

Land north of Hemingfield Road, Hemingfield, Barnsley

Overview of Flood Risk and Drainage Proposals

Technical Note

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Project ref: | 6041 Land North of Hemingfield Road, Hemingfield |
| Prepared by: | Dr Kevin Tilford BSc (Hons) MSc (Eng) PhD MBA C.WEM FCIWEM CEnv <i>Managing Director</i> |
| Date: | 30 January 2025 |
| Version: | Final v1-3 |

Background

1. This Technical Note has been prepared on behalf of Hargreaves Land Limited and relates to the proposed development of an approximately 6.78 ha site to the north of Hemingfield Road, Hemingfield (“the site”) for residential use.
2. The site forms part, and is located at the western end, of a wider area of land designated as Safeguarded Land in the Barnsley Local Plan (Site ref: SL6).
3. An application for outline planning permission sought permission for the “*demolition of existing structures and erection of residential dwellings with associated infrastructure and open space. All matters reserved apart from access into the site*” and was submitted by Hargreaves Land Limited (“the applicant”) to the local planning authority (Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council referred to in this report as ‘Barnsley MBC’ or ‘the Council’) on 9 February 2024. The application was validated with the application reference 2024/0122.
4. Planning permission was refused by way of a Decision Notice dated 11 December 2024. The reasons for refusal related to the status of the site in the Local Plan and a concern that the proposal would have a potential impact on the comprehensive development of the wider site.
5. This Technical Note presents a technical overview of the proposals in relation to flood risk and drainage. In particular the document presents:
 - About Weetwood;
 - A summary of the work Weetwood has undertaken;
 - The main issues that arose and how these have been addressed;
 - Responses to consultee comments; and,
 - A response to objector comments and objections.

About Weetwood and the Author of this Document

6. Weetwood is an independent consultancy firm specialising in flood risk, drainage, and water management. The company was established in 1998 and operates nationally.
7. The range of services provided by Weetwood includes flood risk/consequences assessments, surface water and foul water drainage strategies and designs, Water Framework Directive assessments, environmental impact assessments, due diligence advice, expert witness and planning appeals support. Weetwood deals with greenfield and brownfield sites, from single dwellings to large strategic developments and urban extensions for residential, commercial, mixed use, retail, leisure, and industrial uses.
8. Weetwood advises a wide range of clients in the public and private sector including house builders, property developers, investors and banks, private clients, insurance companies, legal firms, local authority and the Environment Agency (EA), and we work collaboratively with consultants across a range of disciplines including architects, planning consultants, development managers, lawyers, engineers and property consultants.
9. This document has been prepared by Dr Kevin Tilford. I am Managing Director and owner of Weetwood, a position I have held since 2015. I hold a BSc(Hons) in Environmental Science from the University of Lancaster (1986), an MSc(Eng) in Water Resources Technology from the University of Birmingham (1987), a PhD in flood forecasting from the University of Salford (1991), and an MBA from the Cranfield School of Management (2006).

10. I am a Chartered Water and Environmental Manager, a Fellow of the Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management (CIWEM), and a Chartered Environmentalist. I currently serve as an elected member of the CIWEM Professional Standards Committee, a committee responsible for overseeing the maintenance of professional standards and ethics within the water and environmental management profession. Previously, I served as an elected member of the CIWEM Rivers and Coastal Group, the British Hydrological Society Pennines Hydrological Group, and the Royal Meteorological Society.
11. I have worked in the field of hydrology, water engineering and flood risk management since 1988, initially as an academic and thereafter as a consultant, initially with large multi-disciplinary consultants before joining Weetwood in 2010. I have provided flood risk and drainage advice on a wide range of development projects for a wide range of clients, including solar farm and battery energy storage systems developments.

