

Consultation Documents Update and Proposed Responses
Report by Planning Policy Officer

Summary:	This report informs the Committee of the Officers' proposed response to planning policy consultations recently received, and invites any comments or guidance the Committee may have.
Recommendation:	That the report be noted and the nature of proposed response be endorsed.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Appendix 1 shows selected planning policy consultation documents received by the Authority since the last Planning Committee meeting, together with the officer's proposed response.
- 1.2 The Committee's endorsement, comments or guidance are invited.

2 Financial Implications

- 2.1 There are no financial implications.

Background papers: None

Author: Natalie Beal
Date of report: 1 August 2016

Appendices: APPENDIX 1 – Schedule of Planning Policy Consultations received

Planning Policy Consultations Received

ORGANISATION:	Waveney District Council
DOCUMENT:	Lowestoft Flood Risk Management Project
LINK	http://www.lowestoftfrmp.org.uk/latest-news/consultation-document/
RECEIVED:	13 July 2016
DUE DATE:	17 August 2016
STATUS:	Consultation
PROPOSED LEVEL:	Planning Committee Endorsed
NOTES:	<p>This Strategy covers the areas of Lowestoft deemed to be at significant risk from tidal flooding between the Outer Harbour and the western end of Lake Lothing at Mutford Lock; from river flooding along Kirkley Stream, and from surface water flooding both adjacent to Kirkley Stream and other key areas identified to the north and south of Lake Lothing.</p> <p>Solutions are needed to address all these forms of flooding to offer the best possible flood risk management for Lowestoft. In deciding the best ways to manage tidal flood risk in Lowestoft now and in the future, a long list of options have been assessed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do nothing (Option 1) • Maintain existing defences (Option 2) • Improve - defence raising – walls only (Option 3) • Improve - defence raising – walls combined with a barrier. 3 barrier locations considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outer Harbour (Option 4) ○ seaward of Bascule Bridge (Options 5) ○ within Lake Lothing combined with 3rd crossing (Option 6) <p>Kirkley Stream:</p> <p>Fluvial Options Overview – Location & Description Options Considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 01 Create new storage and restrict flows 02 Additional storage in existing green spaces 03 Re-routing of the watercourse 04 Reducing flows from upstream watercourses 05 Restrict flows to use capacity in existing drainage systems 06 Create embankments 07 Installing a two stage channel in Kirkley Stream 08 Earlier operation of surface water pumps 09 Increasing capacity of existing storage areas 10 Removal of silt and re-grading of the watercourse 11 Adding non return valves on the network

	<p>13 Installing local mitigation measures 14 Optimising throttles in the river 15 Strategic non-return valve and underground storage</p>
<p>PROPOSED RESPONSE:</p>	<p>No specific mention of how a changing climate might alter the impacts. Suggest reference made to changing patterns of rainfall (including projected increased frequency and intensity of rain events) and rising sea level to help people understand the changing probabilities and risks over time. Other climate impacts may have an effect on the Kirkley stream – such as water temperature increasing and periods of drought. Modifications could be designed that might be able to off-set this and to bring environmental improvements as well. The environmental improvements may also bring societal improvements (recreation, landscape) as well although it may need additional finance: this however might be available through other funding streams.</p> <p>Little reference to the Broads to the west of the area. Assume that notice has been taken of the navigation, recreational needs and uses and environmental designations to ensure any potential adverse impacts or potential enhancements have been identified. This allows decision making to be properly informed. Reference to this in the summary document helps inform the public such issues have been covered. The Broads Authority will be happy to help review such issues.</p> <p>The material as presented seems to focus solely on the flood management advantages or disadvantages. Appreciating that other factors can make it more confusing, there is probably merit in reflecting whether any further benefits can be obtained: such as environmental enhancements (natural and historic) recreational opportunities (e.g. does it impact on walking or cycling network) or regeneration advantages. Such consideration can sometimes identify additional costs but may also release other funding strands.</p> <p>Pleased to see references to SuDs and this could be strengthened by drawing out other benefits of such systems (e.g. health, recreation and biodiversity gains).</p> <p>The assessment of the Kirkley stream interventions are very one dimensional and appear not to acknowledge how some positive projects could bring added value to landscape, biodiversity, recreation and well-being.</p> <p>Page 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should show the Broads Executive Area on this map. <p>Page 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should there be an update to reflect the rainfall events of June? Not sure if Lowestoft was affected greatly... if so, might emphasise the importance of such a recent incident. • So far there is only mention of affecting future growth, but what about existing assets and businesses and the community and the impact of flooding on those? Is

	<p>that a reason for defences as well?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Should this strategy feed into our local plan?• Last word – planning? Plan making? Planning permission? Planning applications? Suggest this is elaborated. <p>Page 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Can the evidence be shared with us to update our systems, as a Local Planning Authority for part of the Lowestoft area?• Column 2, last sentence – section ends abruptly, is there any progress on funding?• There could be a section on how this strategy fits with the Broads. <p>Page 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Will hard infrastructure move the issue elsewhere? How has this been taken into consideration? <p>Page 9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is there a target reduction zone in the Broads – map seems to show Oulton Broad... What should we be doing at the Broads?• What do the colours mean? There is no legend. <p>General view that the document is otherwise helpful and clear apart from the map of target area reduction zones and accompanying text is so brief it leave lots of questions (how have the zones been determined? What about priorities? Who is doing what?etc)</p>
--	---