

Responses to second flood risk SPD consultation

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comment	BA response	How SPD changed/amended
#1	Stewart Patience	Anglian Water Services	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the amended draft Flood Risk SPD for the Broads Authority. Having previously had the opportunity to comment and be involved on the development of an earlier draft, the current version incorporates previously suggested comments. The proposed changes made following the previous consultation on the SPD do not appear to any issues of relevance for Anglian Water. On this basis, Anglian Water have no further comment to make and supports the current version of the SPD.	Support noted	No change to SPD
#2	Penny Turner	Norfolk Police	Thank you for the notification of the amended Flood Risk Supplementary Planning Document for the Broads. We have no specific comment regarding the content of this guidance.	Noted	No change to SPD
#3	John Ash	Broads Authority Member	79 After Intense rainfall you may want to add which may increase with climate change	Agree. Will add reference to climate change to 4.2.2.	4.2.2 Intense rainfall, often not lasting a long time, that is unable to soak into the ground or enter drainage systems, can run quickly off land and result in local flooding. Surface water flooding problems are linked to issues of poor drainage, or drainage blockage by debris, and sewer flooding. Instances of intense rainfall may increase as a result of climate change.
#4	John Ash	Broads Authority Member	320 I think it is not helpful saying the flooding is shallow. From my experience flooding can be over 1m in depth in places depending on the topography. 321 add: in or beside a breach in defences where the flow will be greater and the risk would	Noted. Will amend 5.6.9.	The nature of flooding in the Broads is such that flood water is likely to have a slow velocity, may be shallow in depth and may be low hazard (depending on topography), unless it is in an area or beside a breach in defences where the flow could will be greater and the risk would subsequently be higher.
#5	John Ash	Broads Authority Member	1327 add application at the end of the sentence.	Agree. Will amend.	Add 'application'.
#6	Lewis Chappell	Norfolk County Council LLFA	We welcome that comments made previously by the LLFA have been included in the draft provided for consultation. We recommend the following information to be included: Reference to Norfolk County Council (NCC) – Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) Statutory Consultee for Planning: Guidance Document should be made within the document. This outlines the LLFA guidance for developers regarding surface water flooding, drainage design and sustainable development. At this point, we have no further recommendations to make.	Agree. Will include a reference.	Will add reference to this document and this link in Section 9: https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/-/media/norfolk/downloads/rubbish-recycling-planning/flood-and-water-management/guidance-on-norfolk-county-councils-lead-local-flood-authority-role-as-statutory-consultee-to-planning.pdf
#7	Laura Waters	Norfolk County Council	Thank you for your consultation on the Flood Risk SPD for the Broads, as previous comments on the document have been included/utilised in the current document we have no further comments to make on the SPD.	Noted	No change to SPD
#8	Liam Robson	Environment Agency	Section 4.3: New climate change allowances were published in December 2019 on gov.uk, these will result in increases in flood level of between 1.2m and 1.6m compared to present day flood levels.	Agree. Will amend and add reference to this.	This text added as a new section - 4.9 Add this as new footnote to 6.10.4.
#9	Liam Robson	Environment Agency	Section 5.6.9: It may be better to reword this as: Existing flood defences in the Broads area offer a low standard of protection (typically up to a 1 in 7-year standard) so they may be overtopped during a flood event. However some defences are higher, with a 0.5% (1 in 200) standard or greater.	Agree. Will amend and add reference to this.	5.6.9 Existing flood defences in the Broads area offer a low standard of protection (typically up to a 1 in 7-year standard) so they may be overtopped during a flood event. However some defences are higher, with a 0.5% (1 in 200) standard or greater. Existing flood defences in the Broads area offer a low standard of protection (typically up to a 1 in 7-year standard), so they may be overtopped during a flood event.
