



Sequential and Exception Tests

Site address	76 Queens Road Caversham Reading RG4 8DL
Site coordinates	472079, 174463
Report prepared for	Argyll Environmental 7 Abbey Court Eagle Way Sowton Exeter Devon EX2 7HY
Report reference	72198R2
Report status	FINAL
Date issued	4 th October 2019
Dave revised	25 th October 2019
Report author	David South Flood Risk Consultant
Report checker	Alan White Project Consultant
Report reviewer	Mike Piotrowski Principal Hydrologist



1. Executive summary

The Site is located within Caversham, Reading and currently consists of a garage workshop and a single residential bungalow. Development proposals comprise the demolition of the existing buildings and the construction of two new residential dwellings.

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and associated guidance (2014), as the Site lies within Flood Zone 2/3, the Sequential Test is required, a pragmatic approach on the availability of alternative Sites should be taken.

A review of the search area and chosen Site parameters, outlined within Section 4 of this report, indicate there are no suitable alternative development locations, which are at a lower Flood Risk than the subject Site. **Therefore, the Site and proposed development is considered to have passed the Sequential Test.**

In line with paragraph 102 of the NPPF (2019), as there were no alternative Sites at a lower flood risk which would accommodate the Site; the Exception Test should be passed. The Exception Test is comprised of two main components, including wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk be demonstrated and demonstration that development will be safe for its lifetime.

The wider sustainability benefits outweigh the risk identified within the site-specific FRA (ref: AEL-4491-FRA-958724) produced for the Site. The mitigation measures set out within the recommendations of the FRA would provide suitable mitigation to reduce the impacts of flooding over the lifetime of the proposed development.

Thus, the proposed development is considered to pass both the first and second parts of the Exception Test.

In conclusion, the proposed development passes the Sequential and Exception Tests. There are therefore no tenable grounds for refusal on flood risk grounds.

2. Background, scope and Limitations

Report Background

The NPPF (2019) and NPPG (2014) set out national policy and guidance and underpin the requirement for the Sequential & Exception Tests.

The NPPF and NPPG are supported directly by guidance from the Environment Agency (EA) and Department for Environment and Rural Affairs entitled “Flood Risk Assessment: The Sequential Test for Applicants”, as well as local guidance documents and policies; which aim to strengthen the national policy and guidance relating to how the Sequential Test must be undertaken.

The NPPG published in March 2014 and updated in 2015 clarifies the role of the Sequential Test:

The overall aim should be to steer new development to Flood Zone 1. Where there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zone 1, local planning authorities allocating land in local plans or determining planning applications for development at any particular location should take into account the flood risk vulnerability of land uses (see table 2) and consider reasonably available sites in Flood Zone 2, applying the Exception Test if required (see table 3). Only where there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zones 1 or 2 should the suitability of sites in Flood Zone 3 be considered, taking into account the flood risk vulnerability of land uses and applying the Exception Test if required.

This report has been prepared with reference to the NPPF (2019) and NPPG (2014) which promote a sequential, risk based approach to the location of development:

“This general 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. The aim should be to keep development out of medium and high risk flood areas (Flood Zones 2 and 3) and other areas affected by other sources of flooding where possible” (NPPG, 2014).

When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere and only considers development which is appropriate in areas at risk of flooding where, informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment following the Sequential Test, and if required the Exception Test, it can be demonstrated that:

- *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; and*
- *development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant, including safe access and escape routes where required, and that any residual risk can be safely managed, including by emergency planning; and it gives priority to the use of sustainable drainage systems.*

The aim of a Sequential Test is to steer new development towards areas with the lowest probability of flooding (NPPF, 2019). Reasonably available sites located in Flood Zone 1 should be considered before those in Flood Zone 2 and only when there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zones 1 and 2 should development in Flood Zone 3 be considered. As the Site is located within Flood Zone 2/3, the Sequential Test has been prepared to confirm the Sequential approach has been applied and the Exception Test has also been applied, where there are no alternative Sites identified.

Report scope

Information obtained from the EA and a review of the Reading Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (May, 2017) is used to ascertain local flooding issues and, where appropriate, identify information to support a Sequential and/or Exception test required as part of the NPPF (2019).

This assessment has been undertaken by firstly compiling information concerning the Site and the surrounding area. The information which is gathered is then used to construct a 'conceptual site model', including an understanding of the appropriateness of the development as defined in the NPPF (2019) and the source(s) of any flood risk present.

