcel 21 of Green Belt Review Part 1 which does not score against any of the Green Belt purposes at all. Further refined parcel finds that there may be scope for durable boundaries to protect surrounding Green Belt from further sprawl and prevent coalescence with Virginia Water with further consideration of whether development would compromise wider non-fragmented swathe of Green Belt.</p> <p>Area south of the M3 within land parcel 22 of the Green Belt Review Part 1 scores moderately against purpose 3, but relatively weakly against purposes 1 and 2. Further refined parcel finds that there may be scope for durable boundaries to protect surrounding Green Belt from further sprawl with further consideration as to whether development would compromise wider non-fragmented swathe of Green Belt.</p>	<p>The site performs low in terms of accessibility but with low constraints. However the site as a potential new Garden Village would be large enough to improve accessibility and provide on-site local services and facilities and the Government has given its support to the site as a location for such a settlement. The area north of the M3 does not meet any of the Green Belt purposes at all and south of the M3 performs moderately against purpose 3 to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment but only relatively or very weakly against purposes 1 &amp; 2 to check unrestricted sprawl and prevent neighbouring towns from merging. The refined land parcels found that consideration should be given to whether development would compromise the non-fragmented swathe of Green Belt between Runnymede &amp; Surrey Heath.</p> <p>The area north of the M3 is already largely developed with an existing employment use and is now under construction for a mixed use development including 79,000sqm of employment space and 200 residential units. The area south of the M3 is already partially developed. As such, the site cannot entirely be defined as open, which is one of the fundamental characteristics of the Green Belt. In this respect the site has already fragmented the Green Belt in this location in reality and loss would not compromise this further. The gap to other settlements moving westwards into Surrey Heath is considerable with the nearest settlements at Chobham and Windlesham some 2km and 4km respectively. Northwards to Sunningdale the gap is 1.3km and south and east to Ottershaw and Chertsey some 2.7km and 3.7km respectively. Whilst the gap to Virginia Water to the north is only some 200m it is considered that the distinction between a new settlement and Virginia Water can be retained. On balance, it is considered that given the low impacts on constraints, possibility of improving accessibility and that Green Belt purposes are predominantly only weakly met, that developing the site to meet sustainable development needs outweighs protection of the Green Belt. Release would not adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and promote sustainable patterns of development.</p>	✓

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
154 – Land at Howard’s Lane, Rowtown	Medium performing site overall. Accessibility is medium and constraints are low.	Within land parcel 28 in Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores highly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 & 3. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (14) moderately against all three purposes. The sub-area is considered to form part of the wider essential gap between Addlestone and Ottershaw preventing the erosion of an already narrow gap and contributing to openness. Its loss is considered harmful to the wider integrity of the Green Belt.	Site performs medium against accessibility with low constraints. However performance against Green Belt purposes is either moderate or strong with the site playing an integral role in preventing erosion of the narrow gap between settlements. Whilst the site performs medium in terms of accessibility with low constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.	x
156 – Blay’s House, Blay’s Lane, Englefield Green	Medium performing site in terms of both accessibility and constraints.	Within land parcel 5 in Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores highly against purpose 3, moderately against purpose 1 but weakly against purpose 2. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (95) moderately against purposes 1 & 2 and weakly against 3. The sub-area has limited openness and semi-urban character with limited contribution to preventing encroachment and sense of separation from the countryside and loss would not harm wider integrity of Green Belt.	The site is medium performing in terms of both constraints and accessibility. The site scores moderately well against most Green belt purposes but its sense of separation from the wider countryside and semi-urban character means that in reality, the site plays a limited role in meeting Green Belt purposes. The sub-area is also strongly bounded by defensible and durable features. As such, given the sites moderate level of accessibility and medium constraints, it is considered that the delivery of development needs on the site is considered to outweigh Green Belt protection. It is not considered that development would adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt and would promote sustainable patterns of development given the sub-areas limited role in the wider Green Belt.	✓

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
158 – Squires Garden Centre, Hollow Hill Chertsey	Medium performing site overall. Accessibility is medium and constraints are low-medium.	Within land parcel 22 in Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores moderately against purposes 1 & 3 and weakly against purpose 2. Site falls within 3 sub areas in Green Belt Review Part 2, sub-area 43, 44 & 45. Sub-area 43 performs moderately against all three purposes. Sub-area 44 scores highly against purposes 1 & 3 and sub-area 45 weakly against purpose 1 but moderately against purpose 2 and highly against purpose 3. All three sub-areas play an important role in preventing coalescence with sub-areas 44 & 45 also preventing sprawl and/or encroachment into the countryside. The loss of any of the sub-areas would be harmful to the wider strategic Green Belt.	Site performs medium in terms of accessibility with low-medium constraints. However performance against Green Belt purposes is predominantly either moderate or strong with the site playing an important role in preventing coalescence and sprawl/encroachment into the countryside. Whilst the site performs moderately in terms of accessibility with medium constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.	x



SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
167 – Land at Woburn Hill, Addlestone	Medium-High performing site overall. Accessibility is medium-high and constraints low.	Within land parcel 35 in Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores moderate-high against purpose 1, moderately against purpose 2 and weakly against purpose 3. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (41) highly against purpose 2, moderately against purpose 1 and moderately-weak against purpose 3. Sub-area provides a barrier to further sprawl and plays a heightened role in maintaining separation between Chertsey & Addlestone. Sub-area plays a fundamental role in wider Green Belt and loss would be significantly harmful.	The site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility with low constraints. However, the site also performs strongly against Green Belt purposes, playing a fundamental role in preventing the coalescence of settlements and its role in preventing sprawl. Whilst the site is highly accessible with low constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development, especially given the negative impact on maintaining the distinction/individual characteristics of different settlements of the Borough.	x

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
205 – Crockford Bridge Farm, New Haw Road, Addlestone	Medium performing site overall with medium-high accessibility and medium constraints.	Within land parcel 30 in GB Review Part 1 which performs strongly against purposes 1 & 2 and relatively strongly against purpose 3. Site falls within sub area 23 in Green Belt Review Part 2 with a small area in sub-area 22. Sub-area 23 scores highly against purposes 1 & 2 and moderately against purpose 3 with sub-area 22 scoring highly against purpose 1, moderately against purpose 2 and moderately-weak against purpose 3. Sub areas 22 & 23 play an integral role in preventing sprawl and maintaining openness within a narrow gap between settlements. Loss would be harmful to Green Belt at strategic level.	The site is medium-high performing in terms of accessibility with medium constraints. The site scores highly against Green Belt purpose 1 & 2 and is considered to be integral to preventing sprawl with potential to narrow the gap between settlements. Whilst it is noted that the site performs medium-high against accessibility with medium constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs whether for housing or employment is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.	x

<b>SLAA Site</b>	<b>Stage 3&amp;4</b>	<b>Green Belt Review</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Take Forward to Stage 6?</b>
212 – Home Farm, Stroude Road	Medium High performing site overall with medium high accessibility and low-medium constraints.	Within land parcel 9 in Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores moderately against purpose 1, weakly against purpose 2 and moderately against purpose 3. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (65) weakly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 & 3. Loss of the sub-area would harm wider Green Belt by promoting encroachment into an open and sensitive area of countryside.	Site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility and constraints. However, performance against Green Belt purposes 2 & 3 is moderate and is considered to play an important role in preventing encroachment into a sensitive area of countryside. Whilst the site performs well in terms of accessibility and constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.	x

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
217 – Land adjacent Wheelers Green, Parcel E, Chertsey Bittams	Medium-High performing site overall with medium-high accessibility and low constraints.	<p>Within land parcel 25 of GB Review Part 1 which performs strongly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 &amp; 3. Further refined parcel finds that as part of a wider strategic gap, development would not lead to the merging of settlements and with an existing semi-urban character its role in meeting purpose 3 has already been compromised. GB Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (35) moderately against purposes 1 &amp; 3 but weakly against purpose 2, preventing merging of settlements. However the sub-area has a sense of containment, would not see outward expansion or significantly reduce the gap between settlements and as such overall plays a limited role with respect to the wider Green Belt and loss would not be harmful.</p>	<p>The site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility with low constraints. The wider land parcel performed relatively highly against Green Belt purpose 1, however the commentary for the refined parcel states that strong boundaries will prevent further sprawl, the strategic gap would not lead to merger of settlements and the semi-urban character has already compromised open countryside and its role in meeting purpose 3. The sub-area is also only considered to play a limited role in the wider GB. As such, given the sites relatively high level of accessibility and limited impact on constraints, and generally weak performance against Green belt purposes, it is considered that the delivery of development needs on the site outweighs Green Belt protection. It is not considered that development would adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt and would promote sustainable patterns of development given the sub-area's limited role in the wider Green Belt.</p>	✓

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
218 – Rusham Park, Whitehall Lane, Egham	Medium performing site for both accessibility and constraints	<p>Within land parcel 9 of Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores moderately against purposes 1 &amp; 3 and weakly against purpose 2. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (92) weakly against all three purposes. The sub-area plays no role in preventing sprawl, a small role in preventing coalescence and is urban in character and overall plays a limited role in the wider Green Belt.</p>	<p>Site performs medium against both accessibility and constraints and only weakly against Green Belt purposes playing a limited role in the wider Green Belt. However, the site is located on the edge of Egham but with a gap formed from Royal Holloway University of London (RHUL) and public open space between it and the urban boundary to the north. The sub-areas containing RHUL and the open space (97, 98 &amp; 99) have also been identified as weaker or moderately performing with loss not considered harmful to the wider Green Belt. However, consideration needs to be given to the cumulative loss of all 4 areas, given that the loss of sub-area 92 only would create an 'island' of urban area in the Green Belt, severed from the existing urban area. The site area of sub-areas 92, 97, 98 &amp; 99 amount to around 60ha, with sub-area 92 contributing some 6.5ha and therefore only 11% of the land area would be developable for housing. As such, it is considered that the amount of Green Belt that would need to be released to accommodate what would be a limited amount of developable land is disproportionate. Whilst the site performs moderately against constraints and accessibility and weakly against Green Belt purposes, because of the disproportionate nature of the GB release to secure development, it is not considered to promote sustainable patterns of development as required by paragraph 84 of the NPPF. As such greater weight has been given to protection of the Green Belt in this instance.</p>	x
219 – Villa Santa Maria, St Ann's Hill, Chertsey	Medium performing site both in terms of accessibility and constraints.	<p>Within land parcel 16 in Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores highly against purposes 1, moderately against purpose 3 but weakly against purpose 2. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (57) highly against purpose 1, moderately against purpose 3 and weakly against purpose 2. Sub-area plays a heightened role in preventing sprawl with limited potential to reduce harm. Loss would be harmful to wider Green Belt.</p>	<p>The site is medium performing in terms of both accessibility and constraints but performs strongly against purpose 1 and moderately against purpose 3, playing an important role in preventing sprawl. Whilst the site performs moderately against accessibility and constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.</p>	x

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
224 – Land adjacent 62 Addlestone Moor	High performing site overall. Medium-high accessibility and low constraints	Within land parcel 35 of GB Review Part 1 and performed moderately against purposes 1 & 2 and weakly against purpose 3. The GB review Part 2 also scores the sub-area (46) moderately against purposes 1 & 2 and weakly against purpose 3. The site is considered to be integral in strategic terms to maintaining the gap between Chertsey & Addlestone and openness with loss harming wider strategic Green Belt.	Site performs high against accessibility with low constraints, but performs moderately against Green Belt purposes and is considered to be integral to maintaining the gap between Addlestone and Chertsey performing a strategic role. Whilst it is noted that the site is highly accessible with low constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development especially given the significant negative impact on maintaining the distinction/individual characteristics of different settlements of the Borough.	x
227 – Woburn Park Farm, Addlestone Moor	Medium-High performing site overall with medium-high accessibility and medium constraints.	Within land parcel 35 in Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores moderate-high against purpose 1, moderately against purpose 2 and weakly against purpose 3. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (41) highly against purpose 2, moderately against purpose 1 and moderately-weak against purpose 3. Sub-area provides a barrier to further sprawl and plays a heightened role in maintaining separation between Chertsey & Addlestone. Sub-area plays a fundamental role in wider Green Belt and loss would be significantly harmful.	The site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility with medium constraints. However, the site also performs strongly against Green Belt purposes, playing a fundamental role in preventing the coalescence of settlements and its role in preventing sprawl. Whilst it is noted that the site is highly accessible with medium constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development, especially given the significant negative impact on maintaining the distinction/individual characteristics of different settlements of the Borough.	x

