The Scotts Miracle Gro Company (UK) Ltd

Sutton Bridge Extension

Flood Risk Assessment

October 2015

Ref: 2015.013.002a

The Scotts Miracle Gro Company (UK) Ltd

Sutton Bridge Extension

Flood Risk Assessment

October 2015

Ref: 2015.013.002a

Authorised for and on behalf of White Peak Planning Ltd.



Rob White
Director

This report takes into account the particular instructions and requirements of our client. It is not intended for and should not be relied upon by any third party. Any such party relies on this report at their own risk.

WHITE PEAK Planning

Tel: 0845 034 7323

robw@whitepeakplanning.co.uk

© Report copyright of White Peak Planning Ltd.

Contents

1.0 Introduction 1

2.0 The Application Site 2

2.1 Compatibility and Vulnerability Classification 2
2.2 The Sequential and Exception Tests 2
2.3 Surface Water Drainage Strategy 2
2.4 Off-Site Flood Risk 3

3.0 Overview 4

1.0 Introduction

1.1.1 White Peak Planning has prepared a Flood Risk Assessment in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). This report will form part of the supporting documentation for a Planning Application submitted by The Scotts Miracle Gro Company (UK) Ltd to South Holland District Council.

1.1.2 The application site lies within the operational curtilage of The Scotts Miracle Gro Company (UK) Ltd at Greenworld Park, Sutton Bridge, Spalding, Lincolnshire, PE12 9EX, to the south of the A17 dual carriageway and west of the River Nene. It is accessed directly from a slip road after the second exit at the A17.

1.1.3 The development proposal is for an outdoor extension to the existing storage facility used to store bagged finished compost product, usually on wooden pallets.

1.1.4 The application site lies within Flood Risk Zone 3 and is considered to have a 1 in 100 or greater annual probability of river flooding. However, this is a water compatible development, in line with the NPPG and is therefore appropriate to the proposed location.

1.1.5 This assessment will demonstrate that the application site:

a. Is compatible with the proposed development and is not classified as vulnerable;
b. Is not subject to the Sequential and Exception tests during the planning process;
c. Proposes a suitable surface water drainage strategy to drain the site and reduce flood risk and;
d. Will not increase off-site flood risk to the surrounding development.

2.0 The Application Site

2.1 Compatibility and Vulnerability Classification

2.1.1 The application site will be used to store bagged finished compost product, usually on wooden pallets. The bags will be made from heavy duty plastic which is suitable for the compost product. It is not considered that pallet storage is vulnerable to flooding.

2.1.2 The proposed development is therefore water compatible. This means that the NPPG recognises that nature of the proposal will not attribute an increase in flood risk to the site in terms of its potential to cause damage or disruption by flooding.

2.2 The Sequential and Exception Tests

2.2.1 Para. 101 of the NPPF states that *"Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding."*

2.2.2 The sequential test has not been applied in this instance as there is no alternative location for the storage area and the application proposes the extension of an existing storage area at an existing compost manufacturing facility which lies within the flood risk zone.

2.2.3 Para. 104 goes on to say that *'Applications for minor development and changes of use should not be subject to the Sequential or Exception Tests but should still meet the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments.'*

2.2.4 The development proposal can be considered minor in relation to flood risk as it does not increase the size of buildings or remove flood storage area from the flood plain, in line with the NPPG. The site has, however, been subject to compatibility and vulnerability classification in order to meet the requirements of site-specific flood risk assessments.

2.3 Surface Water Drainage Strategy

2.3.1 As for permission H18-0577-14, the proposed storage area extension will drain to the existing perimeter drain at the north east of the Greenworld Park site. This then drains to two existing on-site ponds near the entrance to the Greenworld Park site (Pond 1 then Pond 2, with a connection beneath the access road) which act as soakaways.

2.3.2 The approximate dimensions and capacities of the drain and ponds are shown in *Table 2.1*.

Table 2.1 – Dimensions and Capacities

Waterbody	Dimensions (m)	Capacity
Drain	260 x 10 x 5	13,000,000 litres
Pond 1	100 x 35 x 5	17,500,000 litres
Pond 2	65 x 35 x 5	11,375,000 litres

2.3.3 The site manager confirmed that he has not seen the drain and ponds at greater than approximately 5% capacity and for the majority of the year they remain dry.

2.3.4 Therefore, they will have sufficient capacity to handle the increase in surface water run-off as a result of the proposed development.

2.3.5 This drainage strategy will ensure that surface water is managed in accordance with existing drainage conditions as approved for application H18-0577-14.

2.4 Off-Site Flood Risk

2.4.1 The NPPG states that even essential infrastructure developments (for example, power stations), can be permissible in a flood risk zone if they are designed and constructed to remain operational and safe in times of flood, result in no net loss of floodplain storage and do not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.

2.4.2 The creation of the pallet storage area constitutes a minor development in terms of flood risk as stated in *Para 2.2.4*, and it will remain operational and safe in times of flood. The proposal is to remove circa 325mm depth of grass and topsoil and replace it with crushed concrete and asphalt to the same elevation as existing ground level. Therefore, it does not remove storage volume out of the flood plain and there will be no increased risk of flooding in the surrounding area as a result of development.

3.0 Overview

3.1.1 This Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG.)

3.1.2 The report demonstrates that the development site:

a. Is compatible with the proposed development and is not classified as vulnerable;
b. Is not subject to the Sequential and Exception tests during the planning process;
c. Proposes a suitable surface water drainage strategy to drain the site and reduce flood risk and;
d. Will not increase off-site flood risk to the surrounding development.

3.1.3 Therefore, the proposed development is considered appropriate from a flood risk perspective and should be granted permission on this basis.

WHITE PEAK Planning

White Peak Planning Ltd
Didsbury Business Centre
137 Barlow Moor Road
Manchester
M20 2PW

T: 0845 034 7323
E: info@whitepeakplanning.co.uk

www.whitepeakplanning.co.uk