Your ref: PAP/2021/0663
Our ref: WCC002350 R1/FRM/CSB/002
Your letter received: 18/02/2022

**SENT BY EMAIL**

Flood Risk Management
Warwickshire County Council
Shire Hall
Warwick
Warwickshire

Mr J Brown
Head of Planning
North Warwickshire Borough Council
The Council House
South Street
Atherstone CV9 1DE

**FAO Andrew Collinson**

04 March 2022

Dear Mr Brown

**PROPOSAL:** **Outline planning permission for development of land within Use Class B2 (general industry), Use Class B8 (storage and distribution) and Use Class E(g)(iii) (light industrial), and ancillary infrastructure and associated works, development of overnight lorry parking facility and ancillary infrastructure and associated works. Details of access submitted for approval in full, all other matters reserved**

**LOCATION:** **Land On The West Side Of, Dordon Road, Polesworth**

Warwickshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has reviewed the additional information for this application which was received on the 18 February 2022. It is understood this is in response to the LLFA's prior response on 11 January 2022 where the following was considered outstanding.

1. The FRA states the development will be attenuated the QBar greenfield rate, supporting calculations are required.
2. Further information is required regarding the outfall from the site. Whilst it is noted information has been provided through the pre-application advice process with the LLFA, this information should be provided within the planning application to ensure a holistic review of the information available.
3. A preliminary surface water drainage strategy is required showing where SuDS features will be located and demonstrating sufficient space is accorded within the parameter plans to be approved.
4. Supporting calculations demonstrating that the various attenuation features are suitably sized to accommodate the 1 in 100 year storm event including an allowance for climate change.
5. It's stated within the FRA that the design life of the development is 30 years and an allowance of +20% has been used. This design life could be considered low and as such the LLFA would wish to see the surface water drainage strategy sensitivity tested using a +40% climate change allowance to understand the risks to this and wider development.
6. Further consideration in relation to the culverted watercourse passing through the site. Opportunities to daylight this feature should be considered early and space made available within the masterplan.

7. Assess the likely water quality hazard arising from the development and identify appropriate mitigation
8. Consider and demonstrate how any surface water exceedance and overland flow will be managed and routed through the development.

Based on the information submitted the LLFA currently recommends refusal of planning permission and **maintains our objection** to the development based on the following reasons.

**Reason**

The information submitted with this application does not comply with the requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework[i] (NPPF) and supporting Flood Risk & Coastal Change guidance[ii]. Specifically:

- The details relating to the surface water drainage are insufficient.

The submitted information does not therefore allow a suitable assessment of the proposed development, considering flood risk and surface water drainage matters.

**Overcoming our objection**

You can overcome our objection by submitting further information which is detailed below. This information should provide details of the proposed surface water drainage considering the scale and nature of the development to ensure the site will not increase risk elsewhere and where possible reduces flood risk overall. If this cannot be achieved we are likely to maintain our objection to the application.

At the 'outline' planning stage a the Surface Water Drainage Strategy should be developed to inform the masterplan or indicative site layout. This should be based on SuDS principles and provide opportunity to attenuate surface water runoff, improve water quality and provide amenity and biodiversity. This should be supported by suitable high-level calculations demonstrating the performance of the attenuation and that adequate space is provided.

Given the above, the following comments are made and further information required is outlined. This forms the basis of our current objection:

1. It is stated within the 'Technical Note Response to the LLFA' document (ref 20073-BGL-XX-XX-TN-D-00002, version P03, dated 2nd Feb 2022) that discharge rate calculations are included in Appendix A. No such calculations are included and the reference directs to the Indicative Pond Details drawing. These calculations remain outstanding.
2. An Indicative Pond Details drawing has been provided demonstrating how water will be attenuated however the LLFA has significant concerns regarding the approach as follows:
    a) The collection and attenuation of surface water runoff in a single feature does not represent a SuDS approach of dispersing and controlling water as close to source as possible.
    b) The basin shown is 3.3m deep and as such may be considered an inappropriate depth of water. The SuDS Manual states "*the maximum depth of water in a basin should not normally exceed 2m… many authorities will require lower depths for safety reasons.*" This is supplemented with WCC LLFA's design guide which goes on to state "*where possible the depth of water should not exceed 1 m. Very deep basins ('bomb craters') are unacceptable*"
    c) Given the depth of basin and associated side slopes, maintenance activities such as mowing could be considered challenging. Given the size of the basin in it's current form, the LLFA would expect an appropriate means of access to be able to get suitable plant to the bed of the basin to perform maintenance activities.
    d) The basin represents a single point of failure of the system which should be considered alongside the below:

e) The basin proposes to attenuate 15,000m3 of water behind a raised embankment cresting 3.6m above ground level. This is not yet categorised as a raised reservoir but could yet become one if Schedule 4 of the Flood & Water Management Act (2010) is enacted. Nonetheless, the owner still has a statutory duty for the safety of others. The failure of this embankment and the release of large volumes of water therefore could represent an extreme safety risk, especially considering the location in close proximity to the M42 and A5 strategic road network.

3. Given the above concerns, the LLFA require an alternative strategy to address these points. This should be based on SuDS principles providing a dispersed and resilient system. Runoff should be managed as close to where it lands as possible and the system should utilise multiple SuDS features to manage water quality, provide amenity and bio-diversity. Where necessary, additional space should be made available across the masterplan.
4. The LLFA accepts de-culverting may not be feasible however further consideration should be given to it's existing location considering:
    a) The LLFA strongly recommends no buildings / structures (incl. attenuation basins) are located on top of the culverted watercourse to ensure access, maintainability and stability of the culvert.
    b) The location of culverted watercourse should be shown on the parameter plans (same as the gas main constraint) to ensure the subsequent design accounts for the location of this culvert.
5. Given the potential land use, the single attenuation basin may be consider insufficient to manage water quality. The proposed use of interceptors is welcomed but is not considered acceptable on their own in the absence of a suitable SuDS treatment train to manage & improve water quality. The applicant is referred back to providing a dispersed SuDS system to manage and treat water across the development, as close to where it lands.
6. It's noted that levels design is a detailed design matter to be considered at the next stage. Nonetheless, exceedance and overland flow should be considered at this stage:
    a) The Flood Risk from Surface Water map shows localised areas at risk of surface water flooding, how will this be redirected ensuring the outline sets a strategy for detailed design?
    b) The basin is potentially elevated above existing ground level, therefore how will overland flows enter the basin?
    c) Given the above concerns regarding the basin, how will water be retained on site?

We ask to be re-consulted with the results of any additional information. We will provide you with bespoke comments within 21 days of receiving formal reconsultation..

**Informative**

a) Surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible through a sustainable drainage approach to surface water management. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are an approach to managing surface water run-off which seeks to mimic natural drainage systems and retain water on-site as opposed to traditional drainage approaches which involve piping water off-site as quickly as possible.
b) The LLFA does not consider oversized pipes or box culverts as sustainable drainage. Where such attenuation is considered necessary, this should be supplemented with suitable above ground features such as green roofs, rain-gardens and tree pits to provide water quality, amenity and bio-diversity benefits.
c) Reference is made to the LLFA's *Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage Local guidance for developers*[iii] which provides further advice and guidance as to how surface water drainage proposals should be designed.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

Planning & Sustainable Drainage Engineer

---

Documents Reviewed:
'Technical Note Response to the LLFA' document (ref 20073-BGL-XX-XX-TN-D-00002, version P03, dated 2nd Feb 2022)

---

[i] https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1005759/NPPF_July_2021.pdf

[ii] https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change

[iii] https://api.warwickshire.gov.uk/documents/WCCC-1039-95