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
231 – St Peter's Hospital	Medium-High performing site overall with medium-high accessibility and low-medium constraints.	Within land parcel 26 in Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores weakly against purpose 1 but moderately against purposes 2 & 3. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (38) as weakly, relatively weakly against purposes 2 & 3 but moderately against purpose 1. Sub area does not represent characteristics of wider land parcel with limited contribution to purpose 3 and makes lesser contribution to gap between settlements. Sub-area plays limited role in wider strategic Green Belt and loss would not be harmful.	The site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility with low-medium constraints. The wider land parcel performed moderately well against purposes 2 & 3, but the smaller sub-area is also only considered to play a limited role in meeting purposes 2 & 3 and loss would not be harmful to wider Green Belt. As such, given the sites relatively high level of accessibility and limited impact on constraints, it is considered that the delivery of development need on the site is considered to outweigh Green Belt protection. It is not considered that development would adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt and would promote sustainable patterns of development given the sub-areas limited role in the wider Green Belt.	✓

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
254 – Land Parcel B, Central Veterinary Laboratory, Rowtown	Medium performing site with medium accessibility and low constraints.	<p>Within land parcel 28 of GB Review Part 1 which scores very highly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 &amp; 3. Further refined land parcel finds that in general development of refined area would not compromise purpose 1. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (7) weakly against purposes 1 &amp; 2 and moderately against purpose 3. Sub-area makes lesser contribution to separation of settlements at local level due to enclosed nature of northern section of sub-area. Loss of sub-area would not be harmful to wider Green Belt as it is predominantly infill, but south western part of sub-area plays a more critical role, preventing further ribbon development and significant mitigation would be required.</p>	<p>The site performs medium in terms of accessibility with low constraints. Whilst the wider land parcel performs very highly or moderately against all three purposes the refined parcel is not considered to compromise any of the three purposes. At the local level the sub-area performs weakly against purpose 1 &amp; 2 and moderately against purpose 3. Given the sub-area's lesser role in preventing sprawl and coalescence, due in part to being infill in nature, loss would not harm wider Green Belt. However, as has been acknowledged in the Part 2 Review, the south western part of the sub-area does play a more critical role in the wider Green Belt. It is considered that development of the south western part of the sub-area would begin to push the settlement pattern of Rowtown further southwards beyond existing settlement limits which would physically and to some extent perceptually reduce the gap between Rowtown and Woodham. This will be heightened when the old Rodwell Nursing Home has been demolished. Whilst the access track into the Veterinary Laboratory site from Woodham Park Road lying to the south of the sub-area would form a defensible/durable boundary, one can also be formed further northward by a row of thick vegetation separating field boundaries. As such, given the infill nature of the northern part of the sub-area and its weak performance against purposes 1 &amp; 2, along with limited constraints and moderate accessibility, it is considered release of the northern parcel outweighs Green Belt protection and that meeting development need would not adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt and would promote sustainable patterns of development. However, given the nature of the south western part of the sub-area and its stronger performance against Green Belt purposes, it is not considered that release of this area for development would not outweigh Green Belt protection and its loss would be harmful to the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development. As such, only the northern part of the sub-area to be taken forward for release.</p>	✓



SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
255A – Parcel A, Chertsey Bittams	Medium-high performing site overall with medium-high accessibility and low-medium constraints	Within land parcel 25 in Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores strongly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 & 3. Further refined parcel finds that as part of a wider strategic gap, development would not lead to the merging of settlements and with an existing semi-urban character its role in meeting purpose 3 has already been compromised. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores sub-area (40) moderately against purposes 1 & 3 and weakly against purpose 2. Sub-area fundamentally plays lesser role in preventing sprawl and much lesser role in preventing coalescence with lesser role against encroachment into countryside. Loss would not be harmful to wider Green Belt.	The site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility with low-medium constraints. Whilst the wider land parcel performs strongly or moderately against all three purposes the refined parcel states that strong boundaries will prevent further sprawl and the strategic gap would not lead to merger of settlements and the semi-urban character has already compromised open countryside and its role in meeting purpose 3. This also reflects the findings of the Part 2 Review of the sub-area and its loss would not be harmful to the wider Green Belt. As such, given the sites accessibility and limited impact on constraints, it is considered that the delivery of development needs on the site outweighs Green Belt protection as loss would not adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt and promote sustainable patterns of development.	✓

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
255B – Parcel B, Chertsey Bittams	Medium performing for both accessibility and constraints	<p>Within land parcel 25 in Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores strongly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 &amp; 3. Further refined parcel finds that as part of a wider strategic gap, development would not lead to the merging of settlements and with an existing semi-urban character its role in meeting purpose 3 has already been compromised. Part 2 Green Belt Review scores sub-area (37) moderately against purposes 1 &amp; 3 and weakly against purpose 2. Sub-area fundamentally plays lesser role in preventing sprawl and a small part of the essential gap between settlements. Lesser contribution against encroachment into countryside when considered as part of wider Green Belt. Loss would not be harmful to wider Green Belt.</p>	<p>The site performs medium in terms of both accessibility and constraints. Whilst the wider land parcel performs strongly or moderately against all three purposes the refined parcel states that strong boundaries will prevent further sprawl and the strategic gap would not lead to merger of settlements and the semi-urban character has already compromised open countryside and its role in meeting purpose 3. This also reflects the findings of the Part 2 Review of the sub-area and its loss would not be harmful to the wider Green Belt. As such, given the sites moderate accessibility and impact on constraints, it is considered that the delivery of development needs on the site outweighs Green Belt protection as loss would not adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt and promote sustainable patterns of development.</p>	✓

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
255C – Parcel C, Chertsey Bittams	Medium performing for both accessibility and constraints	<p>Within land parcel 25 in Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores strongly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 &amp; 3. Further refined parcel finds that as part of a wider strategic gap, development would not lead to the merging of settlements and with an existing semi-urban character its role in meeting purpose 3 has already been compromised. Part 2 Green Belt Review scores sub-area (37) moderately against purposes 1 &amp; 3 and weakly against purpose 2. Sub-area fundamentally plays lesser role in preventing sprawl and a small part of the essential gap between settlements. Lesser contribution against encroachment into countryside when considered as part of wider Green Belt. Loss would not be harmful to wider Green Belt.</p>	<p>The site performs medium in terms of both accessibility and constraints. Whilst the wider land parcel performs strongly or moderately against all three purposes the refined parcel states that strong boundaries will prevent further sprawl and the strategic gap would not lead to merger of settlements and the semi-urban character has already compromised open countryside and its role in meeting purpose 3. This also reflects the findings of the Part 2 Review of the sub-area and its loss would not be harmful to the wider Green Belt. As such, given the sites moderate accessibility and impact on constraints, it is considered that the delivery of development needs on the site outweighs Green Belt protection as loss would not adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt and promote sustainable patterns of development.</p>	✓

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
256 – Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel A (Thorpe Lea Manor)	Medium-high performing site overall with medium-high accessibility and low constraints.	Within land parcel 11 of Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores moderately against purpose 1 but weakly against purposes 2 & 3. Refined land parcel finds that there may be scope for small development without compromising meeting purposes 2 & 3, but consideration should be given to impact on purpose 1. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores sub-area (101) weakly against all three purposes. Sub-area plays no role in preventing coalescence and loss would have limited harm to wider Green Belt.	The site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility with low constraints. The wider land parcel performs relatively strongly against purpose 1 but weakly against 2 & 3 with the refined parcel not compromising purposes 2 & 3 but consideration should be given to purpose 1. At the local level the sub-area performs weakly against all three purposes. It is considered that the northern boundaries of the site can form a permanent physical boundary which is durable and defensible and therefore would not impact upon purpose 1. As such, given the sites relatively high accessibility and low impact on constraints, it is considered that the delivery of development needs on the site is considered to outweigh Green Belt protection as it is not considered that development would adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt and promote sustainable patterns of development.	✓
256 – Thorpe Lea Road North, Parcel B (Glenville Farm)	Medium-high performing site overall with medium-high accessibility and low constraints.	Within land parcel 11 of Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores moderately against purpose 1 but weakly against purposes 2 & 3. Refined land parcel finds that there may be scope for small development without compromising meeting purposes 2 & 3, but consideration should be given to impact on purpose 1. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores sub-area (101) weakly against all three purposes. Sub-area plays no role in preventing coalescence and loss would have limited harm to wider Green Belt.	The site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility with low constraints. The wider land parcel performs relatively strongly against purpose 1 but weakly against 2 & 3 with the refined parcel not compromising purposes 2 & 3 but consideration should be given to purpose 1. At the local level the sub-area performs weakly against all three purposes. It is considered that the northern boundaries of the site can form a permanent physical boundary which is durable and defensible and therefore would not impact upon purpose 1. As such, given the sites relatively high accessibility and low impact on constraints and overall Green Belt performance, it is considered that the delivery of development needs on the site is considered to outweigh Green Belt protection and would not adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt and would promote sustainable patterns of development.	✓

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
257 – Thorpe Lea Road West	Medium-high performing site overall with medium-high accessibility and medium constraints.	Within land parcel 10 of Green Belt Review Part 1 which scores moderately against purposes 1 and 3 but weakly against purpose 2. Refined land parcel finds that permanent site boundaries could be defined which would prevent sprawl and would not risk merging settlements. The sites role in meeting purpose 3 has already been compromised. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (94) moderately against purpose 1 and weakly against purposes 2 & 3. Sub-area of moderate importance to preventing sprawl with M25 restricting outward growth. Sub-area of no importance to preventing coalescence. Loss would not harm wider Green Belt.	The site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility and medium in terms of constraints. The wider land parcel performs relatively strongly against purposes 1 & 3 but weakly against purpose 2 with the refined parcel stating that development would not compromise purposes 1 & 2 and that purpose 3 has already been compromised. At the local level the sub-area also performed weakly against purposes 2 & 3 with M25 restricting outward growth with no role in preventing coalescence of settlements. As such, given the sites relatively high accessibility and medium impact on constraints and overall Green Belt performance, it is considered that the delivery of development needs on the site outweighs Green Belt protection as development would not adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt and would promote sustainable patterns of development.	✓

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
258 – Virginia Water North	Medium performing site with medium accessibility and low-medium constraints.	<p>Within land parcel 8 in Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores moderately against purpose 3 but weakly against purposes 1 &amp; 2. Refined land parcel finds that there may be scope for development adjacent to Virginia Water with site partially contained within existing urban area and bounded by permanent physical features preventing further encroachment into the countryside and not compromising purpose 2. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores sub-area (70) weakly against purposes 1 &amp; 2 and moderately against purpose 3. Sub-area does not contribute to strategic role and plays limited role in wider to wider Green Belt and loss would not be harmful.</p>	<p>The site performs medium in terms of accessibility with low-medium constraints. The wider land parcel performs moderately against purposes 3 but weakly against purposes 1 &amp; 2 with the refined parcel stating that development would not compromise purpose 2 or 3. At the local level the sub-area performs weakly against purposes 1 &amp; 2 and moderately against purpose 3 but plays only a limited role in wider Green Belt. As such, given the sites moderate accessibility and low-medium impact on constraints and the overall performance of Green Belt, it is considered that the delivery of development needs on the site outweighs Green Belt protection and that development would not adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt and promote sustainable patterns of development.</p>	✓