Planning Policy and Guidance

National Planning Policy

12. The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the most recent iteration of which was published on 12 December 2024 and the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) updated on 14 February 2024 (specifically Section 7 - Flood Risk and Coastal Change, Updated on 25 August 2022).
13. The thrust of national planning policy, as articulated in the NPPF and the PPG is that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided where possible. The key policies state that:
 - Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided and that development should be directed away from those areas at highest risk (whether existing or future), but where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere (NPPF para. 170).
 - A sequential risk-based approach should be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding (NPPF para. 173). The aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding (NPPF para. 174).
 - The sequential test should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding, except in situations where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates that no built development within the site boundary, including access or escape routes, land raising or other potentially vulnerable elements, would be located on an area that would be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future (having regard to potential changes in flood risk) (NPPF para. 175).
 - If the Sequential Test is required to be undertaken, if it is not possible for development to be located in zones with a lower risk of flooding (taking into account wider sustainable development objectives) the Exception Test may have to be applied. The need for the test will depend on the potential vulnerability of the site and of the development proposed (as set out in Annex 3 of NPPF; also PPG Table 2) (NPPF para. 177).
 - Where the Exception Test must be applied, application of the test for development proposals at the application stage should be informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment. For the test to be passed it should be demonstrated that: (a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; (b) and the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall (NPPF para. 178). Both elements of the test should be satisfied for the development to be permitted (NPPF para. 179).
 - That proposals should not increase flood risk elsewhere (NPPF para. 181 and Footnote 63), and that a site-specific flood risk assessment should be provided for all development in flood zones 2 and 3, while in flood zone 1 an assessment should accompany all proposals involving: sites of 1 ha or more; land which has been identified by the EA as having critical drainage problems; land identified in a SFRA as being at increased flood risk in future; or, land that may be subject to other sources of flooding, where its development would introduce a more vulnerable use. Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where

- the flood risk assessment (and the sequential and exception tests, as applicable), demonstrate: a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location; b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient; c) the development incorporates SuDS, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate; d) any residual flood risk can be safely managed; and, e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.
- Applications which could affect drainage on or around the site should incorporate SuDS to control flow rates and reduce volumes of runoff, and which are proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal. These should provide multifunctional benefits wherever possible, through facilitating improvements in water quality and biodiversity, as well as benefits for amenity. SuDS provided as part of proposals for major development should: a) take account of advice from the LLFA; b) have appropriate proposed minimum operational standards; and, c) have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the lifetime of the development (NPPF para. 182).
14. Guidance on application of the sequential and exception tests is provided in Section 7 of the PPG - Flood Risk and Coastal Change. Key guidance includes:
- The approach is designed to ensure that areas at little or no risk of flooding from any source are developed in preference to areas at higher risk. This means avoiding, so far as possible, development in current and future (i.e. taking climate change into account) medium and high flood risk areas considering all sources of flooding including areas at risk of surface water flooding (PPG para. 7-023).
 - Where it is not possible to locate development in low risk areas, the Sequential Test should go on to compare reasonably available sites within medium risk areas and then, only where there are no reasonably available sites in low and medium risk areas, within high risk areas (PPG para. 7-024).
 - Initially, the presence of existing flood risk management infrastructure should be ignored, as the long-term funding, maintenance and renewal of this infrastructure is uncertain. Climate change will also impact upon the level of protection infrastructure will offer throughout the lifetime of development (PPG para. 7-024).
 - The Sequential Test should be applied to 'Major' and 'Non-major development' proposed in areas at risk of flooding unless the site has been allocated for development and subject to the test at the plan making stage (provided the proposed development is consistent with the use for which the site was allocated and provided there have been no significant changes to the known level of flood risk to the site, now or in the future which would have affected the outcome of the test); the site is in an area at low risk from all sources of flooding, unless the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, or other information, indicates there may be a risk of flooding in the future; or, the application is for a development type that is exempt from the test, as specified in footnote 60 of the NPPF (PPG para. 7-027).
 - For individual planning applications subject to the Sequential Test, the area to apply the test will be defined by local circumstances relating to the catchment area for the type of development proposed. For some developments this may be clear, for example, the catchment area for a school. In other cases, it may be identified from other Plan policies. For example, where there are large areas in Flood Zones 2 and 3 (medium to high probability of flooding) and development is needed in those areas to sustain the existing community, sites outside them are unlikely to provide reasonable alternatives. Equally, a pragmatic approach needs to be taken where proposals involve comparatively small extensions to existing premises (relative to their existing size), where it may be impractical to accommodate the additional space in an alternative location. For nationally or regionally important infrastructure the area of search to which the Sequential Test could be applied will be wider than the local planning authority boundary (PPG para. 027).
 - 'Reasonably available sites' are those in a suitable location for the type of development with a reasonable prospect that the site is available to be developed at the point in time envisaged for the development. These could include a series of smaller sites and/or part of a larger site if these would be capable of accommodating the proposed development. Such lower-risk sites do not need to be owned by the applicant to be considered 'reasonably available' (PPG para. 7-028).
 - The Exception Test should only be applied as set out in Table 2 [of the PPG ("Flood Risk Vulnerability and Flood Zone Incompatibility")] and only if the Sequential Test has shown that there are no reasonably available, lower risk sites, suitable for the proposed development, to which the development could be steered (PPG para. 7-032).

