



RUTLAND LOCAL PLAN 2018 – 2036

STRATEGIC FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT UPDATE



Rutland
County Council

April 2020

Rutland Local Plan 2018 – 2036
Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Update

Contents

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	LEGISLATIVE AND PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT	1
	Flood and Water Management Act 2010.....	1
	National Planning Policy Framework.....	1
	Planning Practice Guidance	2
3.0	RELEVANT FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT DOCUMENTS	2
	Rutland Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (2011) and Addendum (2017)	2
	Rutland County Council Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (April 2018).....	2
	Surface Water Management Plans	3
	Catchment Flood Management Plans.....	3
	River Basin Management Plans.....	3
4.0	FLOOD MAP FOR PLANNING	3
5.0	LOCAL SOURCES OF FLOODING	4
	Surface Water	4
	Groundwater.....	5
	Reservoir Flooding	5
	Sewer Flooding	5
	Critical Drainage Area.....	5
6.0	FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT	5
7.0	SEQUENTIAL TEST/EXCEPTION TEST	6
	Local Plan Site Assessments	7
	Planning Applications	7
8.0	IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE	8
9.0	EMERGENCY PLANNING AND EVACUATION	8
10.0	SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEMS	9

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) assesses flood risk within a Local Planning Authority's (LPA) catchment area. The requirement to prepare a SFRA is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 1.2. A SFRA for Rutland was completed in 2009. It combined a Level 1 SFRA covering the whole County with a Level 2 SFRA, which considered in greater detail the flood risk in Oakham and Uppingham to support the assessment of future development sites. It was prepared in accordance with national planning policy and guidance prevailing at the time.
- 1.3. Since preparation of the SFRA in 2009 a number of matters have emerged that require the SFRA to be updated to ensure that it contains the latest flood risk information and provides a consistent evidence base to inform the review of the Local Plan and make development management decisions.
- 1.4. The SFRA has, therefore, been updated to take account of:
 - Revisions to national policy introduced through the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and associated Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on 'Flood Risk and Coastal Change';
 - Other key documents produced by flood risk authorities;
 - Revised climate change allowances;
 - Updated flood mapping;
 - The Local Plan review and allocation of sites.
- 1.5. Rutland County Council, as the Local Lead Flood Authority, has lead on this SFRA update in consultation with the Environment Agency.

2.0 LEGISLATIVE AND PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

Flood and Water Management Act 2010

- 2.1. The Flood and Water Management Act established the Environment Agency (EA) as responsible for the national strategy for flood and coastal erosion risk management and issuing guidance. The EA also have responsibility for flood risk from main rivers. Rutland County Council (the Council) is the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) with responsibility for flood risk from ordinary watercourses, surface water run-off and groundwater.
- 2.2. In addition Anglian Water Services (AWS) and Severn Trent Water (STW) are responsible for public sewers with Rutland County Council (as highway authority) and Highways England responsible for highway drainage.

National Planning Policy Framework

- 2.3. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)¹ provides guidance to planning authorities on taking account of managing flood risk in their plan making. It states that (paragraph 156):

'Strategic policies should be informed by a strategic flood risk assessment, and should manage flood risk from all sources. They should consider cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding, and take account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management authorities, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards.'

- 2.4. It goes on to say that (paragraph 157) 'all plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development - taking into account the current and future impacts of climate change – so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property.'

¹ Published February 2019 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

Planning Practice Guidance

- 2.5. The Planning Practice Guidance² sets out a tiered approach to flood risk assessment and identifies two levels of SFRA:
- Level 1 – where flooding is not a major issue in relation to potential development sites and where development pressures are low. The assessment should be sufficiently detailed to allow application of the Sequential Test to the location of development.
 - Level 2 – where land outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3 cannot appropriately accommodate all the necessary development creating the need to apply the Exception Test. In these circumstances the Level 2 SFRA should consider the detailed nature of flood characteristics within a Flood Zone.
- 2.6. This update fulfils the requirements of a Level 1 SFRA.