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
259 – Virginia Water West	Medium performing site for both accessibility and constraints.	<p>Within land parcel 7 of Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores weakly against all three purposes. Further refined parcel finds scope for development in two areas which are partially contained within existing development, checked by permanent features and no adverse impact on the strategic gap between Sunningdale and Virginia Water or cause further encroachment into the countryside. Site falls within two sub-areas in the Green Belt Review Part 2 (59 &amp; 60). Sub-area 59 scores weakly/relatively weakly against all three purposes with sub-area 60 scoring weakly against purposes 1 &amp; 2 but moderately against purpose 3. Sub areas 59 &amp; 60 are considered to play a limited role in wider Green Belt and although sub-area 60 plays a heightened role against purpose 3 its role at the strategic level is limited.</p>	<p>The site performs medium against accessibility and constraints. The wider land parcel performs weakly or not at all against all three purposes, with the refined parcel stating that development would not compromise purposes 2 or 3. At the local level sub-area 59 performs weakly against all three purposes and plays no role in the wider Green Belt. Sub-area 60 performs weakly against purposes 1 &amp; 2 but moderately against purpose 3, although its role at the strategic level is limited. As such, given the sites moderate accessibility and impact on constraints and the overall performance of Green Belt, the delivery of development needs on the site is considered to outweigh Green Belt protection and development would not adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt and promote sustainable patterns of development.</p>	✓

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
261 – Virginia Water South	Medium performing site overall with medium accessibility and low-medium constraints.	Within land parcel 7 of Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores weakly against all three purposes. Further refined parcel finds scope for development in two areas which are partially contained within existing development, checked by permanent features and no adverse impact on the strategic gap between Sunningdale and Virginia Water or cause further encroachment into the countryside. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores sub-area (52) weakly against purposes 1 & 2 and moderately against purpose 3. Sub-area plays little or no role to preventing sprawl or coalescence and plays limited role in wider Green Belt.	The site performs medium in terms of accessibility with low-medium constraints. The wider land parcel performs weakly or not at all against all three purposes, with the refined parcel stating that development would not compromise purposes 2 or 3. At the local level the sub-area performs weakly against purposes 1 & 2 and moderately against purpose 3, but is considered to play only a limited role in the wider Green Belt. As such, given the sites moderate accessibility and low-medium impact on constraints as well as overall performance of Green Belt, the delivery of development needs on the site is considered to outweigh Green Belt protection and that development would not adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt and would promote sustainable patterns of development.	✓



SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
263 – Ottershaw East	Medium-high performing site overall with medium-high accessibility and low constraints.	<p>Within land parcel 28 of Green Belt Review Part 1 which scores highly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 &amp; 3. Further refined land parcel finds that in general development of refined land parcel would not compromise purpose 1 and given site partially contained and bounded by physical features does not adversely impact gaps between Ottershaw, Addlestone, New Haw/Woking or cause further encroachment. Site falls within two sub-areas in the Green Belt Review Part 2 (10 &amp; 11). Sub-area 10 scores weakly against purposes 1 &amp; 2 and moderately against purpose 3 although its scale of built form limits its contribution to rurality and loss would not be harmful to wider Green Belt. Sub-area 11 scores weakly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 &amp; 3. Eastern part of sub-area plays a more substantive role in preventing coalescence, with western area more enclosed and less important at a strategic level. Loss of western part of site would not harm wider Green Belt.</p>	<p>The site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility with low constraints. The wider land parcel performs strongly or relatively strongly against all three purposes with the further refined parcel not considered to compromise any of the three purposes. At the local level both sub-areas 10 and 11 do not play a role in preventing sprawl with sub-area 10 playing no role in preventing coalescence and limited role in preventing encroachment. The western part of sub-area 11 also does not play a role in preventing coalescence and is more infill in nature and less important at the strategic level. As such, release of the western part of the site is not considered to be harmful to the wider Green Belt. However, the area east of the footpath is considered to be more fundamental to the wider Green Belt in preventing coalescence of settlements and its loss would be harmful to the wider Green Belt. It is considered that the footpath which runs north-south through the site can form a defensible and durable boundary and is the logical separation between the east and west areas of the site, where the western area would form a natural rounding off of the settlement. Because, sub-area 10 falls on the eastern side of the footpath it is also logical to retain this sub-area in the Green Belt. As such, given the relatively high accessibility and low impact of constraints and Green Belt performance, delivery of development needs is considered to outweigh Green Belt protection and development would not adversely affect the overall integrity, role or function of the Green Belt and promote sustainable patterns of development on the western area of the site. The eastern area of the site (east of the public footpath) plays a more fundamental role in the wider Green Belt and should be retained in the Green Belt along with sub-area 10.</p>	✓

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
268 – Land at 79-87a Woodham Park Road, Woodham	Medium performing site overall with medium accessibility and low constraints.	<p>Within land parcel 28 of Green Belt Review Part 1 which scores highly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 &amp; 3. Further refined land parcel did not include the site. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (1) moderately against purpose 1 and weakly/relatively weakly against purposes 2 &amp; 3. Sub-area plays a limited role in preventing sprawl and forms small part of wider gap between settlements with limited contribution to openness. However site prevents further sprawl in absence of defensible boundaries and would protrude into countryside visually reducing gap between settlements.</p>	<p>The site performs medium in terms of accessibility with low constraints. The Green Belt Review Part 2 found the sub-area to perform either weakly or moderately against Green Belt purposes, however, because of the site's role in preventing further sprawl in the absence of defensible boundaries to the south and preventing coalescence of settlements the sub-area is considered to play a strong role in the wider Green Belt. Although the site performs moderately in terms of accessibility and has low constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.</p>	x

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
274 – Allington & 37, 47, 57 Howard's Lane, Rowtown	Medium performing site overall with medium accessibility and low constraints.	Within land parcel 28 of Green Belt Review Part 1 which scores highly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 & 3. Further refined land parcel did not include the site. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (19) strongly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 & 3. Sub-area plays a strong role in preventing sprawl in the absence of defensible boundaries and would further reduce an already narrow gap between settlements. Loss would be harmful to wider Green Belt.	Site performs medium in terms of accessibility with low constraints. However performance against Green Belt purposes is either moderate or strong with the site playing an integral role in preventing erosion of the narrow gap between settlements and preventing sprawl. Whilst the site performs moderately in terms of accessibility with low constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.	x
277 – The Old Chalet, Callow Hill, Virginia Water	Medium performing site overall with medium accessibility and low constraints.	Within land parcel 8 in Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores moderately against purpose 3 but weakly against purposes 1 & 2. Further refined land parcel did not include the site. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (71) strongly against purpose 3 and weakly against purposes 1 & 2. Sub-area plays important role in preventing encroachment into countryside and at strategic level maintain openness of Green Belt. Loss would be harmful to wider Green Belt.	Site performs medium in terms of accessibility with low constraints. However, performance against Green Belt purpose 3 is strong and is considered to play an important role in preventing encroachment into countryside and maintaining openness. Whilst the site performs moderately in terms of accessibility with low constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.	x

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
284 – Christmas Tree Site, Ottershaw	Medium-high performing site overall with medium-high accessibility and low constraints.	Within land parcel 26 in Green Belt Review Stage 1 and scores weakly against purpose 1 but moderately against purpose 2 and strongly against purpose 3. Site falls within two sub-areas in Green Belt Review Part 2 (24 & 34). Sub-area 24 scores weakly against purpose 1 but strongly against purposes 2 & 3, playing a role in preventing coalescence at a strategic level and preventing encroachment into the countryside. Sub-area 34 scores weakly against purposes 1 & 2 but strongly against purpose 3 playing a role in preventing encroachment into the countryside. The loss of both sub-areas 24 & 34 would be harmful to the wider Green Belt.	Site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility with low constraints. However, performance against Green Belt purpose 3 is strong for both sub-areas and is considered to play an important role in preventing encroachment into countryside and at a strategic level is also considered to prevent the coalescence of settlements. Whilst the site performs medium-high high in terms of accessibility with low constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs whether for housing or employment is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.	x
285 – Sayes Court Kennels, Addlestone	Medium-High performing site overall with medium-high accessibility and low-medium constraints.	Within land parcel 29 of Green Belt Review Stage 1 and scores moderately against purpose 1 and strongly against purposes 2 & 3. Green Belt Review Stage 2 scores sub-area (20) strongly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 & 3. Sub-area plays a role in preventing sprawl and preventing encroachment into countryside. Loss would be harmful to wider Green Belt.	Site performs medium high in terms of accessibility with low constraints. However, performance against Green Belt purpose 1 is strong and is considered to play an important role in preventing sprawl and encroachment into countryside. Whilst the site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility with low constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.	x

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
289 – Webb's, The Green, Englefield Green	Medium performing site overall with medium accessibility and low-medium constraints.	Within land parcel 5 in Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores moderately against purpose 1, weakly against purpose 2 and strongly against purpose 3. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (105) moderately against purpose 1, weakly against purpose 2 and relatively weakly against purpose 3. Sub-area plays an important role in preventing sprawl strategically and loss would be harmful to wider Green Belt.	Site performs medium in terms of accessibility with low-medium constraints. However, performance against Green Belt purpose 1 is strong and is considered to play an important role in preventing sprawl strategically. Whilst the site performs moderately well in terms of accessibility with low constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.	x
293 – Land North of Kings Lane, Englefield Green	Medium performing site in terms of both accessibility and constraints.	Within land parcel 5 in Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores moderately against purpose 1, weakly against purpose 2 and strongly against purpose 3. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (103) strongly against purposes 1 & 3 and weakly against purpose 2. Sub-area plays important role in preventing sprawl and preventing encroachment into countryside. Loss would be harmful to wider Green Belt.	Site performs medium in terms of accessibility and constraints. However, performance against Green Belt purposes 1 & 3 is strong and is considered to play an important role in preventing sprawl and encroachment into the countryside. Whilst the site performs moderately well in terms of accessibility with medium constraints, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development.	x

<b>SLAA Site</b>	<b>Stage 3&amp;4</b>	<b>Green Belt Review</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Take Forward to Stage 6?</b>
312 – Jasmine Cottage and 1 & 2 Home Farm Cottages	Medium performing site in terms of both accessibility and constraints.	Within land parcel 9 in Green Belt Review Part 1 and scores moderately against purpose 1, weakly against purpose 2 and moderately against purpose 3. Green Belt Review Part 2 scores the sub-area (65) weakly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 & 3. Loss of the sub-area would harm wider Green Belt by promoting encroachment into an open and sensitive area of countryside.	Site performs medium in terms of accessibility and constraints. However, performance against Green Belt purposes 2 & 3 is moderate and is considered to play an important role in preventing encroachment into a sensitive area of countryside. Whilst the site performs moderately well in terms of accessibility and constraints and it is noted that planning permission has been granted under RU.15/1899 for 10 dwellings, given its Green Belt performance and role in the wider Green Belt, delivery of development needs is not considered to outweigh Green Belt protection in this instance. Release would therefore adversely affect the overall integrity, role and function of the Green Belt and would not promote sustainable patterns of development. Further, the area of land which would need to be released to form defensible and durable boundaries is not considered to be proportionate to the level of development which could be delivered, given the level of ancient and non-designated woodland on site which it would be favourable to retain. Whilst, this could be overcome if combined with site 212, this does not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.	x

SLAA Site	Stage 3&4	Green Belt Review	Comments	Take Forward to Stage 6?
323 – Cacti Nursery, Bousley Rise, Ottershaw	High-Medium performing site in terms of both accessibility and constraints	<p>Within land parcel 28 of Green Belt Review Part 1 which scores highly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 &amp; 3. Further refined land parcel finds that in general development of refined land parcel would not compromise purpose 1 and given site partially contained and bounded by physical features does not adversely impact gaps between Ottershaw, Addlestone, New Haw/Woking or cause further encroachment. Site falls within sub-area 11 in the Green Belt Review Part 2. Sub-area 11 scores weakly against purpose 1 and moderately against purposes 2 &amp; 3. Eastern part of sub-area plays a more substantive role in preventing coalescence, with western area more enclosed and less important at a strategic level. Sub-area refined to parcel 11i which finds that existing residential development in north east of parcel further reduces linkages with more rural open areas and its loss would not reduce overall scale of gap between settlements.</p>	<p>The site performs medium-high in terms of accessibility with low constraints. The wider land parcel performs strongly or relatively strongly against all three purposes with the further refined parcel not considered to compromise any of the three purposes. At the local level sub-area 11 does not play a role in preventing sprawl. The western part of sub-area 11 also does not play a role in preventing coalescence and is more infill in nature and less important at the strategic level. However, the area east of the footpath is considered to be more fundamental to the wider Green Belt in preventing coalescence of settlements and its loss would be harmful to the wider Green Belt. Sub-area 11 was further refined to parcel 11i and the release of the north east area this parcel, which includes site 323, was not considered to reduce the scale of gap between settlements given the existing development at Bousley Rise.</p> <p>It is considered that the footpath which runs to the west of the site can form a defensible and durable boundary and is the logical separation between the east and west areas of sub-area 11 and the refined parcel at 11i. Whilst Arup considered the north eastern area of sub-parcel 11i could be released from the Green Belt this is one of few instances where the Council disagree with the consultants. It is considered that the footpath running north-south remains the most defensible and durable feature to demarcate the Green Belt from the urban area. Whilst it is acknowledged that Bousley Rise is already developed to a certain degree, the site itself would form a pocket of development with Green Belt surrounding it to the north, south and east almost forming an incongruous small island of urban area surrounded by Green Belt which would threaten the permanence of boundaries especially south west of the site. Even if the site were to come forward with other properties at Bousley Rise, the irregular boundary pattern of properties at Bousley Rise and the features that form them are not considered to be defensible and durable boundaries with a degree of permanence. As such, whilst the site performs relatively highly in terms of accessibility with low impact of constraints and Green Belt purposes, it is not considered that defensible or durable boundaries could be derived which would threaten the permanence boundaries. As such, the site (and area in north east of parcel 11i) should remain in the Green Belt.</p>	x