Local Planning Policy

15. The Barnsley Local Plan (BLP) was adopted by Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council in January 2019. The following policies are relevant in respect of flood risk and drainage:
16. Policy CC1 Climate Change states *“We will seek to reduce the causes of and adapt to the future impacts of climate change by: (Stem 3) Locating and designing development to reduce the risk of flooding; (Stem 4) Promoting the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).”*
17. Policy CC3 Flood Risk states *“The extent and impact of flooding will be reduced by:*
 - *Not permitting new development where it would be at an unacceptable risk of flooding from any sources of flooding or would give rise to flooding elsewhere.*
 - *Ensuring that in the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b), only water compatible development or essential infrastructure (subject to the flood risk exception test) will be allowed. In either case it must be demonstrated that there would not be a harmful effect on the ability of this land to store floodwater;*
 - *Requiring developers with proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to provide evidence of the sequential test and exception test where appropriate.*
 - *Requiring site-specific Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs) for proposals over 1 hectare in Flood Zone 1 and all proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3;*
 - *Expecting proposals over 1000 m² floor space or 0.4 hectares in Flood Zone 1 to demonstrate how the proposal will make a positive contribution to reducing or managing flood risk; and Expecting all development proposals on brownfield sites to reduce surface water run-off by at least 30% and development on greenfield sites to maintain or reduce existing run-off rates requiring development proposals to use Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in accordance with policy CC4; and*
 - *Using flood resilient design in areas of high flood risk.”*
18. Policy CC4 Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) states: *“All major developments will be expected to use [SuDS] to manage surface water drainage, unless it can be demonstrated that all types of SuDS are inappropriate. The Council will also promote the use of SuDS on minor development. To enable the Council to determine the suitability of a proposed SuDS scheme: Outline Planning applications must be supported by a conceptual drainage plan and SuDS design statement; and Detailed Planning applications must be supported by a detailed drainage plan and SuDS design statement, which should contain information on how the SuDS will operate, be managed and maintained for the lifetime of the development.”*
19. Policy CC5 Water Resource Management states: *“To conserve and enhance the Boroughs water resources proposals will be supported which:*
 - a. *Do not result in the deterioration of water courses and which conserve and enhance,*
 - i. *The natural geomorphology of water courses;*
 - ii. *Water quality; and*
 - iii. *The ecological value of the water environment, including watercourse corridors.*
 - b. *Make positive progress towards achieving “good” status or potential under the Water Framework Directive [WFD] in the boroughs surface and ground water bodies;*
 - c. *Manage water demand and improve water efficiency through appropriate water conservation techniques including rainwater harvesting and grey-water recycling; and*
 - d. *Dispose of surface water appropriately and improve water quality through the incorporation of SuDS, in accordance with Policy CC4.”*

Drainage Guidance

20. Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage published by DEFRA in March 2015 set out how surface water runoff generated during the present day 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 AEP rainfall events and for events exceeding the present day 1 in 100 AEP event should be managed, how peak runoff rates should be restricted and how runoff volumes should be controlled.

21. The South Yorkshire Interim Local Guidance for SuDS (June 2015) provides guidance for the local standards for the South Yorkshire lead local flood authorities (LLFA) and (together with the non-statutory technical standards referenced above) promotes the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and sets out the minimum recommended standards to ensure a satisfactory scheme is constructed.

The Submitted FRA Report

22. The application for outline planning permission was accompanied by a Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment report prepared by Weetwood Services Ltd (“Weetwood”) (report ref: 6041/FRDA/Final/v1.2/2024-02-06, Final Version 1.2, 6 February 2024) (“the submitted FRA”).
23. The submitted FRA assessed flood risk at the site, and presented an illustrative drainage scheme. The key findings and statements are summarised below.

Assessment of Flood Risk

24. The overall conclusions relating to flood risk for the site are summarised below:
- From the sea - The site is over 60 m above mean sea level and there are no nearby watercourses. According to the EA Flood Map for Planning the site is located in Flood Zone 1 (“*Low probability of flooding from rivers and the sea*”). Accordingly the site is assessed not to be at a risk of flooding from this source.
 - From rivers - According to the EA Flood Map for Planning the site is located in Flood Zone 1 (“*Low probability of flooding*”). There are no rivers in the vicinity of the site and the site is assessed not to be at a risk of flooding from this source.
 - From surface water - The EA Risk of Flooding from Surface Water mapping (28 January 2025 update) indicates that there is a less than 0.1% (Very Low) chance of surface water flooding across almost all of the site, both now and in the future, i.e. taking climate change into account. According to the EA mapping, there are three exceptions: (i) An area of potential surface water ponding in a small part of the southwest part of the site (Low risk); (ii) A small area of land on the western boundary of the site is indicated to be at a risk of surface water ponding in the future, i.e. taking climate change into account (Low risk); and (iii) There is a narrow surface water flow pathway adjacent to part of the northern boundary of the site (Low to High risk).
 - From canals - There are no canals in proximity to, and/or above the level the site. Accordingly the site is assessed not to be at a risk of flooding from this source. Accordingly the site is assessed not to be at a risk of flooding from this source.
 - From reservoirs and other artificial water impounding facilities - The EA Risk of Flooding from Reservoirs indicates that the site is not at risk of flooding from this source. Accordingly the risk of flooding from this source is assessed to be Low.
 - From groundwater - No information on the risk of groundwater flooding is presented in the 2010 Level 1 Barnsley Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). The SFRA identifies a small number of “*Likely candidates for groundwater flooding*” in the Barnsley district, however, Hemingfield is not one. The submitted FRA presented an extract from the GB Groundwater Flood Map prepared by JBA Risk Management Ltd. The mapping indicates that during the 1 in 100 event, groundwater may potentially be less than 0.5 m below the ground surface. However, the accompanying notes to the mapping state that the mapping is indicative. On-site intrusive testing entailed the excavation of three trial pits to a depth of 1.9 – 2.1 m below ground level. Groundwater was not encountered in any of the trial pits. Accordingly, the risk of flooding from this source is assessed to be Low.
 - From public sewers - No concerns relating to the risk of sewer flooding at the site was raised by Yorkshire Water in its response to a pre-application letter dated 27 October 2023. Accordingly, the risk of flooding from this source is assessed to be Low.

Sequential Test

25. As set out in para. 13 and para. 14, the aim of the Sequential Test is to ensure that areas at little or no risk of current or future flooding from any source are developed in preference to areas at higher risk (PPG para. 7-023).
26. The assessment of flood risk summarised in para. 24 confirms that the risk of current and (where applicable) future flooding, from all sources is Low, Very Low, or None.
27. The only exception to this is the overland surface water flow pathway along part of the northern boundary of the site (refer para. 24, bullet point 3). However, this flow pathway would be accommodated within the 10 metre wide amenity area and buffer located along the northern boundary of the site. The small area of potential surface water ponding located on the western boundary of the site would also be accommodated within an undeveloped amenity buffer, whilst the area of potential surface water ponding in the southwest part of the site is located in undeveloped open-space.
28. The assessment flood risk demonstrates that no built development within the site boundary, including access or escape routes, land raising or other potentially vulnerable elements, would be located on an area that would be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future, and as such the sequential Test need not be applied in accordance with NPPF para. 175.

Mitigation of Flooding Risk

29. On the basis of the assessment of flood risk, no measures are proposed or deemed to be required to mitigate the flood risk at the site aside from the following:
 - Finished floor level of all dwellings to be at least 150 mm above adjacent ground levels to comply with Building Regulations;
 - An amenity buffer along the northern boundary to be implemented to accommodate the overland surface water pathway; and,
 - The use of land in the southwest part of the site to be used for open-space to accommodate potential surface water ponding.

Surface Water Drainage

30. The south-western portion of the site is occupied by two agricultural buildings and associated hardstanding. The remainder of the site is undeveloped agricultural land. Given site topography and ground conditions, surface water runoff would be expected to infiltrate where conditions allow and flow overland in a north-easterly/easterly direction if the infiltration capacity of the ground is exceeded.
31. Soakaway testing undertaken by Sirius Geotechnical Ltd. in accordance with the relevant technical guidance¹ indicates that soakaway drainage is likely to be suitable at the site. The disposal of surface water to the ground via infiltration is the preferred approach in the drainage hierarchy set out in para. 7-056 of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
32. Detailed hydraulic modelling indicates that an infiltration basin (or basins) providing a storage volume of 785 m³, would be sufficient to store and dispose of surface water runoff generated from the impermeable surfaces of the proposed development (i.e. roofs, access roads etc). This is based on the following design principles:
 - Storage designed to store runoff for design events up to and including the 1 in 100 annual exceedance probability event including a 40% increase in rainfall intensity to allow for climate change in accordance with EA guidance²;
 - The lowest measured infiltration rate; and,
 - An impermeable area of 2.53 hectares. This is based on 50% of the developable area of the site (i.e. that part of the site that excludes the two areas in which open space would be provided) plus a 10% allowance for urban creep in accordance with local guidance.

¹ BRE Digest 365 Soakaway Design, Building Research Establishment, 2016.

² Flood Risk Assessments: climate change allowances (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances>).

33. The assessment also demonstrated, by application of the pollution hazard index approach³, that the surface water drainage scheme would provide a suitable level of quality treatment of the surface water runoff.
34. The surface water drainage system could be offered for adoption by Yorkshire Water (YW) (if designed in accordance with the relevant technical guidance⁴) or maintained by a private management company.
35. An illustrative maintenance schedule was presented for the proposed infiltration basin.

Foul Water Drainage

36. The anticipated peak domestic foul water loading from the proposed development has been calculated in accordance with the relevant technical guidance⁵ to be 9.3 l/s (based on 200 dwellings). The estimated site capacity is in the region of 165 to 180 homes depending on the eventual mix inclusive of policy compliant affordable housing. Foul loadings have been calculated on this basis as to provide a worst case estimate of the peak foul water loading.
37. A foul sewer runs through the site from west to east. The location of this sewer has been identified with reference to a sewer search record. Further to this, the exact location of the sewer has been traced by survey. The illustrative site masterplan submitted as part of the application for outline planning permission shows that the combined sewer can be accommodated through the provision of a 6 metre wide corridor through the site.

Consultation Responses to the Submitted FRA Report

Lead Local Flood Authority (Barnsley MBC)

38. Barnsley MBC provided a consultation response to the planning application by way of a letter dated 26 February 2024 (letter ref: IW/2024/0122). No objection is raised, and a planning condition is recommended in respect of surface and foul water drainage.
39. The proposed drainage condition states: Under stem (a) that full details of foul and surface water drainage have must be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA; Under stem (b) that porosity tests should be carried out to demonstrate that the subsoil is suitable for soakaways; and, under stem (c) that calculations based on the porosity tests should be submitted to prove that adequate land area is available for soakaways.

Environment Agency

40. As the site is located entirely in Flood Zone 1, is not within 20 m of a main river, and is not in an area with critical drainage problems, the EA was not consulted on the planning application. This is in accordance with the EA National Flood Risk Standing Advice⁶.

