

# Planning Committee

April 1<sup>st</sup> 2015

## Members Update

### Appendix 2: Hurst Road Emails

## Graham Vaughan

---

**From:** Penny Stoodley on behalf of Development Control  
**Sent:** 27 March 2015 11:42  
**To:** Graham Vaughan  
**Subject:** FW: Wokingham Planning - Committee notification letter F/2014/2353 58 Hurst Road ~[UNCLASSIFIED]~  
**Attachments:** 9031267.DOC

---

**From:** Gill Ketley [mailto: [REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** 26 March 2015 20:29  
**To:** Development Control  
**Subject:** Fwd: Wokingham Planning - Committee notification letter F/2014/2353 58 Hurst Road

Graham

Vis the attached I would be grateful if you would please explain how you can ignore both local and national government policy and recommend approving building 12 houses on a flood plain? Why would you sanction building on this site rather than other more suitable and available ones which don't carry this risk?

Have you viewed the video from last winter which actually shows the same field flooded? Is this not sufficient evidence and the very reason why we have such restrictions on building on the flood plain?

I am frankly astounded you can do such a thing and I pity any future inhabitants who will suffer as a result of the inevitable flooding, which this building works only increase.

Please send me full details as to how you have come to such a conclusion and are seeking to recommend approval, especially when you haven't visited the site - you're doing so after you've made your decision!

I look forward to your response.

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Theresa Brown < [REDACTED] >  
**Date:** 23 March 2015 16:56:31 GMT  
**To:** " [REDACTED] "  
**Subject:** Wokingham Planning - Committee notification letter

Please find attached document.

### DISCLAIMER

You should be aware that all e-mails received and sent by this Council are subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and therefore may be disclosed to a third party. (The information contained in this message or any of its attachments may be privileged and confidential and intended for the exclusive use of the addressee). The views expressed may not be official policy but the personal views of the originator.

If you are not the addressee any disclosure, reproduction, distribution, other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited.

If you received this message in error please return it to the originator and confirm that you have deleted all copies of it.

All messages sent by this organisation are checked for viruses using the latest antivirus products. This does not guarantee a virus has not been transmitted. Please therefore ensure that you take your own precautions for the detection and eradication of viruses.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam 

  




## Graham Vaughan

---

**From:** Russell Tomlinson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 March 2015 22:34  
**To:** Graham Vaughan  
**Cc:** Louise Yeadon; Rob Yeadon; Dee Tomlin; Andy Crookell; Katy Next Door; Malcolm Burgess; Theresa May; Lindsay Ferris - External; Richard Oldham; David Smith; Gill Ketley; Simon Burgess; Hurst Rd; Hazel Evans; twyfordpc@btconnect.com; Ashley Smith; nick.clark@wokingham.gov.uk; Andrea Jenkins; Clare Lawrence; Eddie Napper  
**Subject:** Planning Application - 58 Hurst Road

[https://www2.wokingham.gov.uk/sys\\_upl/templates/BT\\_WOK\\_PlanningApplication/lib/ServePADocument.asp?path=F20142353%5CRevised+%26+Additional+Details%5CF20142353revpl+Drainage+Comments%5FHC%2Epdf](https://www2.wokingham.gov.uk/sys_upl/templates/BT_WOK_PlanningApplication/lib/ServePADocument.asp?path=F20142353%5CRevised+%26+Additional+Details%5CF20142353revpl+Drainage+Comments%5FHC%2Epdf)

Dear Mr Vaughan

Prior to Wednesday's Planning Committee Meeting I am horrified to read that you have recommended this application to the Planning Committee and have totally dismissed the concerns and objections from over 90 local residents who have gone to great lengths to object to this development of 12 houses based on the intended site being a GREENFIELD SITE within FLOOD ZONE 2 & 3.

Evidential maps provided by the Environmental Agency were submitted detailing the "at risk areas of flood zones and surface water" within the intended sites boundaries yet you and the Council have disregarded these facts in favour of accepting the developers manipulated and inaccurate reports.

Fact: the developers have proposed to install all electrical points and sockets at a height of 1 meter in every property. Why is this if flooding and surface water is not a risk????

Fact: the EA maps prior to December 2014 all clearly showed the site, 85% of it, being within flood zone 2 & 3. Why has the developers reports only taken the measurements and recommendations of that land of the site that is in flood zone 1????

