

Supplementary Planning Document – Flooding

Schedule of Representations and response

	Respondent	Para	Representation	Response
1.	English Heritage	General	No comments	Noted
2.	Mr Clive Narrainen	General	No comments	Noted
3.	Staines Town Society	General	Comprehensive, sensible and instructive	Comments noted
4.	Gresford Developments	General	SPD is supported as it provides additional guidance for development	Noted
5.	Environment Agency (EA)	General	The EA comment that as Spelthorne's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) was published in December 2006 the Council might consider reviewing it. They refer to paragraphs 7 and 8 of the 'Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework'.	In response to the EA's point, the extent of flood risk in the Borough does not show a fundamentally different degree of flood risk to that in 2006. For this reason the SFRA, which was a comprehensive study, does not appear to be out of date, but it is agreed the matter needs to be kept under review. This is not, however, a matter for the SPD. No change.
6.	Surrey County Council (SCC)	General	Request reference to the fact that SCC are currently producing a Surrey Local Flood Risk Management Strategy which is a statutory document that District Councils will have a duty to have regard for in discharging duties that may affect flood risk.	Agreed. Proposed Change: Addition to Appendix B under the description of SCC's flood related responsibilities to the effect that: SCC has a duty to prepare a Local Flood Risk Management Strategy to which District Councils must have regard.

	Respondent	Para	Representation	Response
7.	LOSRA	Page 1 - Footnote 3	Question whether 'main rivers' are designated by DEFRA and notes that the EA has permissive powers to do work on them and some channels are relatively small.	<p>Main rivers are designated by DEFRA. It is recognised that a lot of additional technical detail could be included given the subject nature of the SPD. However, a careful balance is felt necessary to ensure only essential information is given in order that the intention of the document to focus on providing an explanation of Policy LO1 is not lost. This suggestion, albeit well intentioned, is about river maintenance generally and is more than strictly necessary to understand Policy LO1 and its general context.</p> <p>No change.</p>
8.	Gresford Developments	Section 3	References should be made to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which provides information about the strategic approach to development in the Borough.	<p>The SFRA is already referred to in paras 3.18-3.20.</p> <p>No change.</p>
9.	LOSRA Mr P Brady	3.3 a & b and 4.25-4.28	These paragraphs briefly comment on surface water and ground water flooding. LOSRA and Mr Brady make identical points that ground water flow can be impeded by reservoirs and back-filling of gravel pits leading to surface water flooding, including on highways. Such areas should be mapped to assist Spelthorne and Surrey County Council (SCC) in considering new gravel workings and a map of these areas included in the SPD.	<p>It is agreed that natural ground water flow can be impeded to a degree by the means described. This is a complex subject and gravel extraction schemes, which are determined by SCC, are required to submit hydrological assessments as part of the application so that the implications for the site can be assessed. It is beyond the scope of this SPD to undertake such a detailed exercise to show information which is any case required principally by SCC as Minerals Planning Authority.</p> <p>No change.</p>

	Respondent	Para	Representation	Response
10.	Thames Water	3.3 c (sewers)	Ask that more information be included to explain that adequate foul drainage must be provided and developers will be required to demonstrate adequate infrastructure capacity is available. They further note in some cases appropriate upgrades may be required which, if needed ahead of normal investment programmes, may need to be at a developer's expense.	<p>The purpose of the whole of paragraph 3.3 is to provide a simple identification of the main sources of flooding. The text notes that sewers themselves are not a significant source of flooding but can be inundated in a fluvial flood. The additional information requested, though important, relates to general infrastructure requirements rather than flooding and goes beyond the intended scope of the SPD. It is suggested a footnote be added to the relevant page to remind developers to check the infrastructure implications of intended developments with Thames Water.</p> <p>Proposed Change: Add a footnote to para 3.3 c: 'In order to avoid future risk of flooding from sewers developers are reminded to liaise with Thames Water about connections to the sewer system and to submit information with any planning application to demonstrate adequate sewer capacity either exists or will be provided prior to occupation of the development'.</p>
11.	LOSRA	3.3 (d)	Suggest more specific instructions are given in Footnote 5 on how to find further information on flood risk from reservoirs on the EA website. LOSRA has made similar suggestions in relation to other footnotes.	<p>Organisations do from time to time change the structure and content of websites and a conscious decision was taken to refer to subject matter on the EA website rather than current page titles so as to avoid detailed references becoming quickly out of date.</p> <p>No change.</p>