Sewerage Undertaker (Yorkshire Water)

41. By way of a pre-planning sewerage enquiry response dated 27 October 2023, Yorkshire Water (YW) confirmed that *"Foul water domestic waste can discharge to the 300 mm diameter public combined sewer recorded crossing the site."*
42. YW provided a consultation response to the planning application by way of a letter dated 14 March 2024 (YW letter ref: A000951). No objection is raised, and planning conditions are recommended in respect of surface and foul water drainage.

³ The SuDS Manual, CIRIA C753, December 2015.

⁴ Design and Construction Guidance for foul and surface water sewers offered for adoption under the code for adoption agreements for water and sewerage companies operating wholly or mainly in England ("the Code"), Approved Version 2.0, 10 March 2020.

⁵ Sewerage Sector Guidance Appendix C, Water UK, Approved Version 2.0, March 2020

⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-local-planning-authorities>

43. The YW letter states, under point 3a, that “... the local public sewer network does not have adequate capacity available to accommodate the anticipated foul water discharge from this proposal directly adjacent to the site” while point 3b states “A robust build plan and start date is required, so we can undertake an internal (Yorkshire Water) network reinforcement study to determine the suitable point(s) of connection to the available network, along with the relevant timescales required for any upgrade work which we will facilitate.”
44. During further discussions with YW’s developer services team, YW confirmed that the capacity issue flagged up in the 14 March 2024 response relates to hydraulic modelling of the sewer undertaken in 2014, indicating potential sewer flooding approximately 530 m east of the eastern site boundary. YW has advised that a number of flooding incidents occurred in this location in 2017 due to blockages associated with unauthorised material in the sewer, potentially exacerbated by a structural failure of the sewer. Following these incidents, the 75 m section of sewer at this location was re-lined to resolve the structural issue.
45. YW has advised that since the re-lining works were undertaken, there has been no further sewer flooding and YW is now of the opinion that the public combined sewer does have adequate capacity to receive and convey foul water from the proposed development.

Responses to the Submitted FRA Report from Local Residents

46. At the time of writing, 38 letters of representations had been submitted by local residents in response to the planning application.
47. A handful raise concerns regarding existing drainage issues. Almost all of these relate to properties on Briery Meadows, which is adjacent to the eastern part of the southern boundary of the site.
48. The concern expressed by some residents is that the proposed development will exacerbate drainage problems purportedly experienced by some of the residents. While the extent and likely cause of the existing problems is not known, two points are relevant:
 - a) Foul water from the proposed development will discharge to the existing public combined sewer that crosses the site (refer para. 37) and not to the public foul sewers that serve properties along Briery Meadows, Garden Grove, and Hemingfield Road. As such the proposed development will not impact on the sewerage infrastructure serving the existing residential development to the south of the proposed development.
 - b) Surface water runoff from the proposed development will be conveyed to an infiltration basin (or basins) located adjacent to the northern boundary of the site (refer para. 30-35 above), i.e. located away from the existing residential development to the south of the proposed development. This includes the small part of the site that naturally drains towards Briery Meadows and Garden Grove. As such there will actually be a reduction in surface water runoff that currently drains towards existing properties to the south of the site.
49. I conclude that the proposal will not exacerbate any existing drainage issues experienced by residents of the existing development to the south of the site, and as stated above, would be expected to reduce flood risk.

Compliance with Planning Policy

50. The application for outline planning permission for the demolition of existing structures and erection of residential dwellings submitted in February 2024 was accompanied by a Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment report in accordance with para. 181 and Footnote 63 of the NPPF, and Policy CC3 of the BLP.
51. The Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment report presented a detailed assessment of flood risk from all known sources and concluded that the risk of flooding is ‘Low - No risk of flooding from all identified sources’ (as summarised in para. 24 above).
52. Given that flood risk from all sources is assessed to be Low (or less), the Sequential Test does not need to be applied, in accordance with para. 175 of the NPPF, para. 7-024 of the PPG, and Policy CC3 Flood Risk of the BLP.
53. According to Table 2 of the PPG, the Exception Test need not be applied for ‘More Vulnerable’ (residential) development located in Flood Zone 1.

