

From: Keith Baker <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 13 March 2021 19:58
To: Fixter, Grant <Grant.Fixter@boston.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: B/20/0485 32, Red Lion Street, Boston, PE21 6PZ

Dear Grant

In that the EA do not favour discussing with me I have set out below as I see it in response to as the EA have said.

I have attached their letter and pasted the relevant substance of their letter and commented below each they say in their order.

Frankly they are none other than pedants, splitting hairs in respect of possible and proposed and in fact getting it completely wrong in respect of describing it as a Change of Use.

Environment Agency position

In the absence of any clear proposals to mitigate the flood risk (in the Flood Risk Assessment, prepared by Design and Management, no date) to the site we object to the grant of planning permission and recommend refusal on this basis for the following reasons:

Reasons

The site lies within the Hazard category 'Danger to ALL' with possible depths of 0.5-1.0m (max spot depths of 0.8m) in the 2115 0.5% (1in200 year) Tidal breach scenario. Whilst the FRA makes suggestions for what mitigation could be suitable, there is no clear proposal upon which we can make our decision. The local standing advice for a new building in this location would require a FFL 1m above ground level and flood resilient construction techniques.

Referring to Mitigation within the FRA, I beg to differ. It seems to me as suggested constitutes proposing what is possible. The EA can select whichever suits. That is the point of suggesting/proposing possibilities rather than proposing only specific, so the full range of possibilities can be considered in light of the desirability and practicality of incorporating all, some, or none.

Overcoming our objection

The applicant can overcome our objection by submitting a FRA which covers the deficiencies highlighted above and demonstrates that the development will be safe, not increase risk elsewhere and where possible will reduce flood risk overall. If this cannot be achieved we are likely to maintain our objection to the application. It is appreciated that the proposed development is a change of use, and therefore raising the FFL in line with that required for a new build may not be possible. However the floor level should be raised as far as practical, and other mitigation measures to reduce risk to the property should be proposed, such as flood resilient/resistant construction techniques and 600mm demountable defences.

It is not a change of use but a continuation of the current and currently permitted GF use it being only proposed to extend upwards to a new First etc floors.

My client has no objection to demountable defences to the height proposed, nor flood resilient/resistant construction , because as far as I am aware the GF is already or being already constructed in flood flood resilient/resistant construction. Raising the GF level is more complicated it being already construction or under construction and parts are in use, and of course it is within the Conservation Area. But if the EA insist on it my client will consider it.

Having compared the modelling however, with other provided previously by the EA including Red Lion Street ,there seems no difference between the modelling in respect of Red Lion Street then, and the modelling now, is it I wonder outdated modelling predating the completion of Barrier which for all it's millions is meant to prevent a recurrence of the 2013 event or anything like it.

To summarise it seems as the EA require is entirely acceptable. Please inform them my client agrees.

Yours Sincerely

Keith Baker

Design and Management. co. uk

██████████