3.0 RELEVANT FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT DOCUMENTS

Rutland Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (2011) and Addendum (2017)

- 3.1. As LLFA, the Council are required to prepare a Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA)³. This is a high level screening exercise to identify flood risk areas and to provide a basis for a flood risk management strategy. The PFRA identifies areas at significant risk of flooding from surface water, ground water and ordinary watercourses. It does not consider flooding from main rivers or reservoirs.
- 3.2. The 2011 PFRA reviewed past flood events and future flood risk but the available information suggested that flood risk in the County was low. Whilst the PFRA identified a number of locations as being at risk from surface water flooding there were no locations that met the criteria for being identified as an area of significant flood risk. As such there was no requirement to prepare flood risk and flood hazard maps or flood management plans.
- 3.3. A 2017 review of the PFRA⁴ concluded that since the publication of the original PFRA there had been no nationally or locally significant flood events. However, a review of the latest available surface water flood risk mapping was found to highlight a new area of nationally significant flood risk in Oakham. As this was not consistent with the local history of flooding the PFRA indicated that further work would need to be undertaken to better understand the risk.

Rutland County Council Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (April 2018)

- 3.3. The Flood Risk Management Strategy (FRMS)⁵ provides an overview of the water environment in Rutland and how the Council as LLFA will lead and co-ordinate local flood risk management.
- 3.4. The FRMS objectives for managing flood risk include:
- Reducing the number of properties at risk from flooding;
 - Helping residents, property and business owners in the area become more resilient to flood events;
 - Reducing the area of highway under water for a given storm event and minimize traffic disruption from flooding;
 - Increasing the amount of green space contributing to the mitigation of flood risk; and
 - Reducing the number of pollution incidents affecting watercourses.

² Planning Practice Guidance – Flood Risk and Coastal Change (published 6 March 2014) <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change>

³ <https://rutlandcounty.moderngov.co.uk/Data/Cabinet/20110705/Agenda/92-2011%20Flood%20Risk%20Assessment%20%20-%20Annex%201.pdf>

⁴ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/698244/PFRA_Rutland_County_Council_2017.pdf

⁵ <https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-community/environment/flood-and-water-management/local-flood-risk-management-strategy/>

- 3.5. The FRMS contains an Action Plan that details the actions the Council will undertake together with partners to better understand the flood risks and how these might be managed or mitigated.

Surface Water Management Plans

- 3.6. Surface Water Management Plans (SWMPs) outline the preferred surface water management strategy in a given location. SWMPs establish a long term action plan to manage surface water in an area and are intended to influence future capital investment, drainage maintenance, public engagement and understanding, land use planning, emergency planning and future developments.
- 3.7. The need to prepare a SWMP for Oakham was identified in the PFRA Addendum (2017). The preparation of a SWMP is identified in the FRMS Action Plan but its completion remains outstanding.

Catchment Flood Management Plans

- 3.8. Catchment Flood Management Plans (CFMPs) are high level strategic plans providing an overview of flood risks across each river catchment. The EA use CFMPs to identify and agree long term policies for sustainable flood risk management.
- 3.9. Rutland is covered by three CFMPs: for the rivers Witham, Welland and Trent.⁶ All are classified as low to moderate risk.

River Basin Management Plans

- 3.10. The Water Framework Directive (WFD) requires the production of management plans for each River Basin District. River Basin Management Plans (RBMP) are designed to address the pressures facing the water environment in the river basin management districts and the actions that will address them. They aim to ensure that all aquatic ecosystems, riparian ecosystems and wetlands reach 'good status'. To achieve 'good status', a waterbody must be observed to be at a level of ecological and chemical quality.
- 3.11. There are three river basins with headwaters within the County area: the Anglian, Humber and the Severn.⁷ The latest version of the RBMPs were prepared in 2015.

