

Critical Assessment: The Cumulative Flood Risk of North Petherton Development on the Somerset Levels

Executive Summary

The Core Issue: Unacceptable Cumulative Flood Risk

This report finds that the aggregate flood risk from **1,080 new residential units** in North Petherton has been fundamentally underestimated. The proposals, including sites at Park Lane, Gateway, Stafflands Farm, and Daws Lane, are being assessed in isolation, ignoring their collective impact on the **vulnerable Somerset Levels** catchment, which is already severely constrained, as evidenced by the 2014 flood events.



Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
1. Introduction: The Critical Failure to Address Cumulative Flood Risk.....	4
2. Exacerbated Flood Risk to Moorland and the Somerset Levels	4
The Mechanism of Increased Risk.....	5
3. Inadequate Pumping and Drainage Capacity	5
4. The Flawed Reliance on Attenuation and SuDS	6
5. Reduced Waterway Maintenance and Legislative Failures.....	7
6. NPPF Policy Weight: A National Imperative	8
7. Sedgemoor Local Plan: Specific Local Protection.....	9
Summary of Policy Application	10
Appendix X	11
Estimated Runoff from Individual Applications (Piece-meal) & References for Assumption Calculations	11
Site-by-site worked calculations	12
Estimated piece-meal runoff (method and results).....	15
Recommended Reference Sources for Assumptions	16
Reference Basis for Assumptions	17
Version Control	18
Addendum to the Cumulative Flood Risk Assessment of North Petherton.....	19
Addendum No 1 to the Cumulative Flood Risk Assessment of North Petherton (December 2025). 20	
Implications of Recent Flood Events for Ongoing Development Proposals	20
1. Purpose of this Addendum	20
2. Relationship to the December 2025 Assessment	20
3. Observed Flood Events Since Publication	20
4. Implications for Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs)	20
5. Implications for SuDS and Attenuation-Based Mitigation.....	21
6. Cumulative Impact: From Risk to Demonstrated Constraint	21
7. Planning Implications	21
8. Conclusion and Recommendation	21
Addendum No. 2 (Version 1.4 – April 2026) Cumulative Flood Risk Assessment of North Petherton Forensic Review of System Resilience and Recent Flood Evidence	22
Contents.....	22
1. Purpose of Addendum.....	23
2. Status of Original Report	23
3. New Evidence Considered.....	23

4. Review of System Resilience Claims	23
5. Implications for Hydraulic Capacity	24
6. Implications for Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs)	24
7. Implications for SuDS and Attenuation	24
8. Cumulative Impact – Confirmed Constraint	24
9. Planning and Policy Implications	25
10. Updated Conclusion	25

1. Introduction: The Critical Failure to Address Cumulative Flood Risk

This report highlights a **critical and unacceptable failure** to fully address the **cumulative flood risk** posed by the current portfolio of major housing applications in **North Petherton**.

The proposed developments—totalling **1,080 new dwellings**—are being assessed in isolation, overlooking the aggregate hydraulic burden placed on the already marginal drainage capacity of the receiving environment. This approach contravenes national and local planning policy aimed at protecting vulnerable communities.

Development Scale and Geographic Context

The collective impact from the following key applications, currently in various planning stages, demands an immediate, unified reassessment:

Application Reference	Site Name	Proposed Dwellings	Notes
37/25/00044	Park Lane	64	<i>(New figure as of August 25)</i>
37/22/00125	Vistry Gateway	150	
37/25/00055	Gateway	15	
37/25/00042	Gateway	346	
37/25/00023	Stafflands Farm	190	
37/25/00018	Daws Lane	175	
37/25/00088	Dancing Hill	140	
SUB-TOTAL		1,080	

2. Exacerbated Flood Risk to Moorland and the Somerset Levels

The proposed development of 1,080 new homes in North Petherton, which sits close to the catchment area of the Somerset Levels and Moors, presents an undeniable increase in flood risk to communities downstream, particularly Moorland.