54. Surface water runoff from all impermeable surfaces located within the proposed development would be directed to one or more SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) infiltration basins in accordance with policies CC3 and CC5 of the BLP.
55. The proposed surface water drainage system would reduce surface water runoff that currently drains: (i) towards properties along Briery Meadows and Garden Grove; and, (ii) to the north of the site via the underpass under the A6195 Dearne Valley Parkway. The proposal would therefore be expected to reduce flood risk to a number of properties along Briery Meadows and Garden Grove, and to land to the north of the site.
56. Domestic foul water would be discharged to an existing public combined sewer that crosses the site. No foul water would be discharged to the public sewers that serve the existing residential properties located to the south of the site.
57. The proposals comply with the requirements of national planning policy as presented in the NPPF and PPG, and local planning policy, including policies CC1, CC3, CC4 and CC5 of the 2019 BLP.
58. The flood risk and drainage proposals also comply with the relevant technical guidance including the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage and local guidance for SuDS.
59. Furthermore, Barnsley MBC confirm in the officer's report that 'the proposed [*sic*] is therefore acceptable with regards to flood risk and drainage considerations in accordance with Local Plan Policies CC3 and CC4'.

Effect of the Proposals on the Wider Safeguarded Land

60. The site forms part, and is located at the western end, of a wider area of land designated as Safeguarded Land in the Barnsley Local Plan (Site ref: SL6).
61. Based on the assessment of flood risk and drainage presented in the submitted FRA report and summarised in this technical note, I conclude that development of the site for residential use, in accordance with the plans submitted with the outline planning application 2024/0122, and with the design principles presented in the submitted Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment, would not increase flood risk or otherwise prejudice the future delivery of the remaining area of the Safeguarded Land SL6 on the grounds of flood risk and drainage. Should planning permission be sought for the remaining part of the safeguarded land, any such planning application would also need to address flood risk and drainage issues. This would not be affected by the development of the appeal Site.
62. Barnsley MBC does not raise any concerns about the potential for flood risk and drainage matters to prejudice the delivery of the remaining area of the designated Safeguarded Land in their officer's report.

Conclusions

63. The planning application was accompanied by a FRA report that presented a site-specific assessment of flood risk at the site in accordance with planning policy. The report also presented an illustrative surface water drainage scheme based on sustainable drainage principles.
64. Flood risk from all identified sources is assessed to be Low. Accordingly no specific measures are proposed or deemed to be required to mitigate the flood risk at the site and there is no requirement to apply the flood risk sequential test or exception test to the site/proposals.
65. The illustrative surface water drainage scheme presented in the submitted FRA report demonstrative that surface water runoff from the proposed development can be sustainably managed in accordance with planning policy (including the drainage hierarchy set out in para. 7-056 of the PPG), and relevant technical guidance
66. Some nearby residents have expressed a concern that the proposed development will exacerbate drainage problems purportedly experienced by them. While the extent and likely cause of the existing problems is not known, by virtue of the design principles of the illustrative surface and foul water drainage schemes presented in the submitted FRA, the proposal will not exacerbate any existing drainage issues experienced by residents of the existing development to the south of the site and is likely to reduce flood risk. Barnsley MBC's Drainage Officer and Yorkshire Water do not raise any objections on this basis.

67. Foul water from the proposed development would be discharged to the public sewer that crosses the site. YW has confirmed that the sewer has sufficient capacity to receive and convey foul water from the proposed development.
68. Finally, development of the application site for residential use, in accordance with the plans submitted with the outline planning application 2024/0122 and with the design principles presented in the submitted Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment, will not increase flood risk or otherwise prejudice the future delivery of the remainder of the Safeguarded Land SL6, on the grounds of flood risk and drainage.

Weetwood

Development • Planning • Environment

Delivering client focussed services nationally

Flood Risk Assessments
Flood Consequences Assessments
Surface Water Drainage
Foul Water Drainage
Environmental Impact Assessments
River Realignment and Restoration
Water Framework Directive Assessments
Environmental Permit and Land Drainage Applications
Sequential, Justification and Exception Tests
Utility Assessments
Expert Witness and Planning Appeals
Discharge of Planning Conditions

www.weetwood.net