	Respondent	Para	Representation	Response
12.	Environment Agency	3.5	Recommend the word 'guidance' in the first line is prefaced by the words 'Framework and Technical' to reflect the source being the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and its technical support document.	Agreed. Proposed Change: Add the words 'Framework and Technical' before the word 'guidance' in paragraph 3.5.
13.	Environment Agency	3.16	Suggest that the brief summary of climate change in this paragraph should be expanded. They suggest the Council should explain why it is not taking climate change into account when assessing flood risk, except for establishing finished floor levels. They refer to the NPPF paragraphs 94 and 99 which say climate change should be taken into account.	The NPPF says that 'proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change' should be adopted and take full account of flood risk (para 94.) Para 99 refers to account being taken of climate change and flood risk over the longer term. It says that new development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability and, where it is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure the risks can be managed. Policy LO1 uses the 1 in 20, 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 flood levels but does not add in longer term climate change impacts. The Council's approach resulted from the SFRA undertaken, the EA's unequivocal support and Policy LO1 which followed on from it. It does take climate change into account when stipulating the finished floor level of new buildings in flood risk areas. The SPD cannot change the Policy and it is considered unnecessary to seek to explain in any detail how the Policy itself was developed and what it does not seek to do. The Council will need to judge when a review of its SFRA is required and any consequent changes to policy that such work might suggest in the context of the careful balancing of all its development needs and other policy objectives.

	Respondent	Para	Representation	Response
				It is suggested this part of the SPD does not need to be expanded. No change.
14.	LOSRA Mr R Stephenson	4.7	Both comment that it will be important for the EA's proposed flood relief channels and related capacity improvements to start at the lowest point downstream.	The EA has always made clear it is essential any work progresses from the lowest point upstream. This is a level of detail which is considered unnecessary for the SPD and a footnote referring to the EA website for more information is already given. No change.
15.	Environment Agency	4.10	Question the reference in the paragraph to commercial areas at flood risk being permitted to redevelop and why they are not all identified.	This paragraph summarises information which was contained in the SFRA. Defined commercial areas are all identified on the Proposals Map and areas at flood risk can be readily identified by comparison with the latest available flood map. Flood maps can vary over time as modelling is improved and new data is included. It would therefore be unhelpful to define precise areas within the SPD which may change in the future. No change.
16.	Gresford Developments	4.14	Concerned the last sentence is inaccurate as it says that 'dry islands' should be accessed by dry routes.	The comment misunderstands the point being made. It makes clear that development on 'dry islands' may not be acceptable and that in order to establish if a site is not on a 'dry island' a dry route to a point outside the flood plain needs to be identified. No change.

	Respondent	Para	Representation	Response
17.	LOSRA Mr R Stephenson	4.22-4.23	Both make identical points about the suitability of relying on soakaways in times of flood as the ground is already saturated.	It is accepted that in times of prolonged rainfall the water table in Spelthorne will rise. This reflects in part the flat nature of the Borough where the speed of ground water movement is limited. The use of soakaways is nevertheless the most sustainable approach for the reason given in paragraph 4.21, that use of the gravel sub-strata enables the speed at which water would otherwise get to main watercourses to be slowed up. This avoids flash flooding from the watercourses. No change.
18.	Gresford Developments	4.30	Supports the paragraph as it recognises that development can, by removing other structures, result in less development on the flood plain.	Noted.
19.	Environment Agency Gresford Developments	4.33-4.38	Feel it would be helpful for the Council to explain why a safe route of escape is regarded as one which is 'dry' in a 1 in 100 year event but would not be dry in the longer term if climate change is taken into account. They also suggest reference to further technical advice in a technical document available on the EA website on Risk Assessment (FD2320). No mention of Flood Evacuation Plans. The SPD should explain where these would be acceptable and provide guidance about what they should include.	Use of flood levels and account of climate change has already been dealt with in response to para 3.16. It also made clear that the role of the SPD is simply to expand on the existing policy. It is recognised that sophisticated methods of assessing flood risk hazards exist – as in the document referred to by the EA. These can assess relative levels of risk associated with walking through flood water. However, so far as new residential development in the 1 in 100 flood risk level is concerned the Council does not consider that it needs to take any risks of agreeing escape routes in these circumstances being through flood water. As already explained in paragraph 4.37, the logic of insisting on a dry route is appropriate. Sub-point (e) of the policy does quite properly