4.0 FLOOD MAP FOR PLANNING

- 4.1. The EA's Flood Map for Planning⁸ shows areas across England that could be affected by flooding from rivers (and from coastal flooding, which is not relevant to Rutland). It also shows flood defences and the areas that benefit from them. The Flood Map shows the extent of Flood Zones, which are defined in the PPG⁹ and which are the starting point for the application of the Sequential Test (see Section 7.0) and identifying when a developer needs to carry out a site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). They ignore the presence of existing flood defences, since defences can be 'overtopped' if a flood occurs which is higher than the defences are designed to withstand or through structural failure.
- 4.2. The flood mapping shows a small number of properties as being at risk from flooding in Caldecott, Greetham, Ketton, Langham, Oakham, Ryhall, Tolethorpe, Tickencote and Whissendine.
- 4.3. Table 1 provides a description of the Flood Zones and outlines the circumstances when a FRA will be required.

⁶ River Witham CFMP <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/river-witham-catchment-flood-management-plan>

River Welland CFMP <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/river-welland-catchment-flood-management-plan>

River Trent CFMP <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/river-trent-catchment-flood-management-plan>

⁷ <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/river-basin-management-plans-2015>

⁸ <https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/>

⁹ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change#flood-zone-and-flood-risk-tables>

Rutland Local Plan 2018 – 2036
Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Update

Flood Zone	Description	FRA Required
Flood Zone 1 – low probability	Land having less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river flooding (shown as 'clear' on the Flood Map)	For development proposals on sites of one hectare or more the vulnerability to flooding from river and other sources of flooding and the potential to increase flood risk elsewhere through the addition of hard surfaces and the effect on surface water run-off, should be incorporated into a FRA.
Flood Zone 2 – medium probability	Land having between a 1 in 100 and 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river flooding (shown as 'light blue' on the Flood Map)	All developments require an FRA.
Flood Zone 3a – High probability	Land having a 1 in 100 or greater annual probability of river flooding (shown in 'dark blue' on the Flood Map)	All developments require an FRA.
Flood Zone 3b – Functional Floodplain	Comprises land where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood (it is not distinguished from Flood Zone 3a on the Flood Map)	All developments require an FRA

Table 1: Flood Zone Description

- 4.4. The EA Flood Map should be used to inform planning decisions. The Flood Maps do not take account of the possible impacts of climate change and consequent changes in the probability of flooding. Reference should be made, therefore, to Section 8.0 of this SFRA when considering location and potential future flood risks to development and land uses.
- 4.5. It should be noted that a FRA may also be required for development at risk of flooding from other local sources of flooding.

5.0 LOCAL SOURCES OF FLOODING

Surface Water

- 5.1. The PPG indicates that in preparing a SFRA areas at risk from surface water flooding should be identified taking account of the EA's mapping and other available evidence such as a local FRMS. It should also identify the types of measures which may be appropriate to manage them, taking account of location, site opportunities, constraints and geology.
- 5.2. The EA's surface water flood risk mapping¹⁰ shows areas that could be affected by surface water flooding and the potential depth and velocity of that flooding. Surface water flooding is subdivided into the following categories:
- High – chance of flooding greater than 1 in 30 each year
 - Medium – chance of flooding between 1 in 100 and 1 in 30 each year
 - Low – chance of flooding between 1 in 1,000 and 1 in 100 each year
- 5.3. The mapping should be used in high level assessments to identify an area's risk of flooding and not to identify whether an individual property will flood. If a particular sites is indicated to be at risk from surface water flooding, a more detailed assessment may be required to more accurately illustrate the flood risk at a site specific scale.
- 5.4. More detailed information on surface water flood risk in Oakham will be available when the Oakham SWMP

¹⁰ <https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk>

is published and developers should refer to this for further more detailed information to inform site specific FRAs.

Groundwater

- 5.5. Groundwater refers to all water which is below the surface of the ground and in direct contact with the ground or subsoil. Groundwater flooding occurs when the water table in permeable rocks rises to enter basements/cellars or comes up above the ground surface. Groundwater flooding is not necessarily linked directly to a specific rainfall event and is generally of longer duration than other causes of flooding.
- 5.6. The presence of existing springs and limestone bedrock in the area suggest that ground water flooding could be possible in the County. However, the risk is considered to be low.
- 5.7. The British Geological Society (BGS) have produced information on the susceptibility of groundwater flooding¹¹. The BGS should be contacted for more detailed sites specific information when preparing a FRA. The LLFA will need to be consulted on any proposed development in an area at risk of groundwater flooding.