<b>SLAA Site</b>	<b>Stage 3&amp;4</b>	<b>Green Belt Review</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Take Forward to Stage 6?</b>



## **Appendix 9 – Sustainability Objectives**

<b>Sustainability Objectives</b>	
1.	To conserve and enhance biodiversity, habitats and species
2.	To protect and improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health
3.	To protect soil and minerals resources
4.	To improve water quality and efficiency
5.	To increase resilience to climate change, including flood risk
6.	To reduce air and noise pollution
7.	To reduce greenhouse gas emissions
8.	To sustain economic growth and competitiveness across the Borough
9.	To ensure the provision of high quality, sustainable constructed and affordable homes and necessary community infrastructure
10.	To protect and enhance the Borough's historic assets
11.	To protect and enhance open space and the landscape character of the Borough

**Appendix 10 - Table of Representations on First Draft Site Selection Methodology & Assessment (2016) with Officer Responses**

Representor/Site	Representor Comments	Runnymede Response	Actions
<p>Ottershaw Properties Ltd</p> <p>Land to rear of 232 Brox Road, Ottershaw (Site 77)</p>	<p>The site and all the surrounding area is designated Green Belt, including that which is already developed. The Council is considering removing from the Green Belt other parcels of land in the vicinity of Brox Road. It is suggested that as part of its Borough-wide review, the council also rescind this site's Green Belt designation and include its curtilage within the settlement boundary so that it could be considered for planning permission for residential development.</p> <p>There is a designated public footpath to the south of the site which leads a short distance to the established settlement on Brox Road which is on a bus route which connects in turn with Woking about 4km to the south. The M25 and the M3 are both within a few minutes' drive of the site. Also within a short level walking distance of the site are local shops, a school, pub and other community facilities. St Peter's Hospital is about 1km to the north.</p> <p>The site itself is of limited environmental value having been for very many years a mono-culture of grass pasture. However it does benefit from being surrounded by mature trees and hedgerows, already much taller than any likely new buildings that might be created by a residential development. This total tree screen means the site is not overlooked from any directions and in turn none of the adjoining properties can be seen from the site. The access to Guilford Road however offers good straight sight-lines in both directions, north and south. All existing trees would be preserved and additional indigenous landscaping could be provided across the site to improve the local environment and bio-diversity.</p>	<p>The Runnymede draft Site Selection Methodology &amp; Assessment considered the site at 232 Brox Road having had regard to the sites performance against Green Belt as indicated in the Green Belt Review (2014) and sustainability. The SSMA concluded that the site should not be preferred for development.</p> <p>Comments regarding the site are noted as are the accessibility credentials of the site and performance against constraints which have again been considered in this SSMA along with performance against Green Belt purposes as indicated by the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Green Belt Reviews. For the reasons set out in this assessment in Table 5-4 and Appendix 8 it is considered that greater weight be attached to protection of the Green Belt and the site at 232 Brox Road not taken recommended for allocation.</p>	<p>No action.</p>
<p>Ashill</p> <p>Land at Fox Hills Road, Ottershaw (Site 284 known as Christmas Tree Site, Ottershaw)</p>	<p>The site has been assessed using the site selection methodology and the site performs well (appendix two of the representation on the Runnymede IOPA gives further detail).</p>	<p>This site was not considered within the draft Site Selection Methodology &amp; Assessment as the site was not known to the Council at the time of assessment. However, the site has now been considered within this version of the SSMA and within the Stage 2 Green Belt Review. Although the site performs well in terms of accessibility and constraints, for the reasons set out in</p>	<p>Assess site in Final Draft SSMA.</p>

Representor/Site	Representor Comments	Runnymede Response	Actions
		Table 5-4 and Appendix 8 of this assessment greater weight has been attached to protection of the Green Belt and the site is not recommended for allocation.	
Berkeley Homes  Crockford Bridge Farm (Site 205)	<p>The draft site selection methodology, which only takes Resultant Land Parcels forward to stage 6 is flawed because it fails to prioritise the most suitable sites for development and it relies upon the indicative number of dwellings given to each site to be deliverable. Sustainability criteria were not considered in the Green Belt Review and Crockford Bridge Farm is sustainable.</p> <p>In relation to the RLPs as strategic allocations, there is no evidence which 'automatically' shows that indicative capacity of the RLPs can realistically be provided. For example, sites 97, 99, 255 and 257 are directly adjacent to the M25 and M3 and densities of 35-45 dwellings per gross hectare are unrealistic given the buffer, public open space and landscaping areas that would be required to deliver a quality development. Furthermore, this density does not allow for Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGs) to be provided on site.</p>	<p>There is no mention of site capacity in the draft SSMA or this version of the SSMA and at no stage does it use capacity as a method to assess the suitability of a site. Further, the draft and this SSMA considers sites in the round to ensure that the performance of sites are compared to one another, rather than only taking some sites forward and not others.</p> <p>In any event the site at Crockford Bridge Farm has been appraised in this assessment for its performance against accessibility and constraints and although the site performed reasonably well, for the reasons set out in Table 5-4 and Appendix 8 of this assessment greater weight has been attached to protection of the Green Belt and the site is not recommended for allocation.</p> <p>The Council have undertaken further more detailed site capacity work since the publication of the IOPA which takes account of constraints such as M25/M3 and the need to provide SANG on or off site. This capacity work will be published alongside this version of the SSMA.</p>	No action.
IQ Planning Consultants  The Old Chalet, Callow Hill	New site identified through consultation.	This site was not considered within the draft SSMA as the site was not known to the Council at the time of assessment. The site has now been appraised in this version of the SSMA and for the reasons set out in Table	Assess site in Final Draft SSMA.

Representor/Site	Representor Comments	Runnymede Response	Actions
(Site 277)		5-4 and Appendix 8 greater weight has been attached to protection of the Green Belt and the site is not recommended for allocation.	
Surrey Wildlife Trust	<p>Support the use of criteria including proximity to SNCI and Ancient woodland, as well as alerts to potential loss of Natural and Semi-Natural Urban Green Space, within the 'Non-absolute constraint analysis'. Incidentally, we observe that there appear to be very few direct tensions regarding impact/loss of SNCI/AW.</p> <p>A similar consideration of proximity to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas might also have been useful, as an early recognition of opportunities within the development planning process for achieving their respective objectives/targets, which appears to include Site 254 (Veterinary Laboratory Site, Rowtown) as having part of a BOA R04 (River Wey &amp; tributaries) and Former DERA site, Longcross Road is wholly within BOA TBH01 (Chobham Commons North), or similarly BOA TBH02 (Chobham Commons South). The Surrey Nature Partnership has always harboured strong hopes that this situation would dictate a clear policy requirement to achieve significant Priority habitat restoration and/or creation (here Lowland heathland and Acid grassland) within and/or beyond both these sites. This might prove an opportunity for a test case of the effectiveness of strategic planning policy around BOAs in Surrey.</p>	<p>Support for criteria in the SSMA noted and welcomed.</p> <p>A similar consideration of proximity to BOAs is considered to be unnecessary as a sifting exercise as a BOA is a non-statutory designation and development on these areas is permitted. Whilst it is noted that the impact on a BOA should be taken into account (as it has been in Stage 4 of this SSMA) it is likely that if a site were allocated within a BOA or close to it, it should make a contribution to achieving their objectives/targets and consider priority habitat restoration. This would be true of the Vet Labs Site (Site 254) and the DERA site south, although DERA site north is already under construction (Sites 97 &amp; 99 known as Longcross Garden Village). The Local Plan could make this clear for individual allocations.</p>	No action for SSMA.
Steadman Consulting 47 Howards Lane, Addlestone (Site 274 known as Allington & 37, 47, 57 Howard's Lane, Rowtown)	Is there a reason why the land adjacent to SLAA site 154 (Land at Howards Lane, Row Town) was not included in the Site Selection Assessment? The same selection criteria apply should a Technical Review of the Green Belt be forthcoming.	This site was not considered within the draft SSMA as the site was not known to the Council at the time of assessment. The site has now been appraised in this version of the SSMA and for the reasons set out in Table 5-4 and Appendix 8 greater weight has been attached to protection of the Green Belt and the site is not	Assess site in Final Draft SSMA.

Representor/Site	Representor Comments	Runnymede Response	Actions
<p>Nexus Planning Ltd</p> <p>Villa Santa Maria, Chertsey (Site 219)</p>	<p>Analysis of the Site in the “Sustainability Appraisal of the Issues and Options” document (July 2016) confirms that the Site scores positively against a number of Sustainability Appraisal objectives. It concludes in summary that the Site is currently in residential use so development is likely to have a neutral impact on landscape character. It further suggests that if the Site provided open space it would score positively with regard to protecting and enhancing open space.</p> <p>The Site has no role when assessed against Green Belt purposes, 2, 4 and 5. Against purposes 1 and 3 it is clear that the Site performs only very weakly. The Site when viewed in isolation contains clear and defensible boundaries. Furthermore, it would see a significant gap retained to the B389, it would not represent ribbon development and would not result in the merging of settlements.</p> <p>The Site Selection Methodology concluded that the Site is medium performing in terms of accessibility and constraints. Central Government research states that distances of less than 2km are suited to journeys on foot whilst the Institute of Highways and Transportation Guidelines suggest a maximum ‘acceptable’ walking distance for pedestrians without mobility impairment is 2km. Central government research also explains that for journeys of less than 5km, cycling has the potential to replace trips by car. Site is within acceptable walking distance of a wide range of key facilities whilst a host of additional facilities, including the Chertsey Health Centre, are well within an acceptable 5km cycling distance.</p> <p>Bus routes 446 and 461 operate less than a 10 minute walk</p>	<p>recommended for allocation.</p> <p>Comments on the sustainability appraisal are noted, but this is not the only determining factor when allocating sites.</p> <p>A finer grained Stage 2 Green Belt Review has been undertaken which considers smaller sub-areas of land including the sub-area covering site 219. The Stage 2 Green Belt Review continues to conclude that the site performs strongly against Green Belt purposes and loss would be harmful to the wider Green Belt.</p> <p>The Institute of Highways &amp; Transportation guidance mentioned is presumably the document titled ‘Providing for Journeys on Foot’ and dates from 1999-2000. This sets out suggested acceptable walking distances for a range of facilities with a preferred maximum for commuting &amp; schools as 2km but for elsewhere 1.2km. Further guidance from 2015 also sets out walk distances to bus stops and rail stations as 400m &amp; 800m respectively (ref 14) and the Manual for Streets considers 800m as an accessible walking distance. As such the use of 2km for all facilities is not an indication of accessibility. The SSMA also uses a distance to facilities by taking the visual centre of a site and then measuring shortest route by path not as the crow flies. There is no reference in the representation as to whether this methodology has been employed. In terms of the cycle distance to health</p>	<p>Review accessibility &amp; constraints</p>