#10	Liam Robson	Environment Agency	Line 326 and 327: The measures to take before, during and after a flood should be detailed within a Flood Response Plan for each development site.	Agree. Will amend and add reference to this.	5.6.10 Some people living and working within the Broads are historically familiar with the water environment and are unlikely to be surprised or alarmed by the possibility of floods or rising water levels or may be more prepared. That being said, others may not have had any experience of flooding. Measures will need to be in place to ensure effective communication with visitors - an issue which is already addressed on many sites locally. The measures to take before, during and after a flood should be detailed within a Flood Response Plan for each development site.
#11	Liam Robson	Environment Agency	Section 6.10.6: actual risk 1% (1 in 100) fluvial or 0.5% (1 in 200) tidal annual probability climate change flood event. Should it say the Environment Agency requires this or the NPPF Planning Practice Guidance? As the PPG allows flood resilient construction to be used for change of use/new less vulnerable but not new more vulnerable development, and therefore new more vulnerable to be dry in a flood. We also require refuge above the 0.1% (1 in 1000) climate change annual probability extreme flood for more vulnerable development.	Agree. Will amend and add reference to this.	6.10.6 It is important to note that the Environment Agency NPPG need new more vulnerable development to not flood in the actual risk 1% (1 in 100) fluvial or 0.5% (1 in 200) tidal annual probability climate change flood event through the provision of defences, raised land or raised floor levels. The Environment Agency also require refuge above the 0.1% (1 in 1000) climate change annual probability extreme flood for more vulnerable development.

#12	Liam Robson	Environment Agency	Line 702: Reword to 'if proposed less vulnerable development at actual or residual risk of flooding, or more vulnerable development at residual risk of flooding would be...'	Agree. Will amend and add reference to this.	The Authority will also consider if <u>proposed less vulnerable development at actual or residual risk of flooding, or more vulnerable development at residual risk of flooding would be</u> consider if proposed less vulnerable developments at risk of flooding that would be safe and sustainable and whether flood resilient measures and flood response plans are sufficient to mitigate risk.
#13	Liam Robson	Environment Agency	Line 705 and 706: And advice on Flood Response Plans can be found in Appendix D.	Agree. Will amend and add reference to this.	Advice on the flood resistance and resilience of buildings can be found at section 5 7 of this SPD <u>and advice on Flood Response Plans can be found in Appendix D.</u>
#14	Liam Robson	Environment Agency	Line 1019: This sentence still does not make sense. Words missing. Perhaps reword as: 'If the use of a culvert cannot be avoided then their size should be designed so they are appropriately designed for both low and high flows, are the biggest culvert that can be accommodated within the watercourse to maintain existing capacity and so have capacity for high flow conditions (and this specification might be a matter for the IDB, LLFA or Environment Agency	Agree. Will amend and add reference to this.	Replace existing wording with the proposed wording.
#15	Gary Burckitt	Member of community	The document implies that the "hold the line" policy will run until 2055. But goes on to state that "this is dependent on the option continuing to be technically and economically deliverable". – leading to the possibility of managed realignment or a retired line of defence further inland. (Presumably at any time in the next 35 years. – Could be within a few years.) Whilst there is comfort in stating the line will be held until 2055, making it dependent on technical and economic factors surely means that it is under constant review and, in my opinion, does not reassure owners of domestic properties and business premises one little bit.	Noted. The document uses the position set out in the Shoreline Management Plan. However we will amend 5.9.	As a summary for this document, the general approach to coastal erosion along this stretch for the present day and medium term is to hold the line up to 2055. This is dependent on the option continuing to be technically and economically deliverable and over time other options may be investigated such as possible managed realignment, or a retired line of defence further inland. In relation to the present day, the Plan says:
#16	Robin Buxton	Horsey Parish Council	Horsey Parish Council met on the 20th February and the Authority's Flood Risk Supplementary Planning Document Consultation was considered. Members support the purposes of the plan and indeed the contents apart from section 5.9 The Coast, in reference to the local sea defences, hold the line up to 2055, that this is dependent on the option continuing to be technically and economically deliverable and over time other options may be investigated such as possible managed realignment on a retired line of defence further inland. We strongly suggest that any reference to "what may be investigated such as possible managed realignment on a retired line of defence further inland" be removed as this is totally unacceptable to us. Such reference could result in a planning blight and may present problems for some properties obtaining flood insurance as happened during a Conservation body report made in the recent past. We understand that the Broads Authority is not qualified to speculate on what may or might not be investigated on coast related matters since the Authority is not a risk management authority under the Coast Protection Act. The forthcoming Broadland Futures Initiative project would be the appropriate opportunity to discuss future coastal matters rather than a planning guidance document.	Noted. The document uses the position set out in the Shoreline Management Plan. However we will amend 5.9.	As a summary for this document, the general approach to coastal erosion along this stretch for the present day and medium term is to hold the line up to 2055. This is dependent on the option continuing to be technically and economically deliverable and over time other options may be investigated such as possible managed realignment, or a retired line of defence further inland. In relation to the present day, the Plan says:
#17	David Auston	Member of community	From what I have understood of the paper I think it is vital to emphasise the importance of achieving an accurate and contemporary picture of land levels between the Broads and the coast and that until such work has been thoroughly carried out and the public informed, there should be no speculation indulged in publicly and even then only informed bodies should lead the debate. On this last point I believe that only risk management authorities should be involved thus precluding the Broads Authority who I believe do not come under that description. A great deal of damage is done by loose speculation which has no real scientific base. In all the above proceedings the general public and in particular those residents of areas under discussion have to be kept informed. Having said the above, I will indulge a little in my own speculation. I have read that the existing line of defence is to be held until 2055 so long as it is technically and economically deliverable. I would say that of course it is technically deliverable. You only have to look at the Dutch nation to see that, or to consider the proposition by Dutch scientists and engineers to build a dam across the North Sea from Scotland to Norway and at the southern end between England and France to understand that anything is possible. It is whether there is the political will which is a far more salient point. Finally, a retired line of defence would, I imagine, carry with it an economic cost on a par with that at the coast so why not hold it there? There can be no end to the policy of retreat.	Noted. The document uses the position set out in the Shoreline Management Plan. However we will amend 5.9.	As a summary for this document, the general approach to coastal erosion along this stretch for the present day and medium term is to hold the line up to 2055. This is dependent on the option continuing to be technically and economically deliverable and over time other options may be investigated such as possible managed realignment, or a retired line of defence further inland. In relation to the present day, the Plan says:

#18	Dennis Willis	Member of community	The draft SPD document fails to acknowledge that Hoveton exists. There are foul water flooding issues in Hoveton that affect the river Bure. (sharing evidence!).	Noted. Will amend text.	Add to foul sewer column on page 22: • Anglian Water is currently preparing a position statement relating to Hoveton catchment. It is intended to set out the current position relating to this catchment including historic issues within the network and the implications for new development.
#19	Dennis Willis	Member of community	The BA should not consider just its own area regarding planning applications. (joined-up action!) It should have concern that nearby developments, in flood zones 1, WILL have impact on the executive area. Your 4.5.2 Refers: "Existing sewers can also become overloaded as new development adds to the discharge to their catchment,(urban creep). Sewer flooding is therefore a problem that could occur in many locations" ... it does in Hoveton, yet BA as consultee makes response that fails to refer to sewage discharges into the Broads (Planning application PF/11/07620). How can SPD address this issue? I'm waiting to see BA response as consultee to present planning application PF_19_1659 regarding the same issue.	Noted. Will pass on the comments made in this representation to NNDC, with the permission of Mr Willis. This comment has also been passed on to the DM Officer at the Broads Authority who is preparing the Authority's response. Row #18 last column shows that we will add text relating to Hoveton. The answer to the comment in #21 is of relevance to this comment. We have been made aware of the issues subsequently and will take them into account when commenting on planning applications in NNDC area.	No change to SPD.
