

## Schedule of Representations – Flood Risk and Development Planning Guidance, Amended Consultation Draft, February 2008

**Representation:  
Environment Agency**

Paragraph/ Policy	Paragraph/ Policy Text	Nature of Response	Response / Representation	Council Response and Recommendations
Para. 6.4	Proposed Amendments	Support with Conditions	<p>We are generally in agreement with the proposed additional paragraphs relating to flood risk and in particular, the suggestion that planning applications adjoining the Ship Canal should include a flood risk assessment.</p> <p>However, it would be preferable if this were a requirement rather than "strongly recommended". Developers are reluctant to undertake meaningful flood risk assessments in areas that are not shown or acknowledged to be at risk. Accordingly, they are unlikely to carry one out unless pushed to do so.</p> <p>The lack of an available model for the canal system that could be used to inform a FRA is also likely to be a problem. However, conservative assumptions would be required.</p>	<p>Response: Accepted</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Delete 'strongly recommended' and replace with 'require' and insert the following text at the end of the paragraph.... 'The developer should determine the scope and extent of any Flood Risk Assessment to the satisfaction of the Council and the Environment Agency. The Environment Agency may determine that a flood risk assessment is not required, so applicants are encouraged to seek advice at an early stage to clarify the requirement on individual sites potentially impacted by the canal'.</p> <p>The council already requires Flood Risk Assessments for development proposals adjacent to the canal that are 1ha or above because it is a requirement of PPS25. Inline with the Environment Agency response, the council</p>

				will amend the Proposed Amendments to 'require' Flood Risk Assessments for development proposals under 1ha adjacent to the canal. The scope and extent of any Flood Risk Assessment may be minor and in some cases may not be required depending on site specifics. Therefore it is important that developers seek advice on Flood Risk Assessment requirements at an early stage.
--	--	--	--	--

**Representation:  
United Utilities**

<b>Paragraph/ Policy</b>	<b>Paragraph/ Policy Text</b>	<b>Nature of Response</b>	<b>Response / Representation</b>	<b>Council Response and Recommendation</b>
Proposed Amendments		Other	United Utilities has no objection to the proposed amendments.	No response.  No recommendation.

**Representation:  
Natural England**

<b>Paragraph/ Policy</b>	<b>Paragraph/ Policy Text</b>	<b>Nature of Response</b>	<b>Response / Representation</b>	<b>Council Response and Recommendation</b>
Proposed Amendments		Other	Thank you for your consultation dated 30 January 2008, received at this office on 31 January 2008 attaching a copy of the proposed amendment. We were formally consulted on 28 June 2007 and forwarded our comments to that consultation on 7 August 2007. The proposed amendment identifies the need for an assessment of any flooding potential from the Manchester Ship Canal, we therefore have no further comments to make beyond those in our letter dated 7 August.	No response.  No recommendation.

**Representation:  
Urban Vision, Development Control**

<b>Paragraph/ Policy</b>	<b>Paragraph/ Policy Text</b>	<b>Nature of Response</b>	<b>Response / Representation</b>	<b>Council Response and Recommendation</b>
Proposed Amendments		Other	Further to your email regarding the proposed amendments to the Draft Flood Risk and Development Planning Guidance. I have been asked to provide comments on behalf of Development Control. I have read both the draft guidance and the proposed amendments and consider the additional information on the ship canal to be comprehensive and therefore have no further comments to make. If you wish me to provide any further comments please do not hesitate to contact me.	No response.  No recommendation.