Fact: the attached technical report also queries and requests further investigation to ACTUAL drainage and surface water as there was not enough accurate information or enough in depth questioning to the EA maps and surface water reports. Why has this planning for development not been delayed until further facts, information and accurate reporting can be established to ascertain why, prior to December 2014, the site was declared 85% FLOOD ZONE 2 & 3, but following the developers report it is miraculously all deemed flood zone 1????

Fact: there have been in excess of 90 objections from local residents consulted and not one registered declaration in favour of this proposed development. As a Council and Planning Officer employed by the local tax payer and local rate payers, why are our objections not being listened to or addressed???? Who is representing the voices of objection against a developer who has manipulated the planning process by providing inaccurate and misleading information????

Thank you for spending a brief 10 minutes on the proposed development site last Friday and although the Planning Committee failed to walk the full extent of the site and along all boundaries where there was standing water and evidence of animal tracks, it's a shame you all didn't visit the field today, as after one day's continuous rain, the field is totally saturated with masses of standing water that matches the EA mapping (prior to Dec 2014) of where the anticipated flood zones are and surface water run offs should be!!!!

My request to you, the Council and to Mrs. May our MP is to postpone any decision on this intended application until FACTUAL & ACCURATE FLOOD ZONE INFORMATION CAN BE PROVIDED not to mention the intention to build on a designated GREENFIELD SITE, both aspects that are contrary to Local and Government guidelines and policy.

I fear our 3 minutes to speak and object as concerned residents at Wednesday's Planning Meeting cuts against and is nothing compared to the hours, days, weeks and months that Hicks Developments Ltd has had with you and the Council.

FACT: there were over 90 objections to this proposed planning application. Our concerns HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED by you or the Council to date. Why have a democratic process if the objections are to be ignored???

Kind regards

Russell Tomlinson  
52 Hurst Road  
Twyford RG10 0AN

Sent from a Remote Desktop, please excuse any typos

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.



## Graham Vaughan

---

**From:** Richard Oldham [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 30 March 2015 10:56  
**To:** Graham Vaughan  
**Cc:** Louise Yeadon; Rob Yeadon; Dee Tomlin; Andrew Croskell; Katy Next Door; Malcolm Burgess; ADAMS, Charlotte E; Lindsay Ferris - External; Richard Oldham; David Smith; Gill Ketley; Simon Burgess; Hazel Evans; Twyford PC; Ashley Smith; nick.clark@wokingham.gov.uk; Andrea Jenkins; Clare Lawrence; Eddie Napper; Peter Hutchins; steven watts; Graham Brown; Charlie Hobson; Jacqui; Russ Tomlinson  
**Subject:** Development 58 Hurst Road

Mr. Vaughan,

You have never before acknowledged or replied to my emails, Please do so this time.

I fully endorse every word in Mr.Tomlinson's latest email to you.

I know your Council think they have no liability for any irresponsible Planning Decisions as they don't make the decision, it is passed to a lay Committee. This Committee may well be very honest people, BUT, they don't have the professional qualifications to make the decision in a case like this one. In this case you have sent out emails stating you recommend this one to the Committee. They will probably respect your "professional" judgement and approve the application. This must surely put the responsibility back on you and the Council and, as such, can at any time in the future make you liable to prosecution if flooding occurs.

Planning Application O/2000/1625 - Charles Church for Orpington Close. The whole of Orpington Close and your field between the Close and Twyford Brook was a "Brown" field site in the flood plain. It being a chicken processing factory. After a prolonged series of modifications your Council approved building above the Flood Plain, Charles Church having to grass over the bottom half in the flood plain and give it to you. The Plans which accompany the various applications all show the flood plain at the rear walls of 14, 15 and 16.

Water levels have risen since then and what was a "Brown" field site is now half a "Green" field site. Why has the Council suddenly changed it's policy ?

Richard Oldham



Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.



## Graham Vaughan

---

**From:** Lindsay Ferris - External  
**Sent:** 31 March 2015 08:56  
**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: Urgent Planning Application Request - 58 Hurst Road

All

I have forwarded the EA e-mail (below) to the Chairman & Vice Chairman of the Planning Committee so that this can be brought to the attention of all Planning Committee members, as this is a significant issue.