Representor/Site	Representor Comments	Runnymede Response	Actions
	<p>from the Site providing regular bus services to a range of centres including Weybridge, Staines, Woking, Kingston-upon-Thames and Addlestone. Staines with its wide range of shops, leisure and employment opportunities is only 5km away and can be reached in approximately 15 minutes either by bus or bicycle. Chertsey Railway Station is situated just over 1km from the Site. When assessed in accordance with the methodology used in the Site Selection document, we consider that the Site should be given a score of 'medium-high' rather than 'medium' as concluded within the analysis included at Appendix 3. On that basis the accessibility of the Villa Santa Maria is no lower than the majority of the RLPs from the Arup work and higher than those at the former DERA site and Virginia Water South and Virginia Water West.</p> <p>The Draft Site Selection Methodology and Assessment states that there is a landfill within 250m of the Site. However, there is no known landfill within this distance and this is assumed to be an error.</p>	<p>centres, not all users of a health centre will necessarily be able to cycle due to infirmity or because it is not practical. The distance to secondary education has been measured to Sir William Perkins School which is a private single sex school and as such not a suitable comparator.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the accessibility and constraints at the site were re-appraised in this assessment and confirm that the site performs medium in terms of accessibility and constraints and for the reasons set out in Table 5-4 and Appendix 8 greater weight has been attached to protection of the Green Belt and the site is not recommended for allocation.</p> <p>Noted. This has been checked and no issues highlighted so reference removed from Stage 4 assessment.</p>	
Bracknell Forest Council	<p>Draft Site Selection Methodology includes a section on the assessment of sites and the Green Belt Review – paragraph 4.55 should be amended in light of the level of need for development in Runnymede. NPPF makes clear that Green Belt boundaries can be altered in exceptional circumstances. BFBC feels that the restrictive nature of national policy relating to the Green Belt is being over emphasised.</p>	<p>The draft SSMA and this version of the SSMA considered both the sustainability of sites in terms of accessibility and constraints as well as performance against Green Belt purposes. In other words it considers the balance between sustainability and Green Belt purposes and this is set out in paras 4.50-4.63 of this SSMA. Whilst the level of housing need in Runnymede is noted, paragraph 47 of the NPPF sets out that full OAN should be met as far as is consistent with policies set out in the Framework and para 14 that OAN should be met unless specific policies in the framework indicate development should be restricted (this includes Green Belt). As such the restrictive nature of national policy in terms of Green Belt</p>	No action.



Representor/Site	Representor Comments	Runnymede Response	Actions
		<p>is not being over emphasised.</p> <p>Therefore the ability of Runnymede to meet OAN will need to take account of policies in the NPPF which constrain development but seek to balance growth with the need to do so sustainably.</p>	
<p>Turley Associates</p> <p>Parcel A – Chertsey Bittams (Site 255A)</p>	<p>Supportive of the multi-step approach undertaken with regard to identifying positive and negative impacts that may arise from a development, and relating Green Belt considerations to the delivery of sustainable development.</p> <p>The site (Parcel A of ID255) directly abuts the existing settlement boundary of Chertsey South, which is identified as an existing urban area within RBC’s adopted Local Plan which provides a range of local facilities and is within easy access of Chertsey itself by bus or on foot, with the train station providing onward services to Reading or London Waterloo. The site provides an opportunity to deliver an extension to the existing urban boundary, infilling the existing land between the settlement and the M25 to the east. Access to the site can be gained from Green Lane which can feed into the wider strategic highway network around Chertsey.</p> <p>RBC has assessed the ID255 through its Sustainability Appraisal IOPA 2016 at Appendix 2. As such, we have provided an updated table, in line with the Council’s own methodology to assist in demonstrating that Parcel A of ID255 should continue to be promoted for allocation albeit with the potential for it to come forward in isolation to the wider Chertsey Bittams allocation within the New Local Plan.</p> <p>Through these representations our Client seek to confirm the availability and deliverability of the land over the plan period and would be willing to meet to discuss the opportunities for</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The findings of the IOPA SA have now fed into this version of the SSMA, including individual parcel A at Chertsey Bittams.</p> <p>Availability of the site is noted.</p>	<p>No action.</p>

Representor/Site	Representor Comments	Runnymede Response	Actions
	<p>the site to come forward separately to the wider ID255 site and earlier in the plan period.</p>		
<p>ECA Architects</p> <p>Land at Ten Acre Lane, Thorpe (Site 42 known as CEMEX 1, Ten Acre Lane, Thorpe)</p>	<p>We have the following specific objections to the Draft Site Allocation Selection Methodology and Assessment (the assessment) and attach a table of detailed comments on the assessment of some sites, highlighting irregularities. Our research indicates that the Assessment is unsound on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. Smaller sites on the edge of Thorpe are proposed for removal from the Green Belt. In the proposed boundary change and for the purposes of assessment, these green belt sites have therefore been considered as part of the urban area. But this is highly inconsistent with the methodology used to assess other sites in the green belt and is also not consistent with all sites adjoining Thorpe Village, including the TREG site on Ten Acre Lane.</p>	<p>1. The GBVR Stage 2 does not consider the small areas on the edge of Thorpe as 'sites'. The GBVR Stage 2 identified these areas through consideration of how each area of the village as set out in the map tiles in appendix 1 of the GBVR performs against Green Belt purposes. As such, the process for assessing where the most logical and defensible boundary should be placed between the village and Green Belt. How large sites which could be allocated for development are considered in the SSMA rather than where a village boundary should sit, is not comparable. At no point in the GBVR Stage 2 are the small areas around Thorpe considered to form part of the 'urban area' but are assessed on their merits in accordance with the methodology set out in the GBVR Stage 2 which complements the wider Stage 1 Green Belt Review. Whilst it is noted that the SSMA identifies these areas as 'urban sites', this is only for the purposes of identifying the buffer around settlements for the Stage 1 sift of sites in the SSMA. As such, this is not comparable to the assessment in the GBVR Stage 2 which looks at the location for a village boundary. If the SSMA had found that one of the larger sites on the edge of Thorpe could be allocated for development, then the GBVR Stage 2 would have taken this into account when considering options for the location for the village</p>	<p>Review site in Final Draft SSMA.</p>

Representor/Site	Representor Comments	Runnymede Response	Actions
	<p>2. The assessment was informed by the Stage 2 Green Belt Villages Review, but this part of the evidence base inappropriately designates Thorpe Industrial Estate as part of the green belt and open countryside. This is wholly inconsistent with not only its existing built up character but also its current designation within the urban area on the current Local Plan Policies Map. This methodology is therefore unsound as it is contrary to the NPPF which no longer allows for 'Major developed Sites' in the green belt. It is extremely built up and does not serve the five main purposes of the green belt and should therefore be considered as part of the urban area for assessment purposes. It is also within walking distance to Egham and Thorpe.</p> <p>3. A more detailed critique of the individual sites assessments is attached as Table 1 and specific objections in relation to Site 42, Ten Acre Lane, Thorpe are set out below. These confirm that the assessment is unsound as it makes some completely incorrect assumptions at each stage as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stage 1: Initial Sift: The site passes this stage which confirms that it is completely comparable with other large strategic sites;</li> <li>• Stage 2: SEA of Sites: The SEA is not used to exclude sites at this stage in the process. The site therefore passes this stage. 39 potential housing sites and 6 employment sites are</li> </ul>	<p>boundary.</p> <p>2. The GBVR Stage 2 does not state that the Thorpe Industrial Estate is Green Belt or a 'Major Developed Site' in the Green Belt and neither does the SSMA. Neither does the NPPF set out how areas such as the industrial estate should be considered when selecting sites for allocation and therefore the methodology cannot be contrary to it. Again, the reason for not considering the Thorpe Industrial Estate as part of the urban area for the purposes of the SSMA is that the industrial estate is not a stand-alone settlement with its own services and facilities but is an employment area only. To consider a stand-alone area designated as urban area but which has no facilities or services and performs no residential function as a suitable area to expand for housing would be nonsensical. As such the buffer used for the Stage 2 Green Belt Review and Stage 1 of this SSMA does not include Thorpe Industrial Estate as part of the urban area. However, Site 42 passed Stage 1 of this SSMA.</p> <p>3. Noted, the site passed Stage 1 as it fell within a 200m buffer of the village of Thorpe.</p> <p>Noted, however scoring between sites is not considered to be inconsistent.</p>	

Representor/Site	Representor Comments	Runnymede Response	Actions
	<p>selected and assessed. This seems to be a sufficient amount and the sites are reasonable alternatives. However the scoring between the sites is inconsistent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stage 3: Accessibility and Significant Non-Absolute Constraints: We object to the scoring methodology which should be weighted for some constraints. We object to the 'Constraints Impact' score of 'Medium-High' which is based on the site scoring poorly in 2/6 criteria. No weight is given to the fact that it scores far higher than other sites on other criteria. For example, in relation to 'Major Centres Journey Time and/or Walk Time from Public Transport to Employment, the site scores '19 minutes to Staines and 250 metres to the bus stop' which is the 3/39 sites assessed. We agree that the site is relatively inaccessible to a Health Centre, but we do not agree that a Health Centre could not be provided in any redevelopment of the site. We have experience of providing health care on redevelopment sites and consider this to be a viable option here. No health centre will be provided in conjunction with other development sites in Thorpe which have been allocated. The site could easily provide this and make this site together with the neighbouring Thorpe Village a more sustainable location for development.</li> </ul> <p>Stage 4: Assessment of Significant Non-Absolute Constraints- The site receives a Red score as it is states that it is 'Grade 1 or 2' Agricultural. Our recent report confirms that it is Grade 3 Agricultural Land Value and the scoring and therefore the assessment is unsound and not sufficiently robust. This table also states that '100% of the site is within a minerals safeguarded area and constrained by previous or potential extraction'. Minerals have never been extracted from the site and planning permission was previously refused</p>	<p>Noted, however each constraint has been considered qualitatively based on the information available at the time of assessment. In concluding how a site performs either in terms of 'accessibility' or 'constraints' it is the balance across all parameters that was considered and each site was considered on its merits in the round rather than the scoring of points for comparison. Weighting of constraints/accessibility is not therefore considered to be necessary or reasonable. The site has been reappraised in this version of the SSMA with a medium impact on constraints, taking account of information submitted to Runnymede with respect to minerals and agricultural land value, but continues to score low-medium in terms of accessibility, not only because of access to health but also because of poor bus services, accessibility to rail and secondary education facilities. In terms of the site being able to provide health facilities no viability evidence has been submitted to corroborate this and no evidence of discussions with relevant health authorities has been submitted.</p> <p>Submission of agricultural report and minerals report noted and scoring has been re-assessed on this basis as set out above. However, consideration of agricultural land value and minerals is still part of Stage 3 not Stage 4 of this SSMA.</p>	

Representor/Site	Representor Comments	Runnymede Response	Actions
	<p>for mineral extraction. There is no potential in the future as it is surplus to Cemex requirements and was sold by them.</p> <p>The site should therefore have been taken forward to Stage 5.</p>	<p>The site has been reassessed and was sifted out of the SSMA process at Stage 3 given its overall low-medium score. In any event should the site have passed through to stage 5, the Stage 2 Green Belt Review found that the sub-area performed strongly against all Green Belt purposes.</p>	
<p>Boyer Planning</p> <p>Stroude Road Farm, Virginia Water (Site 13)</p>	<p>Representation contains several appraisals of sites in the draft SSMA including appraising accessibility and constraints.</p>	<p>Appraisals noted, however all sites appraised within this version of the SSMA have been considered on a consistent basis in line with the methodology set out. It is noted that the scoring methodology in the Boyer representations is different to the SSMA and as such is not comparable. Site 13 passed through stages 1, 3 and 4 and although performed reasonably well in terms of accessibility and constraints for the reasons set out in Table 5-4 and Appendix 8 greater weight has been attached to protection of the Green Belt and the site is not recommended for allocation.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>OSP Architecture</p> <p>Charnwood Nurseries, Woodham (site 29)</p>	<p>The site falls from the methodology at stage 5 due to the conclusion that “if [the site were] developed [it] would adversely affect the integrity, role and function of the Green Belt”.</p> <p>Given the conclusions of section 4 of this document this conclusion is challenged. Particular weight appears to be given to the potential for urban sprawl and this does not reflect that fact that the site already contains built form and is largely screened from the wider landscape (issues on which the site performs better than the allocated Ottershaw East site).</p> <p>It would therefore be contended that the site should have</p>	<p>Comments noted. Site 29 passed through stages 1, 3 and 4 of this SSMA and has been considered again in Stage 5 in light of the findings of the Green Belt Review Stage 2 which considers smaller sub-areas of land within the Green Belt such as site 29. Whilst the site performed well against accessibility and constraints, for the reasons set out in Table 5-4 and Appendix 8 greater weight has been attached to protection of the Green Belt and the site is not recommended for allocation. The Green Belt Review Stage 2 highlighted the sub-area as performing strongly against all 3 Green Belt purposes.</p>	<p>No action</p>

