FLOOD RISK ASSESMENT

185A NENE TERRACE CROWLAND PE6 0LD 13-01-2025

Proposed Development: New garage, workshop (camper van and boat storage) and porch to existing dwelling
Site Address: 185A Nene Terrace, Crowland, Peterborough, PE6 0LD
Date: January 2026

---

1. Introduction

This Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been prepared to accompany a planning application for the construction of a new garage, workshop (for camper van and boat storage), and a porch extension to the existing dwelling at 185A Nene Terrace, Crowland.

The purpose of this FRA is to:

- Assess the risk of flooding to the site from all potential sources;
- Demonstrate that the proposed development will be safe for its lifetime;
- Confirm that the development will not increase flood risk elsewhere; and
- Identify appropriate mitigation and resilience measures where necessary.

This assessment has been prepared in accordance with:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);
- Planning Practice Guidance (Flood Risk and Coastal Change);
- Environment Agency (EA) standing advice for minor development;
- Local planning policy requirements.

---

2. Site Description

The application site comprises an existing residential dwelling with associated curtilage located on the eastern side of Nene Terrace in Crowland. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings with ancillary outbuildings.

The site is relatively flat and lies within an area historically influenced by managed watercourses and drainage infrastructure. The proposed works are confined entirely within the existing residential curtilage.

---

3. Proposed Development

The proposal includes:

- A detached garage and workshop building for the storage of a camper van and boat;
- A porch extension to the existing dwelling;
- No change of use to the land or dwelling.

The garage/workshop will be used for ancillary domestic purposes only and will not introduce any habitable accommodation. The porch will provide sheltered access to the existing dwelling.

The scale of development is modest and classed as **minor development** under the NPPF.

---

4. Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification

In accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance, the vulnerability classifications are as follows:

- **Dwelling and porch extension:** *More Vulnerable*
- **Garage and workshop (non-habitable):** *Less Vulnerable*

No Highly Vulnerable or Essential Infrastructure uses are proposed.

---

5. Flood Risk from All Sources

5.1 Fluvial (River) Flooding

The site lies within an area where fluvial flood risk may be present due to proximity to main rivers and the wider fenland drainage network. The exact Environment Agency Flood Zone should be confirmed using the latest EA Flood Map for Planning.

The proposed development is minor in nature and largely comprises non-habitable structures. The porch extension does not create new residential units or intensify vulnerability.

5.2 Surface Water Flooding

Surface water flood risk exists locally during extreme rainfall events, particularly in low-lying areas such as Crowland. The proposed development increases impermeable area only marginally.

Mitigation measures (see Section 7) will ensure that surface water runoff is appropriately managed and does not increase flood risk on or off site.

5.3 Groundwater Flooding

The site is located within a low-lying fenland area where groundwater levels can rise seasonally. However, the proposed buildings are shallow-founded structures and no basement or deep excavation is proposed.

5.4 Sewer Flooding

There is no recorded history of sewer flooding affecting the site. Foul and surface water drainage will remain separate and connected to existing systems where appropriate.

5.5 Reservoir and Artificial Sources

There are no reservoirs or artificial water bodies immediately adjacent to the site that would pose a significant flood risk to the proposed development.

---

6. Sequential and Exception Tests

6.1 Sequential Test

The Sequential Test aims to steer development to areas of lowest flood risk. As this proposal relates to minor development within the curtilage of an existing dwelling, the Sequential Test is not required under the Planning Practice Guidance.

6.2 Exception Test

The Exception Test is not required as:

- The proposal is minor development;
- No new dwellings are proposed;
- The development will be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

---

7. Flood Risk Mitigation and Resilience Measures

The following measures will be incorporated:

- Finished floor levels of the porch will be set no lower than the existing dwelling floor level;
- The garage and workshop will be non-habitable, with services designed to be resilient to potential flood water ingress;

- Use of flood-resilient materials at low levels where appropriate;
- No raising of ground levels that would displace flood water;
- Surface water runoff to be managed via permeable surfaces and/or soakaways where ground conditions allow, or by controlled discharge to existing drainage systems;
- Rainwater goods to be directed away from the dwelling and towards appropriate drainage points;
- An informal flood response plan for the occupiers, including awareness of EA flood warnings.

---

8. Impact on Flood Risk Elsewhere

The proposed development will not increase flood risk elsewhere as:

- The footprint increase is limited;
- No loss of floodplain storage is proposed;
- Surface water runoff will be managed to ensure greenfield or better runoff rates;
- No watercourses will be culverted, diverted, or impeded.

---

9. Conclusion

This Flood Risk Assessment demonstrates that the proposed garage, workshop, and porch extension at 185A Nene Terrace, Crowland:

- Is appropriate in flood risk terms for its location;
- Will be safe for its lifetime taking account of climate change;
- Will not increase flood risk elsewhere;
- Incorporates proportionate mitigation and resilience measures.

It is therefore concluded that the proposed development complies with national and local flood risk planning policy and should be considered acceptable from a flood risk perspective.