Reservoir Flooding

- 5.8. The risk of flooding from reservoirs is mainly due to overtopping of the dam/reservoir wall or a wall breach. There are two significant reservoirs within the County: Rutland Water and Eyebrook reservoir both of which fall under the Reservoir Act 1975 (having a volume greater than 25,000m³). As part of the Reservoirs Act there is a need to create an onsite reservoir plan, which sets out how to respond to an emergency incident.
- 5.9. The EA's flood risk mapping shows areas at risk of flooding from reservoirs and should be used to inform development decisions when considering the flood risk posed by reservoirs. The PPG states¹² that LPAs should discuss their proposed site allocations with reservoir undertakers to avoid an intensification of development within areas at risk from reservoir failure and ensure that reservoir undertakers can assess the cost implications of any reservoir safety improvements required due to changes in land use downstream of their assets.
- 5.10. Site allocations are not being considered in the mapped reservoir flood risk areas and AWS who manage both Rutland Water and Eyebrook reservoir have been consulted at various stages of the Local Plan review process.

Sewer Flooding

- 5.11. Sewer flooding arises when drainage systems are unable to cope with the volumes of rainfall during an event causing pipes to back up and surcharge, which may lead to flood flows. It may also arise as a result of groundwater infiltration into the sewer network leading to overloading and subsequent flooding.
- 5.12. Sewer flooding has occurred in Rutland and is reported to and acted upon by AWS and STW. Properties that are affected are recorded by AWS and STW on the DG5 registers.

Critical Drainage Area

Waiting for information.

6.0 FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT

- 6.1. Table 1 outlines when a FRA will be required to accompany a planning application. The FRA should identify and assess the risks from all sources of flooding to and from the development and demonstrate how these

¹¹ <https://www.bgs.ac.uk/products/hydrogeology/groundwaterFlooding.html>

¹² PPG – Flood Risk and Coastal Change Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 7-006-20140306 <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change>

risks will be managed, taking climate change into account and the vulnerability of the proposed use. The FRA should be proportionate to the degree of flood risk and appropriate to the scale, nature and location of the development.

- 6.2. In preparing a site specific FRA, developers should have regard to the EA’s standing advice on preparing a FRA.¹³

7.0 SEQUENTIAL TEST/EXCEPTION TEST

7.1. The NPPF advocates a sequential approach to development to ensure that areas with little or no risk of flooding (from all sources) are developed in preference to areas at higher risk with the aim of keeping development outside of medium to high flood risk areas where possible. The SFRA provides the basis for applying this sequential approach.

7.2. The sequential approach can be applied both between and within Flood Zones. The preference when allocating land is, wherever possible, to place all new development on land in Flood Zone 1. However, it is often the case that it is not possible for all new development to be allocated on land that is not at risk from flooding. Only where no suitable sites in Flood Zone 1 are available should a site in a higher risk flood zone be considered. Sequentially development should be located in Flood Zone 2 before sites in Flood Zone 3a are considered.

7.3. When locating sites in Flood Zone 2 or 3a it is also necessary to take the vulnerability of the proposed development into account. The PPG categorises land uses into five vulnerability classes¹⁴ from essential infrastructure to water compatible uses, which are then used to determine the appropriateness of a land use within each flood zone. The flood risk vulnerability and flood zone compatibility are shown in Table 2 (taken from Table 3 of the PPG¹⁵) and whether the Exception Test needs to be applied. The Exception Test should only be applied only after the Sequential Test has been undertaken.

Flood Zone	Essential Infrastructure	Water Compatible	Highly Vulnerable	More Vulnerable	Less Vulnerable
Zone 1	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
Zone 2	Compatible	Compatible	Exception Test Required	Compatible	Compatible
Zone 3a	Exception Test Required	Compatible	Not Compatible	Exception Test Required	Not Compatible
Zone 3b	Exception Test Required	Compatible	Not Compatible	Not Compatible	Not Compatible

Table 2: Flood Risk Compatibility

7.4. The Exception Test is a method to demonstrate and help ensure that flood risk to people and property will be managed satisfactorily, allowing necessary development to go ahead in situations where suitable sites at lower risk of flooding are not available. There are two parts to the Exception Test:

- Wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk¹⁶; and
- That development will be safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere and where possible reduce flood risk overall.

¹³ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-standing-advice> (updated March 2019)

¹⁴ PPG – Flood Risk and Coastal Change Paragraph: 066 Reference ID: 7-066-20140306 <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change#Table-2-Flood-Risk-Vulnerability-Classification>

¹⁵ PPG – Flood Risk and Coastal Change Paragraph: 067 Reference ID: 7-067-20140306 <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change>

¹⁶ This could involve drawing on the criteria for assessing the sustainability of development set out in the Rutland Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Report <https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-policy/local-plan-evidence-base/sustainability-and-environmental-assessment/>

Rutland Local Plan 2018 – 2036
Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Update

- 7.5. Both elements of the Exception Test have to be passed for the site to be allocated or development permitted. The risk from other sources such as surface water and groundwater also need to be considered as a site in Flood Zone 1 may still be at high risk of flooding from other sources.

Local Plan Site Assessments

- 7.6. A Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) has been undertaken to identify sites that could contribute to the housing and employment land supply and this has provided the starting point for the Local Plan site assessment process.
- 7.7. In undertaking the SHELAA assessment¹⁷ all sites have been screened against available flood risk information by the LLFA to provide a summary of the flood risk for each site, including:
- The proportion of the site in each flood zone;
 - Whether the site is shown to be at risk from surface water flooding.
- 7.8. For each site a red/amber/green (RAG) rating assessment has been used. Sites scored a red RAG rating for flood risk where more than 50% of a site was within Flood Zone 2 or 3. These sites were identified as unsuitable and not take forward for further assessment. The majority of sites assessed lie entirely within Flood Zone 1. Where sites have a small proportion of land within Flood Zones 2 and 3, the sequential test has been applied within the site boundary to situate all development in Flood Zone 1. All sites are considered to pass the Sequential Test and the Exception Test is not required.
- 7.9. Where sites are within an area of medium or high surface water flood risk they were scored an amber RAG rating. However, in the majority of cases surface water flooding can be managed by design and mitigation and detailed layout considerations. Surface water flooding is not considered to be a constraint to development.
- 7.10. The PPG provides guidance on the application of the Sequential and Exception Tests in respect of the Local Plan¹⁸.

Planning Applications

- 7.11. The NPPF requires those proposing development in a location which is vulnerable to flood risk to demonstrate through a site specific FRA there are no other reasonably available sites at a lower risk of flooding that could be suitable to accommodate the proposed development.
- 7.12. The Sequential Test does not need to be applied to developments that come forward on sites allocated in a Local Plan. Applications for some minor developments or change of use do not need to be subject to the Sequential or Exception Tests.¹⁹
- 7.13. To carry out a Sequential Test it is necessary to define the geographical area within which to undertake a search for alternative sites at lower risk of flooding. The search area should be the whole of the Council area unless the functional requirements of the development justify a reduced search area, for example because the development is to serve a specific catchment area. In some circumstances it may be appropriate to extend the search area beyond the County boundary, for example because the development is intended to serve a wider regional or national area.
- 7.14. The FRA should define the Sequential Test search area and justify the area identified (if it is different to the

¹⁷ <https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-policy/local-plan-evidence-base/housing/>

¹⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change#Sequential-Test-to-Local-Plan>

¹⁹ This includes householder development, small non-residential extensions (with a footprint of less than 250m²) and changes of use; except for changes of use to a caravan, camping or chalet site, or to a mobile home or park home site.