The Mechanism of Increased Risk

- **Increased Impermeable Surfaces:** New development, by its nature, replaces porous land (fields, open ground) with impermeable surfaces (roofs, roads, driveways). This dramatically **accelerates and increases surface water runoff volume**.
 - **Catchment Impact:** North Petherton is situated on the edge of the catchment area that drains into the low-lying **Somerset Levels**, including the Parrett and Tone River systems. A sudden increase in surface water runoff from this scale of development may place an immediate and additional hydraulic burden on the main rivers and, crucially, the surrounding moors used as designated flood storage areas (e.g., Northmoor, Saltmoor, Currymoor, Fordgate).
 - **Direct Impact on Moorland:** Communities like Moorland, which are geographically low-lying and historically prone to inundation, function as a spillover point when the river systems are at capacity. The **cumulative effect of 1,080 new homes** discharging surface water, even at 'greenfield' runoff rates (the ideal scenario, which is often not met in practice), may incrementally increase the frequency, duration, and depth of flooding in these already vulnerable areas. The tragic experiences of 2014, where Moorland was severely impacted, underscore the catastrophic consequences of exceeding the system's storage and conveyance capacity.
-

3. Inadequate Pumping and Drainage Capacity

The current capacity for managing water on the Somerset Levels, particularly the system of pumping stations and drainage networks, is **not sufficient** to manage the existing flood risk, let alone the added pressure from significant new development.

- **Existing Capacity Limitations:** The pumping system is designed to manage water within the context of the historical environment. However, the 2014 floods and subsequent near-miss events have repeatedly demonstrated that the rivers (e.g., River Tone, River Parrett) can reach levels where **pumping stations cannot operate effectively** because the receiving watercourse is already too high, a concept known as being "tide-locked" or "river-locked."
 - **Reliance on Temporary Measures:** Although investments have been made since 2014, reports often highlight the need to deploy **temporary mobile pumps** and take pre-emptive action when intense rainfall is forecast. This indicates that the permanent, built-in capacity is already marginal. Adding the runoff from 1,080 homes may reduce the operational window for existing pumps and accelerate the trigger points for deploying temporary measures, increasing the long-term operational cost and risk.
 - **Climate Change and Future Storm Events:** The current capacity is insufficient when factoring in the increased frequency and intensity of rainfall events predicted under climate change allowances (which mandate a 20-40% increase in design rainfall depths). The development proposals fail to provide a robust demonstration that the capacity exists to manage the worst-case, climate-adjusted scenario without detriment to downstream residents.
-
-

4. The Flawed Reliance on Attenuation and SuDS

The primary mitigation strategy for new developments, as often promoted under the **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**, involves the use of **attenuation ponds/tanks and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)** to manage surface water runoff. However, for a flood-sensitive location like North Petherton and the Somerset Levels, this approach carries significant inherent risks and potential for failure, leading to a repeat of the 2014 situation.

Mitigation Strategy	Risk of Failure & Consequence
Attenuation Ponds/Tanks	These features temporarily <i>store</i> water before slow release. In a prolonged rainfall event, such as in 2014, these structures may fill up and lose all capacity before the storm event is over, resulting in uncontrolled discharge and compounding the flood peak. Their effectiveness is critically dependent on the downstream drainage network having sufficient capacity to accept the attenuated flow, which, as established, is already questionable.
Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)	While designed to mimic natural processes (infiltration, slow conveyance), a review of SuDS in Somerset found that many schemes favour underground storage/pipe-to-pond solutions over truly multi-functional source control features (e.g., rain gardens, permeable paving). Furthermore, poor construction site management and lack of ongoing maintenance can lead to blockages and system failure at a critical time, rendering them ineffective.
Groundwater Interaction	The Somerset Levels have a naturally high-water table. Attenuation features, if not correctly lined or managed, risk being filled with rising groundwater , which significantly reduces their capacity to store surface runoff from rainfall, increasing the flood risk to the development itself and the wider area.

Conclusion: The design and maintenance limitations of these mitigation measures mean they offer **false security**. Relying on them for 1,080 homes introduces an unacceptable systemic risk that, in an extreme event, may inevitably contribute to widespread flooding across the Levels, directly impacting Moorland.