	Respondent	Para	Representation	Response
				<p>refer to the importance of flood risks being overcome. On further consideration it would be appropriate to require that new residential development within the 1 in 100 + climate change level to have appropriate flood evacuation plans. This requirement will be added. The Council has required these in a number of recent developments. These can at the simplest level involve arrangements for residents to receive flood warnings with procedures and defined preferred routes of escape identified.</p> <p>As part of a precautionary approach a new paragraph could be added requiring appropriate flood evacuation plans to be prepared as a means of managing risks that cannot be overcome. Their level of detail and appropriate solutions will be dependent on the circumstances of each site.</p> <p>Proposed Change: Add a new paragraph 4.38: 'Where there would not be a dry route of escape in a 1 in 100 + climate change flood event from new residential development, conversions to residential use, or other 'more vulnerable' or 'highly vulnerable' uses, an appropriate flood evacuation plan will be required to be submitted to and approved by the Council'.</p>
20.	Gresford Developments	4.46	Support recognition that there are design solutions that will make development more resilient to flooding.	Noted.
21.	Environment Agency	4.55	Question why FRAs are not required for residential extensions in flood zones 2 and 3a as this does not appear to comply with NPPF footnote 20 and Policy LO1. They also question whether the Borough Council	In preparing the SPD the Council has tried to establish detailed guidance on the preparation of FRAs. It is clear that where development, such as extensions, would not as a matter of policy be refused, the provision of detailed flood risk related

	Respondent	Para	Representation	Response
			<p>will be checking proposals on sites between 0.5 hectares and 1 hectare in Flood Zone 1 for sustainable drainage provision prior to Sustainable Drainage Approval Bodies being established (County Councils will take on these powers from October 2012 and this is explained in Appendix B to the SPD).</p>	<p>information related to the principle of development would serve no practical purpose. It is accepted that some regard/consideration of flood related issues will still be required as a minimum including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Assessment of the impact of an extension on watercourses where a building is taken to a point less than 8 metres from it – with consequent potential impact on maintenance of the watercourse, b. Consideration of flood resilience measures. <p>It is agreed that some qualification of the text is required.</p> <p>In relation to assessing larger sites for sustainable drainage, these are identified when they arise and appropriate measures are then required.</p> <p>Proposed Change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Add the following sentence to the end of paragraph 4.55: ‘They will also be required in Flood Zone 1 where any form of development comes within 8 metres of a ‘main river’ and will need to demonstrate there is no adverse impact on the ability to maintain the watercourse’. b. Add a new paragraph 4.56: ‘In the case of residential extensions, an FRA as set out in Appendix E will be required. In Flood Zones 2 and 3a information will be required in a simple FRA to confirm (a) that the development is not within 8 metres of a ‘main river’ or will not otherwise affect its maintenance as a watercourse and (b)

	Respondent	Para	Representation	Response
				<p>flood resistant methods of construction are to be used’.</p> <p>c. Add a new paragraph to Appendix E: ‘In Flood Zones 2 and 3a, paragraph 4.56 explains the need for information in relation to the proximity to ‘main rivers’ and flood resilience measures’.</p>
22.	Environment Agency	Table 6 - Point 2	Request text to be modified to say modelled flood levels will be provided by them only where available.	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Proposed Change: Insert the words ‘where available’ after ‘Environment Agency’.</p>
23.	Environment Agency	5.1	Request minor corrections to dealing with impact on watercourses.	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Proposed Change:</p> <p>a. Add the words ‘in, under, over or...’ before ‘within 8 metres’.</p> <p>b. Delete ‘By Law’.</p>
24.	Environment Agency	Appendix B	Suggest that, under Surrey County Council, amend text to make clear they are already the Lead Local Flood Authority.	<p>Agreed:</p> <p>Proposed Change: Delete first bullet point and insert ‘Surrey County Council are the Lead Local Flood Authority as set out in the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and Flood Regulations 2009’.</p>
25.	Environment Agency	Appendix E	Suggest the first sentence should be amended to make clear that the Appendix seeks to explain why the LPA will exceptionally allow an extension in Flood Zone 3b.	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Proposed Change: Delete first sentence and insert ‘This Appendix explains what a householder must do for the LPA to exceptionally allow an extension in Flood Zone 3b’.</p>