Regards  
Lindsay Ferris

In a message dated 30/03/2015 22:32:45 GMT Daylight Time, [REDACTED] writes:

Dear Mr Vaughan

Further to my email to you yesterday, I am taking the opportunity to forward this email and the vital information contained within which has been acquired from the Environmental Agency following an enquiry made by a neighbour of mine and a fellow resident adjacent to the proposed site for development at 58 Hurst Road.

These facts clearly indicate that the proposed site is confirmed as FLOOD ZONE 2, contrary to what Hicks Development Ltd have stated, and as suspected, flood zone and surface water reports supplied by the developers have been manipulated and incorrectly reported resulting in your misjudgement and you being misled to recommend this planning application to the Planning Committee for approval.

As our Council and supposed representatives of local residents, could you please advise us as concerned residents on how these facts can now be supported, included and presented to the Planning Committee, even at this late stage of what can only be described as a shambolic consultation process, bearing in mind that over 90 concerned local residents formally objected to this planning application based on the intended site being a GREENFIELD SITE WITHIN FLOOD ZONE 2????

I find it bizarre that a local resident asks the EA a straight question and gets a straight and factual answer which now underpins the basis of the 90 objections registered with you and the Council, yet the Council takes the word of a manipulated report by a developer.

As I stated in my earlier email, the EA maps and designated flood zoning prior to December 2014 all detailed the proposed site for the 12 houses as within the boundaries of FLOOD ZONE 2, not to mention being proposed on a greenfield site, yet this has been ignored and 90 objections dismissed out of hand without satisfactory explanation.

I am sure I speak on behalf of ALL the concerned neighbouring residents and those who voiced their written objections when I formally request that this planning application should be suspended pending further enquiry and clarification regarding the flood zone designation and the effects of surface water, which by the way, there is masses of in the aftermath of the recent rainfall in the greenfield site being proposed for development!

We would appreciate an urgent response to these latest facts.

Kind regards

Russell Tomlinson  
52 Hurst Road



Twyford RG10 0AN

Sent from a Remote Desktop, please excuse any typos

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Katy Richards <[REDACTED]@btmail.com>

**Date:** 30 March 2015 16:52:51 BST

**To:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@btmail.com> <[REDACTED]@btmail.com> <[REDACTED]@btmail.com>

<[REDACTED]@btmail.com> <[REDACTED]@btmail.com> <[REDACTED]@btmail.com> <[REDACTED]@btmail.com> <[REDACTED]@btmail.com>

<[REDACTED]@btmail.com> <[REDACTED]@btmail.com> <[REDACTED]@btmail.com> <[REDACTED]@btmail.com> <[REDACTED]@btmail.com>

<[REDACTED]@btmail.com>

**Subject:** Fwd: Urgent Planning Application Request

Just got this back from the Environment Agency...confirming that the site is flood zone 2 and 1 and that the majority of the proposed development site falls within flood zone 2....

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** WT Enquiries <WTEnquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk>

**Date:** 30 March 2015 16:24:46 BST

**To:** Katy <[REDACTED]@btmail.com>

**Subject:** RE: Urgent Planning Application Request

Our ref: WT/20023

Dear Katy

Thank you for your enquiry.

I can confirm that the proposed development site falls within flood zone 2 and 1. The majority of the site development will be within flood zone 2. The flood risk assessment that accompanies the planning application also states that the development site falls within flood zone 2 and 1.

I hope that we have correctly interpreted your request. Please see the attached Standard Notice or licence for details of permitted use.

We respond to requests for recorded information that we hold under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and the associated Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR).

How did we do? Can you spare a few minutes to help improve our service? Please click on the link here

Please get in touch if you have any further queries or contact us within two months if you'd like us to review the information we have sent.

Yours sincerely

Dawn Cooper  
Customers and Engagement Officer

[REDACTED]

Customers and Engagement  
Environment Planning and Engagement  
Environment Agency  
South East Region, West Thames Area - sub Office  
Goldcrest House, Alice Holt Lodge, Farnham, Surrey  
GU10 4LH

The Environment Agency website is now closed. All our Information is now

published on the government website [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk)

-----Original Message-----

From: Katy Richens [mailto:████████████████████]

Sent: 27 March 2015 11:38

To: WT Enquiries

Subject: Urgent Planning Application Request

Good Morning,

I spoke with the Floodline earlier this morning and was directed to put my request in writing to this email address.

I am looking for confirmation that the Flood Maps for Planning on your website are the most up to date and accurate that you have. This is with regards to a planning application that has been submitted to Wokingham Borough Council, ref: F/2014/2353 - Land to the rear of 58 Hurst Road.