#20	Dennis Willis	Member of community	Your amendment ref. North Norfolk includes: "At the time of writing, there are early discussions between the Environment Agency, North Norfolk District Council and the Broads Authority about particular issues of discharge and flooding from the river into the drainage systems". This should be definitive and refer "sewage drainage systems".	Agree. Will amend text.	Change to: sewage drainage systems
#21	Dennis Willis	Member of community	Early discussions? EA were aware of sewage system issues in Hoveton in 2017 and referred to it in January 2018 (AE/2017/122281/02-L01 to NNDC Planning).... And nothing has been done about addressing the issues. What can be included in SPD to address them?	We will send you the contact we have at EA and Anglian Water Services. Also see row #18.	No change to SPD.
#22	Dennis Willis	Member of community	Be reminded that Anglian Water has a legal requirement under the Water Act 1991"to provide, improve and extend such a system of public sewers ... and so to cleanse and maintain those sewersas to ensure that that area is and continues to be effectually drained"! This means NOT drained into the Broads. (enhance the catchment!)	Noted.	No change to SPD.
#23	Dennis Willis	Member of community	Your amendment ref. North Norfolk, includes: "To summarise, due to capacity issues, development that increases foul drainage output is not likely to be permitted." How can SBD/BA influence development in NNDC areas abutting the BA executive area that has the capacity to increase foul drainage output?	The Authority tends to be consulted on neighbouring applications that are near to our boundary. This is an issue we can raise in our response, if appropriate and relevant, noting your comment in row #19.	No change to SPD.
#24	Dennis Willis	Member of community	You refer North Norfolk, Groundwater: "No concerns specific to North Norfolk". Developments in upper Hoveton (Brook Park Phases 1 and 2) create surface water discharge into areas of ground that WILL raise the water table at times of significant rainfall. This does affect those properties in areas of upper Hoveton – so there should be concerns.	Noted however this issue, as worded, seems more to do with surface water. Note that we are also seeking advice from EA on this query, but consider this more of a surface water issue and surface water is adequately addressed in the SPD and other documents - see #25 below.	No change to SPD.
#25	Dennis Willis	Member of community	The plan supports the use of SuDS. You should as planning authority ensure that approved SuDS are built as such by developers. Evidence exists that SuDS are not built as approved in Hoveton and in other areas of Norfolk. (carrying out joined-up actions that address agreed issues).	Noted. We have a strong Surface Water Run-off policy in our recently adopted Local Plan - DM6. As Mr Willis points out, the SPD also addresses SuDS. So there is the policy framework to address the need for SuDS. If Mr Willis would like to tell us of specific examples in the Broads Authority where SuDS are not being built as approved, the Authority will look into this.	No change to SPD.
#26	Dennis Willis	Member of community	Line 905 & 906 ..."deep infiltration is unlikely to work in the Broads Authority area due to high ground water levels". Should read BA and abutting authority/council areas.	Noted. The SPD cannot guide development in neighbouring Local Planning Authority areas. With Mr Willis' permission, we will send this comment on to NNDC.	No change to SPD.

