

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 5 June 2019

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

18/3938M

LOCATION

Land Opposite, Lowerhouse Mill, Albert Road, Bollington, Cheshire

UPDATE PREPARED

3 June 2019

KEY ISSUES

Flood risk

The Environment agency advises that they may have had concerns if the proposed development meant that the current design specification of the reservoir no longer was fit for purpose i.e the original reservoir dam was not designed to factor in potential risk to life and the new development created this risk resulting in the needs for dam improvement works.

The planning practice guidance (PPG) to the National Planning Policy Framework states that, in determining whether a development is safe, the ability of residents and users to safely access and exit a building during a design flood and to evacuate before an extreme flood needs to be considered. One of the key considerations to ensure that any new development is safe is whether adequate flood warnings would be available to people using the development.

In all circumstances where warning and emergency response is fundamental to managing flood risk, therefore they recommend consultation with the emergency planners and the emergency services to determine whether the proposals are safe in accordance with the guiding principles of the PPG.

The Emergency Planning Team have advised that Lamaload reservoir is not a high priority reservoir as defined by DEFRA so there is no site specific emergency plan. In the event of a major incident the Generic Reservoir Emergency Plan together with our normal Multi-agency and Local Authority generic response plans would be activated.

Additional consultation response

Further concerns have been raised by one resident regarding whether the sequential test has been fully addressed by the applicant. They refer to the Inspectors comments in the appeal - APP/R3560/W/15/3136799, referring

specifically to paras 24 onwards. (Located in Farnham). They state that the applicants *approach is without support in Government policy or guidance and undermines the overarching objective of steering developments to locations at lower probability of flooding.*

35. In other words, the evidence shows that 30 new dwellings could be accommodated on reasonably available sites with a lower probability of flooding than the appeal site. In these circumstances, the NPPF says development should not be permitted. The proposal fails on that basis, even though the appellant's FRA has demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that the flood risk from all sources has been adequately assessed and can be appropriately mitigated for.

36... The lack of technical objections to the scheme, however, does not override the primacy of steering developments to areas of lower probability of flooding, in this case to sites located within Flood Zone 1.

They submit information regarding alternative sites in Rainow and Henbury which they consider to be reasonable site examples and state they would form part of information to be submitted as part of a Judicial review application, should planning permission be granted.

They disagree with conclusions within the officer report re; odour and noise from Slater Harrison.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve as per the recommendation on page 35 of the agenda reports pack.