The application submitted states that the majority of the proposed site falls within Flood Zone 1, whereas the mapping on your website for planning shows the site falling under Flood Zone 2 (majority) and Flood Zone 3.

Please can you confirm that the planning classification for this proposed development site is, as per your website, majority Flood Zone 2?

I would be very grateful for your quick assistance in this matter. If you have any questions please don't hesitate to contact me either via email or on 07734 155973.

Thank you in advance for your help.

Kind Regards, Katy Croskell

Sent from my iPad

This message has been scanned and no issues discovered.

To report this email as SPAM, please forward it to [spam@websense.com](mailto:spam@websense.com)

Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else.

We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it.

We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.

To report this email as SPAM, please forward it to [spam@websense.com](mailto:spam@websense.com)

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

[REDACTED]



## Graham Vaughan

---

**From:** Andrew Croskell [redacted]  
**Sent:** 31 March 2015 09:04  
**To:** Graham Vaughan; Clare Lawrence  
**Cc:** [redacted]  
**Subject:** 58 Hurst road planning application - new evidence!  
**Attachments:** Doc 30 Mar 2015 2020.pdf; ATT00001.htm

Dear Mr Vaughan,

Please see attached 2 new bits of evidence in relation to the site. The photo attached (taken 2000) shows flood water in the field right hand corner and also along the hedge line adjacent to the water behind in the flood plain. If you would like to see the original let me know and this can be brought in as it is a print rather than a digital image. Please also note the legs of the White horse and how muddy her legs are, this is how muddy and boggy the site was when the grass was kept short.

Finally following your recent enquiry to the environment agency, we have also received communication stating that the site is flood zone 2 and this is from the same office that you had your information from. Given this it absolutely needs to be investigated further before proceeding any further.

I would be grateful if you could either one withdraw the application based on this new evidence or at least pass on the information the planning committee [redacted] the site when there was water on it.

Regards  
Andrew Croskell

**From:** WT Enquiries <[WTenquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:WTenquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk)>  
**Date:** 30 March 2015 16:24:46 BST  
**To:** Katy Richens [redacted]  
**Subject:** RE: Urgent Planning Application Request

Our ref: WT/20023

Dear Katy

Thank you for your enquiry.

I can confirm that the proposed development site falls within flood zone 2 and 1. The majority of the site development will be within flood zone 2. The flood risk assessment that accompanies the planning application also states that the development site falls within flood zone 2 and 1.

I hope that we have correctly interpreted your request. Please see the attached Standard Notice or licence for details of permitted use.  
[redacted]

We respond to requests for recorded information that we hold under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and the associated Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR).

How did we do? Can you spare a few minutes to help improve our service? Please click on the link here

Please get in touch if you have any further queries or contact us within two months if you'd like us to review the information we have sent.

[REDACTED]  
Yours sincerely

Dawn Cooper [REDACTED]  
Customers and Engagement Officer  
Direct Dial: 01252 729534

Customers and Engagement  
Environment Planning and Engagement  
Environment Agency  
South East Region, West Thames Area - sub Office  
Goldcrest House, Alice Holt Lodge, Farnham, Surrey  
GU10 4LH

The Environment Agency website is now closed. All our Information is now published on the government website [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk)

-----Original Message-----

From: Katy Richens [mailto:[REDACTED]]  
Sent: 27 March 2015 11:38  
To: WT Enquiries  
Subject: Urgent Planning Application Request

Good Morning,

I spoke with the Floodline earlier this morning and was directed to put my request in writing to this email address. [REDACTED]

I am looking for confirmation that the Flood Maps for Planning on your website are the most up to date and accurate that you have. This is with regards to a planning application that has been submitted to Wokingham Borough Council, ref: F/2014/2353 - Land to the rear of 58 Hurst Road.

The application submitted states that the majority of the proposed site falls within Flood Zone 1, whereas the mapping on your website for planning shows the site falling under Flood Zone 2 (majority) and Flood Zone 3.

Please can you confirm that the planning classification for this proposed development site is, as per your website, majority Flood Zone 2?

I would be very grateful for your quick assistance in this matter. If you have any questions please don't hesitate to contact me either via email or on [REDACTED]

Thank you in advance for your help.

