

Bury Metropolitan Borough Council
Town Hall
Knowsley Street
Bury
Lancashire
BL9 0SW

Our ref: SO/2020/120565/04-L01
Your ref: 65844
Date: 04 May 2022

Dear Sir/Madam

ERECTION OF 72 NO. DWELLINGS INCLUDING THE RETENTION AND CONVERSION OF 2 EXISTING BUILDINGS TO RESIDENTIAL USE (5 NO. UNITS), THE RETENTION OF A CHIMNEY AND THE DEMOLITION OF A DERELICT BUILDING, TOGETHER WITH ENGINEERING OPERATIONS TO CREATE A DEVELOPMENT PLATFORM AND ASSOCIATED PARKING, LANDSCAPING, DRAINAGE, THE LAYOUT OF INTERNAL ESTATE ROADS AND FOOTWAYS AND OTHER ASSOCIATED WORKS FORMER MONDI/HOLCOMBE MILL, BRIDGE STREET, RAMSBOTTOM, BURY, BL0 0BS

Thank you for referring further details to the Environment Agency to address our previous objection. We have reviewed email dated 12 April 2022, with documents attached from Litchfields.

Previously reviewed:

- Letter from Weetwood ref: 4714/2020-11-06/JA/EA/01
- Annex 1 to letter – Flood Hazard Rating (1% AEP 35%CC)

We have no additional comments to make in relation to these documents and we recommend the Flood Plan document (2020-11-18 4714 Flood Plan Final v1.0) be reviewed by your emergency planners. It is specifically related to measures to ensure development occupiers remain safe through flood warning, access / egress, or refuge within dwellings during a flood. We recommend your emergency planners consider these issues and whether the development proposed would increase the scale of any evacuation necessary from the area as set out in paragraphs 038-040 of the NPPF planning guidance.

Environment Agency
Richard Fairclough House Knutsford Road, Warrington, WA4 1HT.
Customer services line: 03708 506 506
www.gov.uk/environment-agency

Cont/d..

We also note the comments in letter ref: 4926/2022-01-12/JA/LPA/01 from Weetwood. The letter identifies that the published climate change guidance was updated in July 2021 since the application was made and the FRA was written. For “more vulnerable” development in flood zone 3a, the guidance now requires the “central” climate change allowance to be considered as opposed to the previous “higher central” and “upper end” allowances. For the River Irwell catchment, the central allowance is 35% which corresponds to the previous higher central figure. As such, the basic design flood considered in the FRA of 1%AEP 35%cc is appropriate. The FRA has assessed the predominant fluvial flood risk to the site and proposed measures to mitigate the risks. The FRA identifies that there is some risk associated with access/egress from the site during a design event or more extreme events. The applicant has proposed management of these risks via a Flood Plan, which could put additional requirements on emergency responders. Your emergency planners should comment on the adequacy of this before determining the application.

Environment Position

Following review of the submitted details, we can now remove our objection, but would draw your attention to the following Sequential Test and Flood warning and emergency advice.

Sequential Test - Advice to LPA

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, which are consistent with the use for which the site was allocated.

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 decide whether the sequential test has been satisfied, but the applicant should demonstrate to you, with evidence, what area of search has been used. Further guidance on the area of search can be found in the planning practice guidance [here](#).

Flood warning and emergency response - Advice to LPA

We do not normally comment on or approve the adequacy of flood emergency response procedures accompanying development proposals, as we do not carry out these roles during a flood. Our involvement with this development during an emergency will be limited to delivering flood warnings to occupants/users covered by our flood warning network.

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, we advise local planning authorities to formally consider the emergency planning and rescue implications of new development in making their decisions. As such, we recommend you refer to '[Flood risk emergency plans for new development](#)' and undertake appropriate consultation with your emergency planners and the emergency services to determine whether the proposals are safe in accordance with paragraph 167 of the NPPF and the guiding principles of the PPG.

We have considered the findings of the flood risk assessment in relation to the likely duration, depths, velocities, and flood hazard rating against the design flood for the proposal. We agree that this indicates that there could be a danger to some people (for example the elderly and infirm) in relation to access/egress from the site.

The Annex 1 Flood Hazard Rating plan for the design flood event identifies localised risk of "moderate hazard" on Bridge Street. This appears to coincide with the main/only access/egress point for the development.

We remind you to consult with your emergency planners and the emergency services to confirm the adequacy of the evacuation proposals.

Please forward a copy of this letter to the applicant.

Yours faithfully

Mrs. SYLVIA WHITTINGHAM
Planning Advisor

Direct dial 0203 0251059

Direct e-mail sylvia.whittingham@environment-agency.gov.uk