Representor/Site	Representor Comments	Runnymede Response	Actions
	<p>progressed further in the draft site selection methodology and assessment process and that the criteria have been inaccurately applied to the site in this regard.</p>		
<p>Mr &amp; Mrs Holdaway  Land at Howards Lane, Rowtown (Site 154)</p>	<p>Land at Howards Lane site or part of site should be reconsidered in the site selection methodology and taken forward for allocation. The site could accommodate more than 10 dwellings and could be classified as infill. Representation includes comments about the 2014 Arup Green Belt Review.</p> <p>Common land for general recreation is located only two minutes from the site and the public footpath which runs along-side is a shortcut to Ottershaw CofE School.</p> <p>Three infant/junior schools in walking distance. Ongar Place 0.7miles; Holy Family 0.7miles, Grange Infants/New Haw Junior 1.2miles and Ottershaw CofE 1.5miles via Howards Lane. Secondary Schools are Fullbrook 1.5miles and Jubilee High 1mile. Local convenience stores are Ongar Parade 0.5miles and Co-Op at The Broadway, New Haw 1.2miles. Large children's playing space is 5 min walk along Rowtown and another 1 mile away in New Haw.</p> <p>Nearest Health Centre is Crouch Oak in Addlestone 1.4miles away with nearest train station at Addlestone 1.7miles , West Byfleet 2.6miles and Woking 4.1miles.</p> <p>All 'services' are in place.</p>	<p>Noted. The draft SSMA and this version of the SSMA already recognises that the site is capable of delivering 10 or more dwellings. In terms of Green Belt a Stage 2 Review has been undertaken which considered smaller sub-areas of land including site 154.</p> <p>Distance to local services highlighted in the response are noted, however standards to various services have been set out in the draft SSMA and refined in this draft final version of the SSMA and are taken from best practice or recognised standards in terms of sustainability i.e. 10 minute walk times.</p> <p>The site has been re-appraised in line with these standards to ensure that distances to local services are correct. The point regarding the public footpath through to Ottershaw is noted, however, to be considered as a route through to services in Ottershaw, it would have to be a formal footpath, given that adverse weather conditions, especially in the winter months could render the route inaccessible, especially to those with restricted mobility or young families. Making the public footpath into a formal pedestrian footway may not be appropriate given its purpose as access to the countryside and its Green Belt setting.</p> <p>As such the site passed through to stage 5 of this SSMA and although the site performs reasonably well against accessibility and constraints for the reasons set out in Table 5-4 and Appendix 8 greater weight has been attached to protection of the Green Belt and the site is not</p>	<p>Re-appraise site against accessibility.</p>

Representor/Site	Representor Comments	Runnymede Response	Actions
		recommended for allocation.	
<p>Hadley Cooper</p> <p>Land at Norlands Lane, Thorpe (Site 220)</p>	<p>SLAA site 220 did not pass through Stage 1 as it was deemed not to be in 'close proximity' to a settlement or capable of forming its own settlement.</p> <p>If site 220 had proceeded to Stage 3, it could be inferred that site 220 would have a medium score for Accessibility performance. Looking at the reference sites it would appear that they were not taken forward to Stage 4 essentially because there were significant non-absolute constraints in the form of either minerals or grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. As the subject site has neither of these constraints – it could be inferred that the site would have a medium score.</p> <p>In stage 5 of the process, the site would have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. The Green Belt Review took a relatively high level view of the General Area 12, within which site 220 lies. The review correctly identified constraints within this large area but the site 220 represents less than 10 percent of the General Area. Site 220 does not have any of the constraints identified. So if a 'finer grained review of the Green Belt sites' was undertaken the site could be released for development and taken forward to Stage 6.</p> <p>Within Stage 6 the site would have been assessed for Availability and Achievability. The commentary within the Final Interim SLAA June 2016 makes reference to Developability/Deliverability/ Availability &amp; Achievability. The site would score highly on each of these items. Discussions are well advanced with the Lands Trust in respect of the development and on-going management of the proposed</p>	<p>Comments regarding proximity to urban area noted. Stage 1 has now employed a buffer around urban areas and as the site falls within 200m of Thorpe Village, it has passed through to Stage 2.</p> <p>Site 220 has proceeded to Stage 3 and scored low-medium overall with a medium level of accessibility but medium-high impact on constraints, largely due to 63% of the site being within Flood Risk Zone 2 where sequentially there may be preferable sites which can avoid flood risk or are sited on less area within flood zone 2. Minerals were also an issue where it is unknown if the constraint can be overcome and no evidence to the contrary has been submitted.</p> <p>If the site had passed through to stage 5 the Stage 2 Green Belt Review found that the sub-area performed strongly against Green Belt purposes 1 &amp; 2 and moderately against purpose 3 and loss would be considered harmful to wider Green Belt.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Assess site in Final Draft SSMA.</p>

Representor/Site	Representor Comments	Runnymede Response	Actions
	<p>parkland and arrangements to pay for this on-going management have been discussed such that no costs would fall as an obligation to any public body. The site is in single ownership with certain short term lettings of the four residential dwellings and although the gas monitoring station is still required this could be moved within the site so as not to affect the remainder of the site.</p> <p>Appreciated that the site selection process has to adhere to a defined methodology, has to be consistent and out of necessity has to be relatively high level and as such any comments made above are not intended as any form of criticism. Site 220 is available, deliverable and as envisaged is suitable for release from the Green Belt, which makes it no different to other sites that have been identified as resultant land parcels suitable for allocation in the Local Plan. The site would be suitable for a high quality sustainable residential scheme that will make a significant contribution to an acknowledged housing shortfall within the Borough.</p>	Noted.	
<p>White Young Green Land North of Green Lane, Addlestone (Site 24 known as Land at Prairie Road, Hatch Close &amp; Hatch Farm, Addlestone)</p>	<p>Representation contains several appraisals of preferred sites in the IOPA and considers these to be inferior in terms of sustainability credentials to site 24 and that this is confirmed in the draft SSMA which acknowledges site 24 as medium-high performing in terms of accessibility with no absolute or non-absolute constraints.</p>	<p>Noted. Site 24 continues to perform medium-high in this version of the SSMA and although performing well in terms of accessibility and constraints for the reasons set out in Table 5-4 and Appendix 8 greater weight has been attached to protection of the Green Belt and the site is not recommended for allocation.</p>	No action



**Appendix 11 - Table of Representations on Final Draft Site Selection Methodology & Assessment (May 2017) with Officer Responses**

Representor & Site	Summary of Representation(s)	RBC Comments	Actions
<p>Turley Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey</p> <p>Rep 651</p> <p>Parcel A, Chertsey Bittams</p>	<p>With regard to the Site Selection Methodology (Version 2) which has been published to support this consultation, the document assesses the site in the form of a high level Sustainability Appraisal which highlights the high level of accessibility of the site. In addition, it further demonstrates the relatively unconstrained nature of the site to accommodate development with any potential noise, air quality or flood risk implications able to be mitigated through careful design. In addition, it sets out that there are strong existing site boundaries which will prevent further sprawl and avoid the merging of settlements. The prevailing area is noted as being sub-urban in character which has diminished the quality of the site as open countryside. On the basis of the above, the Council concluded that great weight is attached to meeting development needs and thus the site is proposed as a residential allocation through Green Belt release. This position is supported by our Client.</p>	<p>Noted, although the SSMA takes account of the SA rather than being a high level SA in its own right.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>DPDS on behalf of Smech Properties Ltd</p> <p>Rep no 675</p> <p>Longcross Garden Village</p>	<p>Table 5-2 of the SSMA V2 May 2017 sets out the overall performance of housing sites against accessibility and constraints and finds the DERA accessibility performance as low – which is the lowest possible rating to the scoring system.</p> <p>Based on this evidence it is hard to understand why the Council are persisting with the idea that the site will be a sustainable location.</p> <p>Map submitted with representation showing all services in Runnymede within 1km, 2km and 3km of the site.</p> <p>SSMA V2 May 2017 also identifies the DERA north land parcel as containing possible features within the site which reflect BOA objectives and a ‘current planning permission for the site would have considerable biodiversity issues’</p> <p>There are many other, currently non-preferred sites, which the Council have overlooked in favour of pursuing the DERA site, illustrated with our Appendix 1 that there are many other sites located in more accessible locations.</p>	<p>The Council can confirm that it has assessed all potential site allocations through its Site Selection Methodology and Assessment and this work has guided the Council in its selection of sites for allocation in the Local Plan. The Council continues to work with land owners and site promoters to ensure that that the deliverability/developability of sites is clearly understood. Whilst it is acknowledged by the Council that at the current time the Longcross site is less sustainable than a number of the other allocations proposed through the Local Plan, this site is considered to offer a unique opportunity to provide a new exemplar settlement in the Borough over the period of the Local Plan which would epitomise good practice in the delivery of sustainable new communities and their supporting infrastructure. Should the site continue to be proposed for allocation in the Local Plan, a detailed policy will be produced for the site which will set out the Council’s vision for the site and the specific policy requirements to ensure that the site will be a sustainable new settlement. This is likely to require that the settlement contains a range of facilities and services to serve its new population, a range of employment opportunities, and a range of sustainable and active travel choices both within the village and linking to other settlements in the area.</p>	<p>No action</p>

Representor & Site	Summary of Representation(s)	RBC Comments	Actions
		The Council is of the opinion that its approach to site selection has been proactive and thorough. The Council's Site Selection work supports that the allocations consulted on in the ASO consultation as the most appropriate and sustainable areas for growth over the period of the Local Plan.	
Carter Planning Ltd on behalf of the Gribble Family  Rep 1215  Chilsey Green Farm, Pycroft Road, Chertsey	Site passed through all stages of SSMA and is proposed for allocation and SSMA concluded that any negative effects could be mitigated and was considered viable and available. Submit that these conclusions hold good for land to the rear or south of Grange Farm and that this should be included in the Local Plan to provide greater certainty to housing land supply.	Comments made regarding the conclusions drawn in the SSMA are noted. In regard to the comments made about the area of the site considered in the SSMA, the area of the preferred allocation at the time of the production of this evidence base study was assessed. The SSMA will be amended as necessary to reflect any subsequent alterations that are made to the area of this allocation or any other allocations being proposed by the Council.	Update SSMA to include larger site
Armstrong Rigg Planning on behalf of Oakford Homes  Rep 1234  Barrsbrook Cattery, Chertsey	The SSMA said the amount of Green Belt that would need to be release to accommodate what would be a limited amount of developable land is disproportionate.  The site could accommodate 30-36 dwellings and make a valuable contribution to the council's consistent undersupply of housing. -level of housing on site not considered disproportionate as the sites do not meet NPPF Green Belt objectives	Version 2 of the SSMA concludes that the site should not be taken forward, in part as it would be a disproportionate amount of land removed for residential development and greater weight was attached to the Green Belt and the Council are still of this opinion.	No action
Mrs J Tregellis  Rep 1266 & Separate Reps made on SSMA/SLAA in July & November 2017  79 Woodham Park Rd & 79 to 87a Woodham Park Rd	SLAA site ID122 does have capacity for 10 or more dwellings and should be included within the site selection process for allocation as a standalone site not incorporated with SLAA ID268.  Comments made by Arup in Green belt Review Part 2 should not have been regurgitated and incorrectly attributed to SLAA ID268 at Stage 5 in the site selection process. ID268 has not been assessed in isolation and it would be impossible for the site and the Arup parcel to have the same overall assessment due to difference in size and topography.  SLAA ID268 scored on par or more positively within stages 1-	Comment is noted. A site layout plan submitted to the Council by the proponents with their correspondence and shows a layout with 11 dwellings (10 net). Whilst it is noted that the layout is only indicative, given the overall size and shape of the site and location of on-site features such as trees worthy of retention, the Council does not consider that the site is capable of delivering 10 net additional units if allocated and brought into the urban area.  Whilst comments regarding appropriateness of attributing Arup comments on sub-area 1 to site 268 are noted, it was felt by Arup that the site's western boundary was not strongly established, regular and consistent to form a sub-area in its own right. As such, it is considered that the Arup comments on sub-area 1 in the Stage 2 GBR are applicable in that it is not appropriate to disaggregate sub-area 1 into smaller parcels because of the lack of a	No action