#27	Ray Holloway	Member of community	<p>The following comments are a combination of most comments made by Mr Holloway during an email conversation to ascertain the changes he would like to propose.</p> <p>I believe the Broads Authority should urgently remove a reference in its latest flood risk planning document to managed coastal retreat. A sentence could trigger a repeat of the problems that followed Natural England's report seven years ago. It caused panic when leaked to the press because it called for sea defences between Winterton and Horsey to be done away with and for there to be a managed retreat that could go as far inland as Potter Heigham. They withdrew it, funding came from the Government to maintain sea defences and the shoreline management plan is to hold the line until 2055. There is concern at the Broads Authority's statement that "...other options may be investigated such as managed re-alignment on a retired line of defence further inland." The Environment Agency has confirmed the Broads Authority is not a flood risk management authority under the Coastal Protection Act. Please note that my comments paraphrases a report from a local Parish Council meeting, but do reflect my personal opinion. The SMP was adopted in 2012, I consider quoting it by the BA to be irresponsible partly because the situation regarding erosion and climate change has moved on a long way in 8 years, and shoreline management is not part of your responsibility. My understanding is that the BA makes reference to managed retreat, possibly the reference is not the exactly correct wording from the SPD as I picked up the information from a Parish Council meeting. You'll appreciate that these consultation documents are rarely accessible to general public understanding, given their nature. As to how I wish to proceed, I would simply like to register that "any" reference to managed retreat however obliquely worded has no place in any plan or consultation and that to do so is irresponsible and beyond BA's responsibility. I hope this is possible as I believe it is very important and is relevant to all planning considerations along and adjacent to Norfolk's coast. My suggestion is that the following text is taken out of the document, struck through. 'This is dependent on the option continuing to be technically and economically deliverable and over time other options may be investigated such as possible managed realignment, or a retired line of defence further inland. In relation to the present day'</p>	<p>Noted. The document uses the position set out in the Shoreline Management Plan. However we will amend 5.9.</p>	<p>As a summary for this document, the general approach to coastal erosion along this stretch for the present day and medium term is to hold the line up to 2055. This is dependent on the option continuing to be technically and economically deliverable and over time other options may be investigated such as possible managed realignment, or a retired line of defence further inland. In relation to the present day, the Plan says:</p>
#28	Richard Starling	Somerton Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council supports the main purposes of the plan to increase awareness, advice to developers and to maintain high standards of design.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>
#29	Richard Starling	Somerton Parish Council	<p>The plan should state that not all areas of the Broads have detailed hydraulic information and the Environment Agency acknowledges these limitations. The Broadland Futures Initiative minutes of their 21 October 2019 meeting (Note 6 A.O.B.) state "The need to establish the true picture regarding the functional floodplain" and, furthermore, "The need for up to date and accurate land levels especially between the Broads and the Coast". The planning document should include these references to reflect the current position especially section 5.8. Functional Flood Plain. The Environment Agency recognise the need for more detailed surveys and they intent to publish an online public consultation regarding Broadland flood modelling in coming months. Until these surveys are completed the document should state that "the extent and efficiency of the Functional Flood Plain has yet to be established" This would be in line with current Environment Agency information.</p>	<p>Noted. The Local Plan sets this out on page 35.</p> <p>The Authority has a joint position statement with the EA on this very topic: http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0011/958286/SFRA-Position-Statement-June-2018.pdf</p> <p>The SPD talks about this in section 5.5.4</p> <p>The issue is therefore adequately addressed.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>
#30	Richard Starling	Somerton Parish Council	<p>The Coast (5.9) You mention, in relation to the local sea defences, hold the line up to 2055, that this is dependent on the option continuing to be technically and economically deliverable and over time other options may be investigated such as possible managed realignment on a retired line of defence further inland. The Broads Authority is not, according to the Environment Agency, a risk management authority under the Coast Protection Act and therefore Somerton Parish Council considers that the document should not include speculations on what might or may be investigated since the Authority is not qualified to make such statements. These references should therefore be removed or attributed to a body which is qualified.</p>	<p>Noted. The document uses the position set out in the Shoreline Management Plan. However we will amend 5.9.</p>	<p>As a summary for this document, the general approach to coastal erosion along this stretch for the present day and medium term is to hold the line up to 2055. This is dependent on the option continuing to be technically and economically deliverable and over time other options may be investigated such as possible managed realignment, or a retired line of defence further inland. In relation to the present day, the Plan says:</p>
#31	Lorraine Houseago	Norfolk County Council	<p>Thank you for consulting us on this amended planning document. We have no comments to make.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>
#32	Simon Marjoram	Broadland and South Norfolk Councils	<p>References to the impacts of 'climate change', such as the suggested increase in river flows that have been added to para 4.4.1, should be cross-referenced to source material. It would also make the SPD more useful if, where possible, it could be quantified as to what taking into account climate change means in terms of what is required of applicants to demonstrate the acceptability of proposals.</p>	<p>Agreed. EA said the same.</p>	<p>See Row #18. And reference added to 4.4.1.</p>

#33	Simon Marjoram	Broadland and South Norfolk Councils	The SPD would benefit from being more consistent in its reference to Neighbourhood Plans, e.g. para 7.1.3 refers to taking into account other policies in the Broads Local Plan and adjoining authorities' Local Plans, but should refer to Neighbourhood Plans too, as they also form part of the Development Plan; and	Agreed. Will amend 7.1.3	7.1.3 It should be noted that all aspects of the development need to comply with policies of the Local Plan (adopted 2019) as well as adopted Neighbourhood Plans and that conformity with policies SP2 and DM5 does not override applicability of other policies (of the Broads Authority and other relevant Local Planning Authority).