Report limitations

It is noted that the findings presented in this report are based on a desk study of information supplied by third parties. Whilst we assume that all information is representative of past and present conditions we can offer no guarantee as to its validity and a proportionate program of site investigations would be required to fully verify these findings.

This report excludes consideration of potential hazards arising from any activities at the Site other than normal use and occupancy for the intended land uses. Hazards associated with any other activities have not been assessed and must be subject to a specific risk assessment by the parties responsible for those activities.

3. Site analysis

Site information

The Site is located in Caversham, Reading in a setting of residential land use at National Grid Reference (NGR) SU 72079 74463 (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Aerial Site Location Map



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2019
<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/>

Development

The Site currently consists of a garage workshop and a single residential bungalow. Development proposals comprise the demolition of the existing buildings and the construction of two new residential dwellings (see Appendix A).

The effect of the overall development will result in an increase in number of occupants and/or users of the Site and will result in the change of use, nature or times of occupation of the area of the Site used for the garage workshop. The estimated lifespan of the development is 100 years.

Flood Risk

A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was conducted for the Site by Argyll in January 2019. The report confirmed the majority of the Site is located within a Flood Zone 2 with the front of the Site located within Flood Zone 3. The Site is considered to be at Medium flood risk by the EA's RoFRaS map which considers the type, condition and crest height of flood defences.

Finished floor levels were recommended to be set at a minimum level of 38.04mAOD, the use of flood resistant materials during construction and flood resilience measures such as flood doors, non-return flap valves and airbrick covers have been recommended.

4. Sequential Test Approach

The Sequential Test should be applied to demonstrate that there are no reasonably available sites in areas with a lower probability of flooding that would be appropriate to the type of development or land use proposed.

Guidance

The definition of 'reasonably available sites' has been extracted and interpreted from both the National Planning Policy Framework (Footnote 11 and 12) (2019) and "Demonstrating the Flood Risk Sequential Test for Planning Applications" document (2014) prepared by the Environment Agency, which defines reasonably available as sites that are suitable, developable & deliverable.

Deliverable – sites that are available, suitable, & achievable as shown on Local Planning Authority's SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments) or other appropriate guidance or documentation.

Developable – sites should be in a suitable location for development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.

A Sequential Test (ST) is required to demonstrate there are no sequentially preferable "reasonably available" sites at a lower flood risk within a defined area. With regard to the extent of a defined area the PPG (Paragraph: 033 Reference ID: 7-033-20140306) states that this should be defined by local circumstances, and when determining if a ST has been passed the PPG (Paragraph: 034 Reference ID: 7-034-20140306) states that this should take into account the "particular circumstances in any given case". Local Authorities are also advised (Paragraph: 033 Reference ID: 7-033-20140306), "When applying the Sequential Test, a pragmatic approach on the availability of alternatives should be taken."

The FRA (ref: AEL-4491-FRA-958724) demonstrates that as long as the key recommendations for mitigation are included within the overall design of the development, the development would be considered as safe from flooding and will not cause any flooding issues elsewhere.

A development proposal will only fail to pass the Sequential Test if alternative sites are identified within the search area that are at lower risk of flooding, would be appropriate for the proposed development and are 'reasonably available' for development. A site is only considered to be reasonably available if it is both 'deliverable' and 'developable' as defined by the NPPF (Para.47, footnotes 11-12):

- To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable. In accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF (2019) sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires.
- Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans.

- To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.

These sites will usually be drawn from the evidence base / background documents that have been produced to inform the emerging Local Plan. For example, an important source of information for housing sites and development land will be provided by the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and the Employment Land Review (ELR). In the absence of background documents, 'reasonably available' sites would include any sites that are known to the LPA and that meet the functional requirements of the application in question.

To identify potential reasonably available sites the following council documents were assessed:

- Reading Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) (2017)

These are the most current evidence-based documents pertaining to land availability for housing development in Reading Borough.

The conditions set out above have been used to identify sites and determine whether they are reasonably available and suitable alternatives for the proposed development to pass the Sequential Test.

Sequential Test Approach and Criteria

In this instance, the Sequential Test seeks to identify reasonably available sites which have a capacity to accommodate the proposed two residential dwellings, which is one additional residential dwelling than is currently on the Site. In order to conduct a search for alternative Sites which could be more feasible than the current Site, a number of criteria have been set:

- A maximum and minimum size of land for consideration to compare against the Site was set, based upon the Site plans provided using a nominal allowance. These maximum and minimum values were calculated as follows:
 - o Size of Site: (0.0206ha / 206 m²)
 - Maximum:** 247 m² (0.0247 ha) which is the size of the Site plus 20%.
 - Minimum:** 165 m² (0.0165 ha) which is the size of the Site minus 20%.
- Rented land was not considered within the search.
- Sites with planning permission for a number of developments higher than those proposed for the Site have not been classed as achievable. Using these Sites with permission for higher as an alternative would reduce the available land for development in Reading and would be counteractive to local policy and housing aims.

5. Site-specific Sequential Test

Reading Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) (2017)

The HELAA (2017) has identified a pool of sites within Reading that are suitable, available and achievable, and gives information on what the likely timescales for delivery may be, and the potential capacity of each site.

There is a clear need for more housing and a more diverse housing stock in Reading to cater for a wider range of residents from young people, families, older people and people with special accommodation needs. The availability of land for housing will need to be addressed to meet the demand for housing.

Only Sites that are considered to be developable within the next 1-5 years (up to 2022, as the HELAA was produced in 2017) have been considered and sites that either have a higher potential capacity than the proposed 2 houses and sites that are outside of the search criteria as discussed in Section 5 have been discounted.

Table 1: Identification of comparable Sites within Reading from the HELAA (2017)

Address	Site capacity (residential)	Site Size (ha)	Viable Alternative?
Station Hill (wider site)	451	2.87	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Napier Road Junction	200	0.49	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Forbury Business Park and Kenavon Drive	142	2.89	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Former Reading Family Centre, North Street	17	0.23	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
37-43 Market Place	36	0.07	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
173-175 Friar Street	27	0.14	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
84 Watlington Street	10	0.07	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity

Summit House, 49-51 Greyfriars Road	21	0.05	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Kings Reach, 38-50 Kings Road	72	0.11	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Zenith House, 7 Cheapside	41	0.11	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Jacksons Corner, 1-9 Kings Road	26	0.98	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
173-175 Kings Road	13	0.12	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Kings Point, 120 Kings Road	93	0.15	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Kings Lodge, 194 Kings Road	13	0.06	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
118 Chatham Street	14	0.06	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
139-141 Oxford Road	10	0.04	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
42 Kenavon Drive	138	1.49	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
120 Oxford Road	6	0.08	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
57 Castle Street	12	0.02	No – site has a higher potential capacity
27-32 Market Place	14	0.04	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Former Cox & Wyman site, Cardiff Road	81	1.31	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity

Former Gas Works Building, Gas Works Road	18	0.064	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
17-23 Queen Victoria Street	12	0.05	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
211-221 Oxford Road, 10 & rear of 8 Prospect Street	6	0.3	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Reading University Boat Club, Promenade Road	19	0.56	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Corner of Crown Street and Southampton Street	14	0.08	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Corner of Crown Street and Silver Street	51	0.38	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
40 Silver Street	13	0.11	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
34-36 Crown Street	13	0.034	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
The Woodley Arms PH, Waldeck Street	29	0.088	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Land Adjacent The Roebuck Ph, Oxford Road	10	0.1	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Allotments and adjacent land, Kentwood Hill	61	6.68	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Lok n Store, 5-9 Berkeley Avenue	101	0.63	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
1 Castle Crescent	13	0.28	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity

Government Offices, Coley Park, Wensley Road	64	1.89	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Dee Park (excluding 103 Dee Rd)	142	16.4	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
St Georges Hall, St Georges Road	11	0.31	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Alexander House, Kings Road	29	0.16	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Wells Hall, Upper Redlands Road	34	2.07	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Hanover House, 202 Kings Road	90	0.32	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
1a Upper Redlands Road	9	0.53	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
University of Reading, London Road	53	0.45	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
79 London Road and 34 Eldon Terrace	7	0.12	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
252 Kings Road	29	0.18	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Warwick House, Warwick Road	9	0.15	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Land adjacent to 40 Redlands Road	26	0.43	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Elvian School, Bath Road	106	5	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity

Alice Burrows Home, Dwyer Road	20	0.48	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Amethyst Lane	36	0.57	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
The Arthur Clark Home, Dovedale Close	39	0.48	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Meadway Comprehensive School, The Meadway	52	1.24	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Worton Grange	158	8.79	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Green Park Village, Longwater Avenue	866	24.65	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity
Kennet Island Phase 3, Manor Farm Road	362	5.46	No – site is considered to be too large and has a higher potential capacity

Summary of Table 1 – Search of Sites from the SHLAA 2017

In summary, out of the 54 sites identified in Table 1 from the 2017 HELAA within the Reading area that are suitable for residential development and development within 1-5 years, none are considered suitable alternative sites. All sites listed have a potential capacity higher than that of the proposed site (2 dwellings) and would therefore cause a reduction in potential residential dwellings and would therefore be counteractive to Reading Borough Council's housing targets. As there are no developable alternative Sites, the Sequential Test is therefore considered to be passed.

6. Exception Test

In line with paragraph 102 of the NPPF (2019), if following application of the Sequential Test, it is not possible, consistent with wider sustainability objectives, for the development to be located in zones with a lower probability of flooding, the Exception Test can be applied if appropriate. For the Exception Test to be passed:

1. it must be demonstrated that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment where one has been prepared.
2. a site-specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate that 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.

1. Wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk

The NPPG (2014) confirms the guidance associated with this part of the Exception Test within Paragraph: 024 (Reference ID: 7-024-20140306), which states:

".....Evidence of wider sustainability benefits to the community should be provided, for instance, through the sustainability appraisal. If a potential site allocation fails to score positively against the aims and objectives of the sustainability appraisal, or is not otherwise capable of demonstrating sustainability benefits, the local planning authority should consider whether the use of planning conditions and/or planning obligations could make it do so. Where this is not possible the Exception Test has not been satisfied and the allocation should not be made....."

The development will benefit the local area and borough on a number of levels - socially, environmentally and economically:

- Reduce the housing shortfall, boost supply, improve choice and affordability.
- Create a significant number of jobs, both directly and indirectly. The development will generate employment during the construction period and thereby provide some protection to the local economy. It may also support those who provide services to homes (e.g. window cleaners and maintenance tradesmen).
- Provide additional Council income for spending on local communities through increased Council Tax revenue.

2. Development will be safe for its lifetime

A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was conducted for the Site by Argyll in January 2019. The report confirmed the majority of the Site is located within a Flood Zone 2 with the front of the Site located within Flood Zone 3. The Site is considered to be at Medium flood risk by the EA's RoFRaS map which considers the type, condition and crest height of flood defences.

Finished floor levels were recommended to be set at a minimum level of 38.04mAOD, the use of flood resistant materials during construction and flood resilience measures such as flood doors, non-return flap valves and airbrick covers have been recommended.

Exception Test Concluding Remarks

The wider sustainability benefits outweigh the risk identified within the site-specific FRA (ref: AEL-4491-FRA-958724) produced for the Site.



The mitigation measures set out within the recommendations of the FRA would provide suitable mitigation to reduce the impacts of flooding over the lifetime of the proposed development.

Thus, the proposed development is considered to pass both the first and second parts of the Exception Test.

7. Conclusions

A review of the search area and chosen Site parameters, outlined within Section 4 of this report, indicate there are no suitable alternative development locations, which are at a lower Flood Risk than the subject Site. **Therefore, the Site and proposed development is considered to have passed the Sequential Test.**

In line with paragraph 102 of the NPPF (2019), as there were no alternative Sites at a lower flood risk which would accommodate the Site; the Exception Test should be passed. The Exception Test is comprised of two main components, including wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk be demonstrated and demonstration that development will be safe for its lifetime.

The wider sustainability benefits outweigh the risk identified within the site-specific FRA (ref: AEL-4491-FRA-958724) produced for the Site. The mitigation measures set out within the recommendations of the FRA would provide suitable mitigation to reduce the impacts of flooding over the lifetime of the proposed development.

Thus, the proposed development is considered to pass both the first and second parts of the Exception Test.

In conclusion, the proposed development passes the Sequential and Exception Tests. There are therefore no tenable grounds for refusal on flood risk grounds.

8. References and glossary

Defra/Environment Agency (2012). Flood Risk Assessment Guidance for New Development. Flood risk assessment: the sequential test for applicants. Accessed on: 16/10/2018. Accessed from: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-the-sequential-test-for-applicants>

Department for Communities and Local Government (2019). National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

National Planning Practice Guidance (2014). Planning Practice Guidance. Flood Risk and Coastal Change. Accessed from <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change/> on 16/10/2018.

Ordnance Survey Mapping (2017). © Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Licence number AL 100054687. For full terms and conditions visit www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk

Reading Borough Council (2017). Reading Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment. Accessed from: http://www.reading.gov.uk/media/7155/HELAA-for-Reading-May-2017-Volume-I-Main-Report/pdf/HELAA_for_Reading_May_2017_Volume_I_Main_Report.pdf

Glossary

General terms

BGS	British Geological Survey
EA	Environment Agency
GeoSmart groundwater flood risk model	GeoSmart's national groundwater flood risk model takes advantage of all the available data and provides a preliminary indication of groundwater flood risk on a 50m grid covering England and Wales. The model indicates the risk of the water table coming within 1 m of the ground surface for an indicative 1 in 200 year return period scenario.
Dry-Island	An area considered at low risk of flooding (eg. In a Flood Zone 1) that is entirely surrounded by areas at higher risk of flooding (eg. Flood Zone 2 and 3)
Flood resilience	Flood resilience of wet-proofing accepts that water will enter the building, but through careful design will minimise damage and allow the re-occupancy of the building quickly. Mitigation measures that reduce the damage to a property caused by flooding can include water entry strategies, raising electrical sockets off the floor, hard flooring.
Flood resistance	Flood resistance, or dry-proofing, stops water entering a building. Mitigation measures that prevent or reduce the likelihood of water entering a property can include raising flood levels or installation of sandbags.
Flood Zone 1	This zone has less than a 0.1% annual probability of river flooding
Flood Zone 2	This zone has between 0.1 and 1% annual probability of river flooding and between 0.1% and 0.5 % annual probability sea flooding
Flood Zone 3	This zone has more than a 1% annual probability of river flooding and 0.5% annual probability of sea flooding
Functional Flood Plain	An area of land where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood.
Hydrologic model	A computer model that simulates surface run-off or fluvial flow. The typical accuracy of hydrologic models such as this is $\pm 0.25\text{m}$ for estimating flood levels at particular locations.
OS	Ordnance Survey
Residual Flood Risk	The flood risk remaining after taking mitigating actions.
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. This is a brief flood risk assessment provided by the local council
SuDS	A Sustainable drainage system (SuDS) is designed to replicate, as closely as possible, the natural drainage from the Site (before development) to ensure that the flood risk downstream of the Site does not increase as a result of the land being developed. SuDS also significantly improve the quality of water leaving the Site and can also improve the amenity and biodiversity that a site has to offer. There are a range of SuDS options available to provide effective surface water management that intercept and store excess run-off. Sites over 1 Ha will usually require a sustainable drainage assessment if planning permission is required. The current

	proposal is that from April 2014 for more than a single dwelling the drainage system will require approval from the SuDs Approval Board (SABs).
NPPF (2019) terms	
Exception test	Applied once the sequential test has been passed. For the exception test to be passed it must be demonstrated that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk and a site-specific FRA must demonstrate that 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.
Sequential test	Aims to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding.
Essential infrastructure	Essential infrastructure includes essential transport infrastructure, essential utility infrastructure and wind turbines.
Water compatible	Water compatible land uses include flood control infrastructure, water-based recreation and lifeguard/coastal stations.
Less vulnerable	Less vulnerable land uses include police/ambulance/fire stations which are not required to be operational during flooding and buildings used for shops/financial/professional/other services.
More vulnerable	More vulnerable land uses include hospitals, residential institutions, buildings used for dwelling houses/student halls/drinking establishments/hotels and sites used for holiday or short-let caravans and camping.
Highly vulnerable	Highly vulnerable land uses include police/ambulance/fire stations which are required to be operational during flooding, basement dwellings and caravans/mobile homes/park homes intended for permanent residential use.

Disclaimer

This report has been prepared by GeoSmart in its professional capacity as flood risk, drainage, soil and groundwater specialists, with reasonable skill, care and diligence within the agreed scope and terms of contract and taking account of the manpower and resources devoted to it by agreement with its client, and is provided by GeoSmart solely for the internal use of its client.