Kind Regards, Katy Croskell

Sent from my iPhone







## Graham Vaughan

---

**From:** M BURGESS [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 01 April 2015 09:40  
**To:** Graham Vaughan  
**Subject:** F/2014/2353 58 Hurst Road

Dear Mr Vaughan

I have seen the recent emails regarding this matter and your responses. While I personally wouldn't agree with some of the comments made towards the process and people involved, I would like to make the following points.

I have been a resident of 50 Hurst Road since 2005 and there has been several occasions where the corner of the plot I can see from my house/garden has been underwater. This is the part designated for the foul water station and I am very concerned about the potential effect this would have on any houses connected to it. I also believe the standing water was to a height that would effect the lower detached house shown on the plans.

I see a representative of the EA has accepted the typographical survey as evidence that this land is Zone 1 based on height of the land. I don't know what caused this standing water, the stream behind overflowing, the overflow from the culvert to the right or just the surface water collecting there, but I can absolutely assure you it does occur.

I think part of my (and my neighbour's) frustration arises from the fact we have seen this with our own eyes. Annoyingly I didn't take photographs, as seeing standing water on a piece of land that I was informed was in flood zone 2 when I purchased my property, didn't seem that odd or noteworthy.

You mention you have looked at the video provided, can I point out that this doesn't show the flood water level at its highest. The water level shown at the allotments is significantly lower than it's eventual high point, which was past the track/road shown, and progressing further up the also sloping land, to a point past the first line of allotments (this we do have evidence for).

Secondly, being at the bottom of Winchcombe Road we have had several problems with the current drainage being unable to cope in the event of "flash floods" causing high volume of water from Winchcombe to build up in front of our houses. This is why we are so concerned about any changes potentially making this worse. Our houses are attached by garages therefore forming a solid line and we have all had occasions where we have had to open our garages to allow this water a channel to flow rather than build up and enter the houses themselves. Anything that causes a disruption to the drainage or soakaway would have a significant impact.

Finally, although the back of my and my neighbour's gardens are without question higher than the proposed houses, we have standing water in them to a height of several inches every winter. Once again I can't say specifically why, the nature of the soil, the level of the groundwater or whatever, but it occurs every year without fail.

I am aware that to a very large extent you can only act on the information and evidence provided to you, also the restraints of the directives and legislation in place concerning planning applications. However, we cannot ignore the conditions that we regularly witness on this site and just wish to ensure that any development does not cause problems for both the existing properties and any new residents. Could we at least request a delay whilst further tests take place and a comprehensive drainage solution is provided?

Regards

Malcolm Burgess

50 Hurst Road.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.



## Graham Vaughan

---

**From:** WT Enquiries <WTenquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 01 April 2015 15:37  
**To:** Graham Vaughan  
**Subject:** RE: Urgent Planning Application Request - 58 Hurst Road ~[UNCLASSIFIED]~  
**Attachments:** flood map 1 10001 scale.pdf; flood map.pdf

Dear Mr Vaughan

Thank you for your email.

The response that I sent to Katy Richens under the reference WT/20023 was based on the information that is on our flood map (copies attached for your information). I did use the planning reference supplied to ensure that I had a better idea of where the development was taking place as I am not overly familiar with the area. Using a site layout plan and Flood Risk Assessment for comparison it appeared to me that part of the development was in Flood Zone 2.

Katy Richens requested 'Please can you confirm that the planning classification for this proposed development site is, as per your website, majority Flood Zone 2?'. I was responding to this request for information.

From the information that I could see, it appears that the proposed development will be partly based in Flood Zone 2.

The response you have received from my colleague Judith Johnson on 16 March 2015 is our advice based on the information supplied by the applicant for the planning permission. This was based on our Flood Mapping Team comparing our modelling for the Lower Loddon, the flood risk assessment and surveys of the land. They then concluded that the site is in majority flood zone 1, this is not reflected on our Flood Map.

[REDACTED]  
For your information, the flood map is updated every 3 months where required.