Representor & Site	Summary of Representation(s)	RBC Comments	Actions
	<p>4 than sites SLAA ID254 (Parcel B, Vet Labs, Rowtown) and ID263 (Ottershaw East) but failed stage 5 of the process with the content in the comments section a regurgitation from Arup's Green Belt Review Part 2 for sub-area 1, incorrectly applied to ID268.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal shows site ID268 as a more favourable sustainable site for development than ID254 and ID263.</p> <p>All sites within ID268 are previously developed and fulfil the criteria for land to be allocated for housing and are judged sustainable. There is no encroachment into countryside and if suggested otherwise this places too high a burden on the land in respect of this. The definition of countryside is 'land and scenery of a rural area' which befits ID254 and ID263 more than ID268 which is all on previously developed land, has the benefit of a main road frontage, described as semi-urban in character with an urban feel and is more sustainable.</p> <p>Development of ID268 would not cause sprawl or encroach into the countryside as development would be retained within existing curtilages. Arup point out that southern boundary of sub-area 1 needs strengthening on southern boundary and this can be readily overcome by way of strategic planting. SLAA ID122 already has a defensible boundary.</p> <p>Any negative effects attributed to SLAA ID254 or ID263 in GB Review Part 2 or in the SA have either been overlooked or minimised by others, irrespective of the conclusions reached from the evidence leaving the impression that development is preferred on these sites regardless of findings.</p> <p>SLAA ID122 and ID268 are the only suitable areas of Green Belt in Woodham which fulfil the criteria for housing</p>	<p>defensible/durable boundary. The Council concurs with Arup's response, the full version of which can be found on the same web-page as the Council's response to representations made at the Additional Sites and Options consultation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Comment noted, however Sustainability Appraisal needs to be considered in the context of other Local Plan evidence, including the Site Selection Methodology &amp; Assessment and Green Belt Reviews.</p> <p>Comment noted. Arup have responded to this point and comment that at a strategic level, the regularisation of development within the site (and those adjacent) would 'negatively impact the strategic green belt by protruding into the countryside and visually reducing the distance between settlements', thus undermining Purpose 2 in a more strategic sense. In terms of the definition of countryside, this is not the only consideration in whether an area of land meets Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>As stated above it is not considered that SLAA site 122 is capable of delivering 10 net additional units and would not be considered in isolation.</p> <p>Noted, however the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal need to be considered in the round with other evidence supporting the Local Plan including the Green Belt Reviews which have recommended that sites 254 and 263 could be released from the Green Belt. Further, the SA sets out that where negative effects occur these could be mitigated and Stage 6 of the SSMA considers this. As such, negative effects have not been overlooked or minimised.</p> <p>Noted, however the Council is not aware of representations raising concerns of a lack of housing allocations in Woodham other than site promoters.</p>	

Representor & Site	Summary of Representation(s)	RBC Comments	Actions
	allocation. There is genuine concern there has been no allocation for housing within Woodham.		
<p>Tarmac</p> <p>Rep 1475</p> <p>Land North of Thorpe Industrial Estate</p>	<p>The site selection methodology and assessment carried out in 2017 makes note within the 'Assessment of Significant Non-Absolute Constraints (Employment)' that:</p> <p>a. 'There are some flood risks on site but these are largely outside of fluvial flood zones and could be mitigated by drainage/SuDS design.'</p> <p>A flood risk assessment would be carried out prior to any planning application with plans to mitigate any flood risk.</p> <p>b. "Archaeological importance could be dealt with by condition."</p> <p>Any planning application would include plans maintain and protect the area of archaeological significance.</p> <p>c. 'The site is identified within a mineral safeguarding area constrained by previous extraction. This could be a major constraint to development and will require more in depth consideration, but at this time it is not known whether constraint could be overcome.'</p> <p>The history of the site has been noted and Tarmac are carrying out studies to ascertain the condition of the site. Any planning application will be supported by the results of the investigation to show the areas whereby built development is deliverable.</p> <p>d. 'The whole site is also considered to be open space which would be lost to development. However development could retain some of this on site, but land of lesser environmental value should be preferred.'</p> <p>The indicative schemes put forward note that an area of open space would be retained to the northern boundary of the site which would allow access to the wider countryside to the east. This would include additional landscaping and planting to create an area that would feel 'open'.</p>	<p>Comments on constraints are noted and will be taken into account in the final SSMA, although without further evidence on the minerals constraint this is likely to remain unchanged.</p> <p>The SSMA also considered the accessibility of the site for residential or employment use and considered this to be low-medium with poor access to a number of local facilities such as health, primary education and retail facilities. This, along with the performance of constraints, particularly the minerals issue which still remains to be concluded, the site was not taken forward for further analysis of its performance against Green Belt as it is not considered to be a sustainable location.</p>	<p>Update constraints section of SSMA</p>
<p>CBRE on behalf of Ashill Developments Ltd</p> <p>Rep 1481</p> <p>Xmas Tree Farm, Ottershaw</p>	<p>CBRE has concerns regarding the site selection methodology used in the Council's SSMA and considers there is a lack of transparency in respect of final site selection which results in a lack of clarity and ultimately undermines the soundness of the proposed plan. The Council have applied an 8 stage approach for the site selection assessment.</p>	<p>Concerns noted, however the Council considers that its SSMA fairly weighs up the sustainability credentials of a site in terms of its accessibility and constraints and its performance against Green Belt purposes and the permanence of proposed boundaries.</p>	<p>No action</p>

Representor & Site	Summary of Representation(s)	RBC Comments	Actions
	<p>The NPPF at paragraph 84 states that when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. The consideration of the site in proximity to key settlements and accessibility to facilities is assessed early on in the process.</p> <p>The Ottershaw site reached stage 5 of the assessment (Assess sites taken forward from stages 1, 3 and 4 with findings of the Green Belt Reviews) until it was discounted on account of the findings in Green Belt Review Part 2 (2017). The SSMA notes that the site is a medium-high performing site against accessibility with low constraints but the need to provide housing or employment land did not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The balancing exercise, for not only this site but the majority of others assessed in the SSMA, is unduly limited. For example, the analysis does not weigh up the significant benefits the scheme would bring in terms of delivery of housing and essential infrastructure as set out in the following section of our representations.</p> <p>Recent case law has demonstrated that Councils need to put forward a robust case to demonstrate whether exceptional circumstances exist to release a site from the Green Belt, including the nature and extent of harm to the Green Belt, and to what extent the impacts can be mitigated. There is no clear and/or sufficiently detailed rationale in the SSMA from the Council demonstrating exceptional circumstances to release the preferred housing sites in the Green Belt. There is a lack of transparency with respect to the plan.</p>	<p>Reference to para 84 of the NPPF is noted, however it is not considered that releasing sites in locations which perform strongly against Green Belt purposes would create sustainable patterns of development in line with the NPPF. As such the balancing exercise for each site is not considered to be limited and has been consistently applied taking account of the need to deliver sustainable development whilst taking account of Green Belt performance.</p> <p>In terms of exceptional circumstances the Council will be preparing a background document on its approach to exceptional circumstances at the Regulation 19 stage of consultation.</p>	
<p>Savills on behalf of the Crown Estate</p> <p>Rep 1491</p> <p>Land south of St David's Drive &amp; Robert's Way, Englefield Green</p>	<p>The Site must be re-assessed under the SSMA due to incorrect Green Belt Review analysis. Other sites taken forward under SSMA (e.g. Blay's House) also performed moderately against accessibility/ constraints but weakly against the purposes of the Green Belt and are proposed as 'Additional Preferred Sites'. On this basis the TCE land should be allocated.</p>	<p>The SSMA considers the site to be medium performing against accessibility and constraints, however was not taken forward for allocation or release due to its performance against the Green Belt. The Arup Stage 2 Green Belt Review considered the sub-area of land performed strongly against Green Belt purposes and as such its allocation or release would not form sustainable patterns of development. Arup have responded to their scoring of the sub-area and the Council concur with their response. On that basis it is not proposed to re-evaluate the site in the SSMA.</p>	<p>No action</p>

Representor & Site	Summary of Representation(s)	RBC Comments	Actions
<p>Pegasus Groups on behalf of St Edward</p> <p>Rep 1498</p> <p>Land at Great Grove Farm</p>	<p>Do not consider the Council's approach to be robust. There are two underlying reasons for this:</p> <p>i. The sites have not been properly assessed, meaning the additional allocations are not the most appropriate</p> <p>i. Assessment of Sites</p> <p>-The principle of a further Green Belt Review (GBRP2) being undertaken, with a more finely grained approach to assess sites which make up part of a larger parcel, is supported.</p> <p>- The Council have suggested they will use the findings of the GBRP2 to inform their subsequent allocations. However, the Council's Site Selection Methodology &amp; Assessment has failed to give proper consideration to such findings. This is clearly illustrated by the Council's consideration of SLAA site 46 in the SSMA (sub area 25 in the GBRP2).</p> <p>-Site 46 was identified within the GBRP2 as only having a moderate overall score against the Green Belt purposes, as were the two subsequent additional allocations at Blays House and St Peters Hospital. Site 46 actually had an identical score (of 6) as St Peters Hospital, and was very similar to Blays House (5). All 3 sites were therefore part of the 45 areas that the GBRP2 recommended to the Council for further consideration -ie they had been identified as not being the best performing sites in the Green Belt, and their allocation for development, would not detract significantly from the Green Belt.</p> <p>-The GBRP2 did not confirm they should be allocated, due to the need to consider other matters in the balancing exercise, but in terms of the impact upon the Green Belt, their allocation was considered justified.</p> <p>-The SSMA is broken down into a number of sieving stages, the general principle of which is not objected to. At Stage 3 of the SSMA, Site 46 is categorised as 'Medium-High' (when High is best) in terms of its Accessibility Performance, and 'Low-Medium' (when Low is best) in terms of constraints. This effectively ranks the site as more appropriate for development than 73% of the others being considered at Stage 3. Of interest, it also scores better than the eventually allocated site at Blays House, which scores Medium against both Accessibility and Constraints.</p> <p>-Site 46 is taken forward to be assessed at Stage 4 of the SSMA, which considers Non-Significant Non-Absolute Constraints. The site is found acceptable in this respect, with</p>	<p>The Council consider their approach to site selection to be robust and the additional sites to be the most appropriate given the findings of the Site Selection Methodology &amp; Assessment (SSMA) the methodology of which is noted as being broadly supported in principle by the representor. Sites have been considered in the round in the SSMA against a number of accessibility and other physical constraints as well as their performance against Green Belt purposes as reviewed by Arup in the Green Belt Review Stages 1 &amp; 2. The SSMA has taken account of the findings of the Arup Stage 2 GBR in its consideration of the site at Great Grove Farm. This can be seen in Stage 5 of the selection process. Whilst it is noted that Arup consider that a small parcel of land in the south west corner of the site performs more weakly against Green Belt purposes and could be released (sub-area 25i), this was not true of the larger site area (sub-area 25) which was not recommended for release in its entirety. This is one of a very few instances where the Council disagrees with Arup's conclusions and as set out in the SSMA, the Council does not consider releasing the site at Great Grove Farm (either sub areas 25 or 25i) to be a rounding off of the settlement and would push the built envelope of the village further north, reducing the important gap between Ottershaw &amp; Chertsey.</p>	<p>No action</p>

