

Cheryl Parks

From: Wilson, Jennifer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 October 2016 12:04
To: Adam Reynolds
Cc: Cheryl Parks
Subject: Springfield Site - Maidstone LP Examination

Importance: High

Adam

We are aware that the Springfield Site is due to be discussed tomorrow in the examination, as such, I asked my colleague to review Site Assessment section on Springfield as a matter of priority. We will of course be in touch concerning the whole Site Assessment document in due course as part of our formal response to the SFRA and Site Assessment documents. In the mean time we have the following comments on Springfield.

5.5.4 Springfield

Hydraulic modelling of land raising would assess the impact on the development elsewhere while also simulating the appropriate level of flood protection to the development. We therefore agree this is the preferred approach to testing the site. However, we also acknowledge the reasons given in section 6 that no further analysis was proposed for the Springfield site.

We accept this as a way forward as a considerable part of the site is within Flood Zone 1 and therefore residential development can be considered appropriate. However, as no hydraulic modelling has been undertaken in support of this site allocation, we strongly recommend that if this site is to be allocated, the development brief makes it clear that a strongly defined residential area is kept outside from the existing area of Flood Zone 3. Flood Zone 3 should be maintained as an area of open space or other low flood vulnerability activities. Removal of some of the existing commercial development from Flood Zone 3, particularly in the south-east part of the site, will improve floodplain storage and conveyance, with a view to reducing flood risk elsewhere. This activity should be encouraged within the development brief.

The opportunity also exists to incorporate "best practise" sustainable drainage. As the site is at the lower end of the catchment, it would not be necessary to provide storage of surface runoff up to and including the critical 100yr rainfall event. Instead, if discharge to the River Medway is proposed, we recommend source control measures using open storage features to improve the quality of the runoff prior to discharge. This may only require sufficient attenuation to prevent runoff from the site following the first five millimetres (5mm) of rainfall, for all rainfall events.

We would not oppose this allocation for residential development if these measures parameters are set within the development brief.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards

Jennifer Wilson

Planning Specialist (KSL - Kent)

kslplanning@environment-agency.gov.uk

' 02084746711

Speak to us early about environmental issues and opportunities - we can provide a free basic response. For more detailed advice / meetings / reviews we can provide a project manager to co-ordinate specialist advice / meetings which costs £84 per hour. For a free preliminary opinion complete the [form](#) and email it

back to kslplanning@environment-agency.gov.uk with as much information about the proposed development as possible.



This message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you receive it by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not show it to anyone else.

We have scanned this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check for any viruses before opening it.

This message and any reply to it may be made public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam