

Alice Downham
Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council
Development Management

Our ref: RA/2023/145472/01-L01
Your ref: 2023/90209

Date: 27 February 2023

By email: dc.admin@kirklees.gov.uk

Dear Alice

ERECTION OF DETACHED DWELLING AND TWO STOREY WORKSHOPS – LAND OFF THORNHILL ROAD, DEWSBURY, WF12 9QE

Thank you for consulting us on this application which we received on 7 February 2023.

Flood Risk

Our Flood Map for Planning shows the site lies within Flood Zone 3, with a high probability of flooding from rivers and/or the sea. The application includes erection of a dwelling (insert development type here), which is considered to be a 'more vulnerable' land use in [Annex 3](#) of the National Planning Policy Framework. It is therefore necessary for the application to pass the Sequential Test and Exception Test and to be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment (FRA), which can demonstrate that the 'development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall'.

Flood Risk Assessment

An FRA by JNP Group Consulting Engineers, referenced B24955-JNP-XX-XX-RP-C-1001 and dated 11 November 2022, has been submitted in support of the application.

Environment Agency position

In the absence of an acceptable flood risk assessment (FRA) we object to this application and recommend that planning permission is refused.

Reasons

The submitted FRA does not comply with the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments, as set out in paragraphs 20 to 21 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change section of the planning practice guidance and its site-specific flood risk assessment checklist. The FRA does not therefore adequately assess the flood risks posed by the development. In particular, the FRA fails to:

- take the impacts of climate change into account:
 - Flood risk mitigation measures to address flood risk for the lifetime of the development included in the design are inadequate because they will not make the development resilient to the flood levels for the design flood event level (1% AEP CC). Consequently, the development proposes inadequate:

- Raised finished floor levels
- Resistance and resilience measures
- Safe access and egress routes

Overcoming our objection

To overcome our objection, the applicant should submit a revised FRA which addresses the points highlighted above. If this cannot be achieved, we are likely to maintain our objection. Please re-consult us on any revised FRA submitted and we'll respond within 21 days of receiving it.

Floor Levels

Finished floor levels should be raised above the 1 in 100-year return period flood event level, plus an appropriate allowance for climate change, plus a freeboard allowance for uncertainty of 300 mm for less vulnerable uses (workshops) and 600 mm for more vulnerable uses (dwelling). The impact of raising levels should be covered as part of carrying out the FRA.

Flood Risk Mitigation

We normally expect any flood sensitive equipment to be above the highest recorded flood level, or the 1% AEP level plus climate change allowances, whichever is highest, plus an additional 300 mm. We recommend flood resilience to the design flood level (1% AEP plus climate change). The FRA needs to assess the flood risk to the site and provide a minimum level for flood sensitive equipment in mAOD.

Safe Access and Egress Routes

The FRA needs to demonstrate safe access / egress is provided for site users, up to and including the design event. Wherever possible, safe access routes should be provided that are located above design flood levels and avoiding flow paths (i.e. 'dry')". If 'dry' safe access/egress is not possible, the proposed routes can be 'wet' but must be 'safe'. This is defined by the UK flood hazard rating using the FD2320 methodology, calculated according to flood depth, velocity and likely debris factor.

We are not the competent authority on matters of safe access/egress or emergency planning. Our role is to ensure that enough data is available within the FRA for the LPA and their emergency planners to make an informed decision. As a minimum, the FRA should either demonstrate a dry access/egress route or an assessment of a proposed 'wet' route using FD2320. If no safe route is possible and the applicant intends to rely on an emergency plan, then sufficient data needs to be included in the FRA for the decision maker to understand whether emergency planning proposals are acceptable.

Sequential test - advice to LPA

What is the sequential test and does it apply to this application?

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 162), development in flood risk areas should not be permitted if there are reasonably available alternative sites, appropriate for the proposed development, in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The sequential test establishes if this is the case.

Development is in a flood risk area if it is in Flood Zone 2 or 3, or it is within Flood Zone 1 and your strategic flood risk assessment shows it to be at future flood risk or at risk from other sources of flooding such as surface water or groundwater.

The only developments exempt from the sequential test in flood risk areas are:

- Householder developments such as residential extensions, conservatories or loft conversions

- Small non-residential extensions with a footprint of less than 250sqm
- Changes of use (except changes of use to a caravan, camping or chalet site, or to a mobile home or park home site)
- Applications for development on sites allocated in the development plan through the sequential test and:
 - the proposed development is consistent with the use for which the site was allocated; and
 - there have been no significant changes to the known level of flood risk to the site, now or in the future, which would have affected the outcome of the test.

Avoiding flood risk through the sequential test is the most effective way of addressing flood risk because it places the least reliance on measures such as flood defences, flood warnings and property level resilience.

Who undertakes the sequential test?

It is for you, as the local planning authority, to determine an appropriate area of search and to decide whether the sequential test has been passed, with reference to the information you hold on land availability. You may also ask the applicant to identify any other 'reasonably available' sites which are on the open market and to check on the current status of identified sites to determine if they can be considered 'reasonably available'. Further guidance on the area of search can be found in paragraphs 027-030 of the planning practice guidance [here](#).

What is our role in the sequential test?