Representor & Site	Summary of Representation(s)	RBC Comments	Actions
	<p>the comment made that the 'design will need to incorporate/enhance features which make a positive contribution to landscape principles...'</p> <p>-The site is therefore considered as part of Stage 5 of the SSMA, which is described as considering how the sites perform in terms of Green Belt purposes, as informed by the Runnymede Green Belt Review Parts 1 and 2. Site 46 was considered in great detail by the GBRP2, against the Green Belt purposes, and its release from the Green Belt was found to be appropriate in such terms. It therefore seems unreasonable that the Council have chosen to dismiss the site at Stage 5 of the SSMA due to it not 'representing a rounding-off of the urban area pushing settlement boundaries north beyond existing defensible GB boundaries and physically closing gap between Ottershaw/Chertsey. Greater weight attached to protection of Green Belt'</p> <p>The purpose of the GBRP2 was to assess the performance of more detailed sites against the purposes of the Green Belt. Site 46 was found by the GBRP2 to be appropriate for development in this respect, yet the Council's subsequent SSMA has considered it inappropriate for allocation due to its impact on Green Belt purposes despite it performing well in terms of the accessibility and constraints criteria. It is an inconsistent approach, and one that results in less appropriate sites passing through Stage 5 of the SSMA.</p> <p>-The importance and relevance of the Stage 5 'sieve' in the SSMA is that 20 of the 21 sites which pass it, are subsequently allocated for development. The only one which was not subsequently allocated (V Water West) was due to a number of different landowners being involved and part of the site being unavailable. It is therefore reasonable to believe that had Site 46 passed through Stage 5, it would have subsequently been recommended for allocation by the SSMA.</p> <p>-It would be understandable if a site considered to be appropriate for release by the GBRP2 was subsequently not allocated due to other planning considerations which form part of the overall balance. However, in this instance, Site 46, and other sites, have not been taken forward due to their alleged impact on the Green Belt, when the GBRP2 has found such impact to be acceptable.</p> <p>-Site 46 should be considered appropriate for removal from</p>		



Representor & Site	Summary of Representation(s)	RBC Comments	Actions
	<p>the Green Belt and allocated for development because it is within a sustainable location, available now and there are no constraints that may otherwise prevent or delay development from coming forward. The potential benefits associated with the development of this site include a new country park / SANG, a new primary school, a new civic space, new community facilities, strategic infrastructure improvements The SSMA, and subsequent allocations identified cannot therefore be considered to be robust, and the approach needs to be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Do not consider the allocation at Blays House, Englefield Green to be justified. The Council's site selection process has identified that there are more appropriate sites for residential development than Blays House. The site registered 'medium' scores against Accessibility criteria and Constraints as part of Stage 3 of the Council's SSMA. As a result it was not considered to be as appropriate to accommodate residential development as other sites, such as Site 46 at Ottershaw, which were also classed as having a moderate impact on the Green Belt purposes, as part of the GBRP2.</p>	<p>Comments noted, however, it is considered that the release of Blay's House is consistent with the SSMA when considering sites in the round and with the Council's overall spatial strategy for development over the plan period.</p>	
Cunnane Town Planning	The land is infill, within 250m of Ottershaw and does not fulfil	The SSMA has considered the site and whilst it	No action

Representor & Site	Summary of Representation(s)	RBC Comments	Actions
<p>on behalf of Ottershaw Cacti Nursery</p> <p>Rep 1507</p> <p>Ottershaw Cacti Nursery</p>	<p>purposes of Green Belt. This is supported by the sustainability assessment, Habitat Regulations assessment. Seeks the site to be included within 'Ottershaw East' allocation.</p>	<p>performed well in terms of accessibility, constraints and performance against the Green Belt, it is considered that the site if released from the Green Belt on its own or with other sites at Bousley Rise east of the public footpath would either appear as an incongruous form of development almost entirely surrounded by Green Belt on its own and threaten the permanence of Green Belt boundaries given the irregular boundary pattern and form of properties within Bousley Rise.</p>	
<p>Kitewood</p> <p>Rep 1508</p> <p>Wey Manor Farm</p>	<p>The site is well served by public transport and there is a convenience store within 450m. In the context of the settlement as a whole and the accessibility to service centres, not aware of any site being promoted could be considered to have better accessibility than this site.</p> <p>There are no significant infrastructure improvements that would be required to facilitate site access and no significant upgrades would be needed in the wider highway network to deliver the site in the short-term.</p> <p>Agree with the Council's assessment that the Wey Manor Farm site is not subject to any absolute constraints that would restrict development. However, the Council's report could not be considered sound in relation to assessment of non-absolute constraints because it does not reflect the most recent evidence relating to the Wey Manor Farm site. The site is not valuable in terms of mineral, agricultural land quality or open space. The only applicable non- absolute constraints are the site's proximity to the SPA and the small area of the site which falls into Flood Zones 2 and 3. The impact on the SPA is proposed to be mitigated on-site and any planning applications would be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Approximately half of the site area in sub-area 6 is located within flood zones 2 and 3. If the site were to be developed independently of sub-area 12, an FRA including a sequential assessment would be undertaken to justify the quantum of proposed development. A very small proportion of sub- area</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The site will be re-assessed in the final SSMA to support the Reg 19 consultation giving consideration to the particular constraints noted, although further evidence will still be required with respect to minerals safeguarding. In terms of flood risk as the SSMA already states, areas within flood risk zone 2/3 could be mitigated through use as green space and this has been taken into account. The green space point is noted and whilst this is not a designated green space which is publically accessible, it does perform a visual amenity role which has been taken into account. This is consistent with how the Council has considered other sites with non-accessible green space in the SSMA. With respect to the site not requiring any significant infrastructure the Council's Strategic Highways Assessment Report does indicate a congestion hot spot at the junction of Liberty Lane/Brighton Road//Garfield Road which may need to be mitigated through highway improvements.</p>	<p>Update constraints section of SSMA</p>


Representor & Site	Summary of Representation(s)	RBC Comments	Actions
	<p>12 is located within flood zone 2 and the site could therefore be fully developed without any risk of flood.</p> <p>The Wey Manor Farm site is located within a 'mineral safeguarding area' although it doesn't form part of the Addlestone Quarry site to the north which is controlled by Cemex. Have been in liaison with Cemex and they have advised the following in relation to the potential for mineral deposit; "We believe it to be of poor quality bearing in mind we worked the adjoining land. We certainly would not be interested to work it". Notwithstanding this, if there is proved to be a viable quantum of mineral on the site, this doesn't restrict the allocation of the site for housing. It would however mean that prior extraction may be required. On the matter of prior extraction, but understand that the mineral could be removed and worked off-site which means that there would be no delay to the delivery of housing.</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification: A detailed Soils and Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey of the site was carried out by RPS in May 2016. This could therefore be considered the most up-to- date available evidence and the Council's assessment should therefore be updated to reflect this information. The survey found that approximately 76% of the proposal site was Grade 3a land and 24% Grade 3b land. None of the land comprises Grade 2. A copy of the report is enclosed.</p> <p>The final non-absolute constraint to be considered is the allocation of the site as 'urban green space'. There are no public rights of way across the site and it is therefore not publicly accessible. In 2015, we were advised by RBC, that the site will not be given open space status due to its physical inaccessibility to the public. The urban green space allocation is therefore no longer applicable to the Wey Manor Farm site.</p>		
<p>WYG on behalf of Re Creo</p> <p>Rep 1509</p> <p>Land North of Green</p>	<p>The Green Lane site should be part of the additional provision the Council is now intending to make. This site meets all of the requirements for inclusion in a Local Plan as well as performing well in in Green Belt terms in comparison with sites that the Council is proposing be allocated. It could deliver about 250 dwellings, including 100 affordable units,</p>	<p>The site referred to has been considered and assessed through the SSMA. Whilst it is a medium-high performing site against accessibility and constraints, it performs strongly in Green Belt terms. The site is sensitive in terms of its Green Belt location between the built up areas of Addlestone and Chertsey and therefore greater weight is</p>	<p>No action</p>

Representor & Site	Summary of Representation(s)	RBC Comments	Actions
Lane, Addlestone	and do so in the first five years of the Local Plan.	attached to the protection of the Green Belt, in line with national policy. The site was therefore not taken any further forward in the site selection process.	
DP9 Ltd on behalf of Elysian Residences  Rep 1510  Home Farm, Virginia Water	<p>Runnymede SSMA conducts a 7 stage assessment with qualitative judgements made on positive or negative impacts on certain criteria. Site 212 was discounted at stage 3 on the basis of non-absolute constraints regarding minerals safeguarding.</p> <p>DP9 have carried out their own site selection assessment of the consolidated site at Home Farm based on the Council's methodology and taken the site through to later stages of assessment including comparison against Green Belt and Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	<p>Comments on the consolidated site at Home Farm are noted as well as the site selection appraisal undertaken by DP9. The Council will consider these points when updating its Site Selection evidence to support the Regulation 19 Consultation including the sites reappraisal at Stage 3.</p>	<p>Update constraints section of SSMA</p>
WS Architecture on behalf of Windsor Homes  Rep 1534  Ottershaw East	<p>Council's assessment in SSMA that greater weight is attached to the protection of Green Belt on eastern part of the site (east of public footpath) is erroneous and not based on any landscape visual impact assessment. The topography of the site and natural boundaries should also be taken into consideration on top of the location of the footpath.</p>	<p>The SSMA has considered a range of physical and policy constraints in determining which sites are better performing and could be allocated in the Local Plan. This includes a consideration of the recommendations in the Stage 2 Green Belt Review undertaken by Arup. The Stage 2 GBR did not recommend that the entirety of the Ottershaw East site be released and considered that it could subject to further sub-division. The GBR Stage 2 review comments that the south east area (east of the footpath) performs more strongly against Green Belt purposes. The Council has taken this recommendation into account in considering where site allocation boundaries should be set. As such, greater weight has been attached to the performance of the site against Green Belt purposes east of the footpath and determined that the footpath is the most logical, defensible and durable boundary.</p> <p>In terms of a landscape visual impact assessment, the quality (or lack of) landscape quality is not a reason for designating or de-designating Green Belt as it is not one of its fundamental purposes. Whilst this is a consideration in the overall sustainability of the site, greater weight has been given to protection of the Green Belt and its local and strategic role given the performance against Green Belt purposes.</p>	<p>No action</p>

Representor & Site	Summary of Representation(s)	RBC Comments	Actions
		<p>Whilst the Stage 2 GBR recommends that the northeast area of the Ottershaw East site could be released, the Council are of the opinion that this would not form defensible and durable boundaries given the irregular pattern and form of boundaries in this area particularly where this adjoins the south east parcel of land.</p>	
<p>CBRE on behalf of Ashill Developments Ltd</p> <p>Rep 1537</p> <p>Stroude Road Farm</p>	<p>The representor has concerns regarding the site selection methodology used in the Council's Site Selection Methodology Assessment (SSMA) and considers that there is a lack of transparency in respect of final site selection which results in a lack of clarity and ultimately undermines the soundness of the proposed plan. Specifically it is commented that the balancing exercise, for not only this site, but the majority of other others assessed in the SSMA is unduly limited. For example, the analysis does not consider the significant benefits the scheme would bring in terms of delivery of housing and essential infrastructure.</p> <p>There is no clear and/or sufficiently detailed rationale in the SSMA from the Council demonstrating exceptional circumstances to release the preferred housing sites in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The proposed growth strategy in Virginia Water is to focus growth on two Green Belt sites at Virginia Water North and Virginia Water South. Both of these proposed sites are constrained with respect of access, are in multiple ownerships and are not sustainably located with respect to the existing settlement of Virginia Water and key infrastructure (i.e. Virginia Water Station). Stroude Farm is considered a preferable option as it is in single ownership, has safe means of access, provides significant community benefits and is significantly more sustainable in respect of existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>Concerns noted, however the Council considers that its SSMA fairly weighs up the sustainability credentials of a site in terms of its accessibility and constraints and its performance against Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>Alongside its regulation 19 (draft plan) consultation, the Council will be publishing its exceptional circumstances for amending Green Belt boundaries in the Borough.</p> <p>The Council's evidence, in particular its Site Selection Methodology and Assessment supports that Virginia Water North and South are preferable sites for allocation in the Local Plan than the Stroude Farm site.</p>	<p>No action</p>



*This page has been left intentionally blank*



All enquiries about this paper should be directed to:

Policy & Strategy Team  
Planning Business Centre

Runnymede Borough Council  
The Civic Centre  
Station Road  
Addlestone  
Surrey KT15 2AH

Tel 01932 838383

Further copies of this publication can be obtained from the above address,  
or email: [planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk)

[www.runnymede.gov.uk](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk)

2018