Yours sincerely

Dawn Cooper  
Customers and Engagement Officer  
Direct Dial: [REDACTED]

Customers and Engagement  
Environment Planning and Engagement  
Environment Agency  
South East Region, West Thames Area – sub Office  
Goldcrest House, Alice Holt Lodge, Farnham, Surrey  
GU10 4LH

The Environment Agency website is now closed. All our Information is now published on the government website [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk)

---

**From:** Graham Vaughan [mailto:Graham.Vaughan@wokingham.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** 31 March 2015 09:31  
**To:** WT Enquiries

**Subject:** FW: Urgent Planning Application Request - 58 Hurst Road ~[UNCLASSIFIED]~  
**Importance:** High

FAO Dawn Cooper

Dear Ms Cooper,

I was surprised to see your response below to Ms Ritchens regarding the site at the rear of 58 Hurst Road, Twyford, RG10 0AN. As you will see from the attached letter from Judith Johnson, the EA has said the majority of the site is in **Flood Zone 1**. This is regarding an ongoing planning application which is due to be considered by our planning committee tomorrow evening (1<sup>st</sup> April 2015). It is therefore very critical that the EA establishes why contradictory advice has been given.

By my understanding, the EA does not raise an objection to the planning application subject to a condition and considers that the submitted FRA demonstrates that the majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1 and this supersedes the EA flood maps. Please can you confirm this is the case?

Kind regards,

Graham Vaughan  
Senior Planning Officer (Development Management and Regulatory Services)  
Tel: 0118 974 6694  
Wokingham Borough Council, Civic Offices, Shute End, Wokingham, RG40 1WR

***This Council will implement its Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2015. Planning applications which are decided on or after 6<sup>th</sup> April 2015 may be liable to pay the levy. For more information please visit our website at <http://www.wokingham.gov.uk/planning/developers/cil/>***

*Please note, this email is an opinion of an officer of this council which is of an advisory nature only, and is given without prejudice to any formal decision taken in respect of development under the Town and Country Planning Act.*

---

**From:** Russell Tomlinson [mailto: [REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** 30 March 2015 22:33  
**To:** Louise Yeadon; Dee Tomlin; Rob Yeadon ICE; Andy Croskell; Katy Next Door; Malcolm Burgess; Theresa May; Lindsay Ferris - External; Graham Vaughan; Richard Oldham; David Smith; Clare Lawrence; Gill Ketley  
**Subject:** Fwd: Urgent Planning Application Request - 58 Hurst Road

Dear Mr Vaughan

Further to my email to you yesterday, I am taking the opportunity to forward this [REDACTED] and the vital information contained within which has been acquired from the Environmental Agency following an enquiry made by a neighbour of mine and a fellow resident adjacent to the proposed site for development at 58 Hurst Road.

These facts clearly indicate that the proposed site is confirmed as FLOOD ZONE 2, contrary to what Hicks Development Ltd have stated, and as suspected, flood zone and surface water reports supplied by the developers have been manipulated and incorrectly reported resulting in your misjudgement and you being misled to recommend this planning application to the Planning Committee for approval.

As our Council and supposed representatives of local residents, could you please advise us as concerned residents on how these facts can now be supported, included and presented to the Planning Committee, even at this late stage of what can only be described as a shambolic consultation process, bearing in mind that over 90 concerned local residents formally objected to this planning application based on the intended site being a GREENFIELD SITE WITHIN FLOOD ZONE 2????



# Flood Map for Planning (Rivers & Sea) centred on RG10 0AN - created 1 April 2015



Scale 1:2,000



## Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)

Flood Map - Defences

Areas Benefiting from Flood Defences

Flood Map - Flood Storage Areas

Flood Map - Flood Zone 3

Flood Map - Flood Zone 2

## Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea) (assuming no defences)

Flood Zone 3 shows the area that could be affected by flooding:

- from the sea with a 1 in 200 or greater chance of happening each year
- or from a river with a 1 in 100 or greater chance of happening each year.

Flood Zone 2 shows the extent of an extreme flood from rivers or the sea with up to a 1 in 1000 chance of occurring each year.

© Environment Agency copyright and / or database rights 2014. All rights reserved. © Crown Copyright and database right 2014. Ordnance Survey licence number 100024198.

Contact Us: National Customer Contact Centre, PO Box 544, Rotherham, S60 1BY. Tel: 03708 506 506 (Mon-Fri 8-6). Email: [enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk)





## Graham Vaughan

---

**From:** Andrew Croskell <croskell@wokingham.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 01 April 2015 13:50  
**To:** Graham Vaughan; Clare Lawrence; mark.lupit@wokingham.gov.uk  
**Cc:** Dee Tomlin; Lindsay Ferris - External; mayt@parliament.uk; Theresa May; john@wokinghamconservatives.org.uk; Lindsay Ferris; theresa@voteformay.co.uk  
**Subject:** Formal Complaint re planning process applied to 58 Hurst Road, Twyford, F/2014/2353

Dear Sirs and Madam,

Please find below my formal complaint regarding the above. This requires immediate consideration and action before any decision is made at the planning meeting later today. Note this has been formally lodged via the WBC complaints online tool also.