#34	Simon Marjoram	Broadland and South Norfolk Councils	The document numbering also goes awry in places (see sections 5.7 to 5.9).	Noted.	Check all formatting and numbering on adoption of the SPD. Also read through to check for any grammatical or typographical errors.
#35	Andrew Parnell	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	Great Yarmouth Borough Council welcomes the SPD and supports the approach of the Broads Authority to add further detail to Planning Policies around this important issue	Support noted.	No change to SPD.
#36	Andrew Parnell	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	Beginning at point 6.4 the tests to apply the sequential test may require more thought particularly in regards to area of search (6.5.8.)	Noted.	Add this as a bullet point to 6.5.8: Or a wider/another area as appropriate and subject to agreement with the Broads Authority
#37	Andrew Parnell	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	Our own draft policy available here (Policy E1, page 147) seeks to address the application of the sequential test. As an alternative for the broads would the relevant housing market area be an more appropriate area for applying the test for housing proposals?	Part of our area is in the Central Norfolk Housing Market Area which is the area of 5 districts. This approach might not work.	See response to #36 which may address this comment as well.
#38	Andrew Parnell	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	It is also unclear how a developer has to justify its area of search and what appropriate justification would constitute (6.5.11)	This depends in the site and the location. It will be for the applicant to address using this section as a guide.	No change to SPD.
#39	Paul Fletcher	Beccles Society	It is a very comprehensive document and is based on a lot of common sense in conjunction with planning policies. As such we have no further comments to make.	Support noted.	No change to SPD.
#40	Lisa Weller	Hoveton Parish Council	Hoveton Parish Council reviewed the draft Broads Flood Risk Supplementary Planning Document at its meeting of Monday 2nd March, and the Council noted that the draft document doesn't recognise the particular problems that exist in Hoveton regarding surface water and foul water flooding. Hoveton Parish Council would like to request that text is added within the table provided on page 21 of the draft document (sources of flood risk, North Norfolk), as follows:	Noted.	See next rows.
#41	Lisa Weller	Hoveton Parish Council	Under 'surface water' column: There are foul water flooding issues in Hoveton and Wroxham alongside the River Bure, from water running down and across Norwich Road in both these settlements and also in areas of Hoveton which experience serious surface water flooding at times of significant rainfall.	Agree and will amend table.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hoveton Parish Council, in response to the second consultation on the SPD, stated that there are foul water flooding issues in Hoveton and Wroxham alongside the River Bure, from water running down and across Norwich Road in both these settlements and also in areas of Hoveton which experience serious surface water flooding at times of significant rainfall.
#42	Lisa Weller	Hoveton Parish Council	Under 'foul sewer' column: Within Hoveton, the existing sewers have become overloaded, especially as new developments have added their discharge to the catchment. Sewer flooding is therefore now a problem in parts of Hoveton, with discharges into residential properties, which will need to be resolved by Anglian Water.	Agree to some extent and will amend table. Also see row #18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hoveton Parish Council, in response to the second consultation on the SPD, stated that the existing sewers have become overloaded and sewer flooding is now a problem in parts of Hoveton.