We can advise on the relative flood risk between the proposed site and any alternative sites identified - although your strategic flood risk assessment should allow you to do this yourself in most cases. We won't advise on whether alternative sites are reasonably available or whether they would be suitable for the proposed development. We also won't advise on whether there are sustainable development objectives that mean steering the development to any alternative sites would be inappropriate. Further guidance on how to apply the sequential test to site specific applications can be found in the planning practice guidance: [Flood risk and coastal change - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk).

Exception test – advice to LPA

The exception test should only be applied as set out in flood risk table 2 of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) following application of the sequential test. The exception test should not be used to justify the grant of planning permission in flood risk areas when the sequential test has shown that there are reasonably available, lower risk sites, appropriate for the proposed development.

In those circumstances, planning permission should be refused, unless you consider that sustainable development objectives make steering development to these lower risk sites inappropriate as outlined in PPG (ref ID: 7-031-20220825).

Our role in the exception test

The exception test is in two parts, described in the NPPF (paragraph 164). In order for the test to be passed it must be demonstrated that

1. The development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk; and
2. The development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.

Paragraph 165 of the NPPF makes clear that both parts need to be met for the test to be satisfied. It is for the applicant to demonstrate this.

We provide advice on the second part of the test, but it is for you, as the local planning authority, to consider the first part of the test, accounting for the findings of the flood risk assessment and our flood risk advice, and to determine whether the test, overall, has been satisfied. Development that does not satisfy both parts of the exception test should be refused.

Where the flood risk assessment shows the development will be safe throughout its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere

Even where a flood risk assessment shows the development can be made safe throughout its lifetime without increasing risk elsewhere, there will always be some remaining risk that the development will be affected either directly or indirectly by flooding. You will need to weigh these risks against any wider sustainability benefits to the community.

Land contamination

This development site appears to have been the subject of past industrial activity which poses a potential risk of pollution to controlled waters.

However, we are unable to provide site specific advice relating to land contamination as we have recently revised our priorities so that we can focus on:

- Protecting and improving the groundwater that supports existing drinking water supplies
- Groundwater within important aquifers for future supply of drinking water or other environmental use

We recommend that you refer to our published '[Guiding Principles for Land Contamination](#)' which outlines the approach which should be adopted when managing this site's risks to the water environment.

We also advise that you consult with your Environmental Health/ Environmental Protection Department for advice on generic aspects of land contamination management. Where planning controls are considered necessary, we recommend that the environmental protection of controlled waters is considered alongside any human health protection requirements. This approach is supported by paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Model Procedures

We recommend that developers should:

1. Follow the risk management framework provided in [CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination](#), when dealing with land affected by contamination.
2. Refer to our [Guiding principles for land contamination](#) for the type of information that we require in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site. The Local Authority can advise on risk to other receptors, such as human health.
3. Consider using the [National Quality Mark Scheme for Land Contamination Management](#) which involves the use of competent persons to ensure that land contamination risks are appropriately managed.
4. Refer to the [contaminated land](#) pages on GOV.UK for more information.

Use of waste on site

The CL:AIRE Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice (version 2) provides operators with a framework for determining whether or not excavated material arising from site during remediation and/or land development works are waste or have ceased to be waste. Under the Code of Practice:

- excavated materials that are recovered via a treatment operation can be re-used on-site providing they are treated to a standard such that they are fit for purpose and unlikely to cause pollution
- treated materials can be transferred between sites as part of a hub and cluster project
- some naturally occurring clean material can be transferred directly between sites.

Developers should ensure that all contaminated materials are adequately characterised both chemically and physically, and that the permitting status of any proposed on-site operations are clear. If in doubt, the Environment Agency should be contacted for advice at an early stage to avoid any delays.

We recommend that developers should refer to:

- the [position statement](#) on the Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice;
- The [waste management](#) page on GOV.UK

Waste to be taken off-site

Contaminated soil that is (or must be) disposed of is waste. Therefore, its handling, transport, treatment and disposal are subject to waste management legislation, which includes:

- Duty of Care Regulations 1991
- Hazardous Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2005
- Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016
- The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011

Developers should ensure that all contaminated materials are adequately characterised both chemically and physically in line with British Standard BS EN 14899:2005 'Characterization of Waste - Sampling of Waste Materials - Framework for the Preparation and Application of a Sampling Plan' and that the permitting status of any proposed treatment or disposal activity is clear. If in doubt, the Environment Agency should be contacted for advice at an early stage to avoid any delays.

If the total quantity of hazardous waste material produced or taken off-site is 500kg or greater in any 12-month period, the developer will need to register with us as a hazardous waste producer. Refer to the [Hazardous Waste](#) pages on GOV.UK for more information.

Planning Advice Service

Please advise the applicant that if they would like to get further specific advice on how to overcome our objection, they can take advantage of our planning advice service. We can offer services including meetings, telecons and reviews of revised information prior to formal submission. We encourage the applicant to contact us directly to discuss this further.

We currently charge £100 plus VAT per officer per hour. We will provide you with an estimated cost for any further discussions or review of documents. The standard terms for our charged for service are available [here](#).

Should you require any further information or clarification, please contact me.

Yours sincerely

Bev Lambert
Sustainable Places - Planning Advisor

Direct dial 07833 234623

Direct e-mail bev.lambert@environment-agency.gov.uk

Team e-mail sp-yorkshire@environment-agency.gov.uk