Reference: Inclusion of TW103 in the WBC MDD and also the subsequent planning application reference F/2014/2353

I wish to formally complain about the process for which the above site was included in the MDD and then subsequently a planning application which has been raised. The planning application is due to be raised tomorrow (1<sup>st</sup> April 2015) in front of the Planning Committee at Shute End, and until this complaint has been investigated would request that a decision is **immediately** deferred until the full facts of the sequence of events has been established.

Site TW103 was included in the recent MDD document published by Wokingham Borough Council. The site was included in MDD following a submission report from parties connected with the site owner, the issue that I have is that the site was stated to be flood zone 1, when very clearly on the Environment Agency map it was stated as flood zones 2 and 3a. If it had been correctly classified as per the Environment Agency reports (which is standard practice) then a Sequential Test should have been conducted and as a result alternative more suitable sites in the Borough would have been identified. Subsequently as highlighted below the fact that the site was included in the MDD based on incorrect information is now being used as an argument that the flooding risk should be discounted as it has already been done, though clearly it hasn't.

More recently a planning application was submitted (F/2014/2353) and the Environment Agency were contacted and came back stating the site was in Flood zone 2 & 3 and as a consequence a Sequential Test should still be conducted. As part of the Due diligence by Wokingham Borough Council, WSP contacted the applicant with the following comment that 'Whilst the document establishes a number of points that help sequentially test the site, it does not actually apply the test to 58 Hurst Road and the site, therefore, has not been sequentially tested. Given that 95% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 and 5% is in Flood Zone 3a (figures provided by the FRA), this site needs to be sequentially tested against other available sites....'. The response from the Applicant purely stated that due to the site being in the MDD it was not required to Sequentially test' but as can be seen from my first point it was put into the MDD based on inaccurate information.

As a result the site should be removed from the MDD until a Sequential Test has been conducted.

In the Senior Planning Officers recommendation to the Planning Committee a letter has been included within the information file in relation to the Planning application dated 16/Mar/2015 which is a response back from the Environment Agency(EA) which appears to be asking them to confirm a site should be treated as Flood Zone 1. The consequences of this letter are as follows

- ☐ The EA have been asked confirmed the area as flood zone 1 based on topographical data, which has had the effect of shifting the EA's flood zone 2 line to become and flood zone 1 and the EA's flood zone 3 line to a 2, yet as per photos shared with the Senior Planning Officer it regularly floods up to this revised flood zone 2 line therefore it can't possibly be flood zone 2 line but actually the flood zone 3.
- ☐ This confirmation was sought by the Senior Planning Officer only a matter of weeks after the EA confirmed back to the applicant (04/Feb/2015 in the FRA Appendix) and subsequently forwarded to the Senior Planning Officer that nothing had changed regarding their previous rating of the site as Flood zone 2 & 3a and that their previous report still remained valid.

I put it to you that in obtaining this WBC have overcome an issue of a Sequential Test having not being conducted as the site was passed through the MDD on incorrect information at the earlier stages of the

process. Strangely when we contacted the same office literally a few days after the Senior Planning Officer received the response they confirmed that the site again was predominately flood zone 2, thus meaning that the Sequential test should have been applied.

I would further like to complain about the number of inaccuracies, inconsistencies and omissions that were included, or not, in the initial planning application. Only when raised in the numerous objection letters received against this planning application were some of the errors addressed such as drainage and some potential aspects to drainage none of which are currently viable solutions. Examples include:

- ☐ Drainage calculations
- ☐ A culvert that was missed of the Flood Risk Assessment that actually runs through the site,
- ☐ The site size which has ranged from 1.1ha down to 0.72ha and several numbers in between.

As I pointed out to the Senior Planning Officer how can a developer who has promised to conducted precise drainage calculations be trusted to do it right when they failed to spot a stream / culvert on site and the size of a field can't even be measured accurately. This is a **breach of the NPPF guidelines** to ensure that complete and accurate information is provided in planning applications.

Regards,  
Andrew Croskell

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.