Council area). The SHELAA can be used to identify reasonably alternative sites. Sites should not be discounted on the grounds that:

- They are not owned by the developer;
- They are larger than the proposed site;
- They do not offer sustainability benefits equivalent to the proposed site;
- There is an extant permission but development has not begun.

7.15. Evidence should be provided in the FRA to clearly identify the reasonably alternative sites being compared to the application site and the reasons for concluding that the site is, or is not, a reasonable alternative.

7.16. The PPG provides guidance on the application of the Sequential and Exception Tests in respect of individual planning applications²⁰.

8.0 IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE

8.1. The EA published updated climate change allowances and guidance on their application in 2019²¹. These allowances must now be considered in all new developments and planning applications to provide resilience over the lifetime of a development to flooding. The climate change allowances are predictions of anticipated change for:

- Peak river flow
- Peak rainfall intensity
- Sea level rise
- Offshore wind speed and extreme wave height

There are different allowances for different epochs or periods of time over the next century: the '2020's' (2015 to 2039); '2050's' (2040 to 2069) and '2080's' (2070 to 2115).

8.2. The climate change allowances are presented based on river basin district. Rutland falls within the Anglian and Humber River basin districts. It is possible to find out which river basin parts of the County fall into by using the river basin district map²².

8.3. Developers will need to undertake a more detailed site specific assessment of climate change as part of the planning application process when preparing FRAs using the climate change allowances as required by the guidance. The EA can give preliminary opinion to applications on their proposals at pre-application stage. There is a charge for more detailed pre-application planning advice. As the LLFA the Council should be contacted for advice on flood risk from local watercourses, surface or groundwater.

9.0 EMERGENCY PLANNING AND EVACUATION

9.1. The PPG advises that to demonstrate a development will be safe for its lifetime, a site specific FRA may need to show that appropriate evacuation and flood response procedures are in place to manage the residual risk associated with an extreme flood event.

9.2. The PPG further advises that flood warning and evacuation plans will need to take into account the impacts of climate change, for example through increased water depths and the impact on how people can be evacuated. The PPG provides further advice on flood warning and evacuation plans²³.

²⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change#Sequential-Test-to-individual-planning-applications>

²¹ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances>

²² <https://environment.data.gov.uk/DefraDataDownload/?mapService=EA/WFDRiverBasinDistrictsCycle2&Mode=spatial>

²³ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change#flood-warning-and-evacuation-plan>

10.0 SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEMS

- 10.1. Surface water flood risks should be managed using sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). SuDS should be designed to control surface water run off as close to where it falls as possible and mimic the natural catchment process.
- 10.2. SuDS can provide opportunities to:
- Reduce surface water run off;
 - Encourage natural groundwater recharge;
 - Reduce pollution
 - Positively influence the design and landscape value of development through the provision of green space and providing opportunities for biodiversity.
- 10.3. The NPPF (paragraph 165) requires all major developments to incorporate SuDS unless it can be clearly demonstrated to be inappropriate and developments in areas of flood risk will only be permitted where SuDS are incorporated. When considering planning applications, local planning authorities should consult the LLFA on the management of surface water in order to satisfy that the proposed minimum standards operational standards are appropriate and that there are clear arrangements for the on-going maintenance of the system over the development's lifetime
- 10.4. Good design of SuDS is crucial as there is no 'one fits all' solution and they should be considered early in the design process of a development. SuDS should be designed to provide multiple benefits and clear arrangements must be in place for the on-going maintenance and/or adoption of the proposed drainage system for the lifetime of the development.
- 10.5. The PPG provides further guidance on the use of SuDS²⁴ and guidance on the technical standards for their design, maintenance and operation can be found in the non-statutory technical standards²⁵. The Council's requirements for sustainable drainage as part of new development is available on the Council's website²⁶, Policy CS19 of the adopted Core Strategy and Policies EN5 and EN6 of the emerging Rutland Local Plan.

²⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change#sustainable-drainage-systems>

²⁵ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sustainable-drainage-systems-non-statutory-technical-standards>

²⁶ <https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-community/environment/flood-and-water-management/drainage/>