The advice and opinions in this report should be read and relied on only in the context of the report as a whole, taking account of the terms of reference agreed with the client. The findings are based on the information made available to GeoSmart at the date of the report (and will have been assumed to be correct) and on current UK standards, codes, technology and practices as at that time. They do not purport to include any manner of legal advice or opinion. New information or changes in conditions and regulatory requirements may occur in future, which will change the conclusions presented here.

This report is confidential to the client. The client may submit the report to regulatory bodies, where appropriate. Should the client wish to release this report to any other third party for that party's reliance, GeoSmart may, by prior written agreement, agree to such release, provided that it is acknowledged that GeoSmart accepts no responsibility of any nature to any third party to whom this report or any part thereof is made known. GeoSmart accepts no responsibility for any loss or damage incurred as a result, and the third party does not acquire any rights whatsoever, contractual or otherwise, against GeoSmart except as expressly agreed with GeoSmart in writing.

For full T&Cs see <http://geosmartinfo.co.uk/terms-conditions>

Important consumer protection information

This search has been produced by GeoSmart Information Limited, Suite 9-11, 1st Floor, Old Bank Buildings, Bellstone, Shrewsbury, SY1 1HU.

Tel: 01743 298 100

Email: info@geosmartinfo.co.uk

GeoSmart Information Limited is registered with the Property Codes Compliance Board (PCCB) as a subscriber to the Search Code. The PCCB independently monitors how registered search firms maintain compliance with the Code.

The Search Code:

- provides protection for homebuyers, sellers, estate agents, conveyancers and mortgage lenders who rely on the information included in property search reports undertaken by subscribers on residential and commercial property within the United Kingdom
- sets out minimum standards which firms compiling and selling search reports have to meet
- promotes the best practice and quality standards within the industry for the benefit of consumers and property professionals
- enables consumers and property professionals to have confidence in firms which subscribe to the code, their products and services.
- By giving you this information, the search firm is confirming that they keep to the principles of the Code. This provides important protection for you.

The Code's core principles

Firms which subscribe to the Search Code will:

- display the Search Code logo prominently on their search reports
- act with integrity and carry out work with due skill, care and diligence
- at all times maintain adequate and appropriate insurance to protect consumers
- conduct business in an honest, fair and professional manner
- handle complaints speedily and fairly
- ensure that products and services comply with industry registration rules and standards and relevant laws
- monitor their compliance with the Code

Complaints

If you have a query or complaint about your search, you should raise it directly with the search firm, and if appropriate ask for any complaint to be considered under their formal internal complaints procedure. If you remain dissatisfied with the firm's final response, after your complaint has been formally considered, or if the firm has exceeded the response timescales, you may refer your complaint for consideration under The Property Ombudsman scheme (TPOs). The Ombudsman can award compensation of up to £5,000 to you if he finds that you have suffered actual loss as a result of your search provider failing to keep to the Code.

Please note that all queries or complaints regarding your search should be directed to your search provider in the first instance, not to TPOs or to the PCCB.

TPOs contact details:

The Property Ombudsman scheme
Milford House
43-55 Milford Street
Salisbury
Wiltshire SP1 2BP
Tel: 01722 333306
Fax: 01722 332296
Email: admin@tpos.co.uk

You can get more information about the PCCB from www.propertycodes.org.uk. Please ask your search provider if you would like a copy of the search code

Complaints procedure

GeoSmart Information Limited is registered with the Property Codes Compliance Board as a subscriber to the Search Code. A key commitment under the Code is that firms will handle any complaints both speedily and fairly.

If you want to make a complaint, we will:

- Acknowledge it within 5 working days of receipt.
- Normally deal with it fully and provide a final response, in writing, within 20 working days of receipt.
- Keep you informed by letter, telephone or e-mail, as you prefer, if we need more time.
- Provide a final response, in writing, at the latest within 40 working days of receipt.
- Liaise, at your request, with anyone acting formally on your behalf.

If you are not satisfied with our final response, or if we exceed the response timescales, you may refer the complaint to The Property Ombudsman scheme (TPOs): Tel: 01722 333306, E-mail: admin@tpos.co.uk.

We will co-operate fully with the Ombudsman during an investigation and comply with his final decision.

Complaints should be sent to:

Jemma Prydderch
Operations Manager
GeoSmart Information Limited
Suite 9-11, 1st Floor,
Old Bank Buildings,
Bellstone,
Shrewsbury,
SY1 1HU
Tel: 01743 298 100
jemma Prydderch@geosmartinfo.co.uk