

Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals & Waste Plan

Policy M4 – Locations for Sand and Gravel Extraction

Main Matter 3 – Whether the Plan makes adequate provision for the steady and adequate supply of aggregate minerals

Question 3.8 - Is the approach towards the identification of the Area of Search justified? And what criteria have been used?

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

Following our soundness comments about the SFRA the planning authority have submitted the following document. 'Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), revised April 2021, prepared by Hampshire Council' and an email dated 03 September 2021.

We will need the planning authority to review the new climate change allowances for all the site allocations to see if they are still viable before the application stage. Alternatively they could just see which site allocations are in the catchment boundaries that are increasing (Maidenhead and Sunbury) to check the new extents. This should also be done as soon as possible.

Following the review of these documents we need some clarification on paragraph 3.14 on the latest document sent attached to the email dated 03 September 2021:

“In order to ensure the proposed development is viable when climate change is taken into account, flood zone 2 has been used to represent the worst case extent of flood zone 3 + climate change. This assessment ensures that there is sufficient space within the site to allow a sequential approach to the site layout and structures can be located outside the floodplain even for water compatible development.”

Is this section about sites where there is no detailed modelling? If so, this is a conservative approach but needs more context so that it fits with the rest of the climate change section. If it is not, then we need to see reasoning for using Flood Zone 2 to represent Flood Zone 3+ climate change?

Until this work has been completed satisfactorily then our soundness points about the SFRA for policy M4 still apply.