5. Reduced Waterway Maintenance and Legislative Failures

Compounding the capacity and development issues is the observable trend of **reduced maintenance work** on the network of rivers, rhynes, and drainage ditches in the area, a vital component of the Somerset Levels flood defence strategy.

- **Dredging and Desilting:** The effectiveness of the river system to convey water rapidly is dependent on continuous maintenance, notably **dredging and desilting**. A lack of consistent, timely maintenance leads to reduced channel capacity, causing water to overtop banks sooner and flow onto the floodplains (moors) unnecessarily or prematurely.
- **Rhyne and Ditch Clearance:** The smaller drainage networks (rhynes and ditches), managed by Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs), are critical for local water management. If maintenance is neglected, these waterways become choked with vegetation and silt, impeding the flow of water *off* the moors and into the main rivers, thereby **prolonging the duration of flooding** in communities like Moorland.
- **Sedgemoor and NPPF Policy Conflict:** While **Sedgemoor's planning policy** (and the overarching **NPPF**) requires developers to manage flood risk and promote SuDS, the sheer volume of development, coupled with the systemic underinvestment in core downstream infrastructure (pumping and channel maintenance), creates an untenable conflict. The NPPF's **Sequential and Exception Tests** should, in this context, place a far greater emphasis on the *cumulative* downstream impact on highly vulnerable receptors like the Somerset Levels, which appears to have been inadequately addressed.

The current trajectory of high-volume development without a demonstrably robust, fully funded, and future-proofed flood defence and maintenance strategy may inevitably place an overwhelming and unacceptable burden on the residents of Moorland and the wider Somerset Levels. **Planning permission for these 1,080 dwellings may need to be reconsidered until an independently verified, holistic, and capacity-enhancing solution for the entire catchment is delivered.**

The core arguments in the report are strongly supported by key policies in the **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)** and the **Sedgemoor Local Plan** (specifically the Core Strategy and associated policies), particularly in relation to the Sequential Test, cumulative risk, and the long-term maintenance of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).

6. NPPF Policy Weight: A National Imperative

The **NPPF** provides the overarching national policy that compels the Local Planning Authority to prioritise flood risk avoidance and ensures development does not exacerbate the situation elsewhere.

NPPF Paragraph 167: Sequential and Exception Test

- **Policy Link:** This paragraph establishes the fundamental principle of the **Sequential Test**, which may need to be applied to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding.
- **Report Weight:** The proposed 1,080 homes may need to demonstrate they have satisfied this test, proving that **no reasonably available sites** exist in lower-risk areas. If any part of the site is at risk from *any* source (fluvial, surface water, or groundwater), the test is triggered. The report's focus on the downstream impact on Moorland and the Levels highlights that while the North Petherton sites might be considered lower risk *locally*, the **cumulative downstream impact** may need to be robustly factored into the Sequential Test and site selection process, as it directly impacts high-risk receptors.

NPPF Paragraph 169: Making Development Safe Without Increasing Risk Elsewhere

- **Policy Link:** This paragraph is crucial, stating that development is advised to only be allowed if it can be **made safe for its lifetime** *without increasing flood risk elsewhere*.
- **Report Weight:** This directly challenges the current proposals. The report's central argument is that the **cumulative runoff from 1,080 homes may inevitably increase flood risk** to vulnerable downstream communities like Moorland and the Levels. The NPPF makes this an explicit point of failure for a planning application.

NPPF Paragraph 182 (and PPG): Reliability of Mitigation (SuDS Maintenance)

- **Policy Link:** NPPF paragraph **182** requires development to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) where appropriate to manage surface water runoff. **Planning Practice Guidance (Flood Risk and Coastal Change)** clarifies that the **Sequential Test must not rely on mitigation measures requiring ongoing active maintenance** to make a site safe; such measures may be considered at later stages but cannot be used to justify site selection.
- **Report Weight:** The report's scepticism regarding the long-term effectiveness of attenuation ponds/tanks and SuDS (due to silting, blockage, and poor maintenance) gains significant weight from this policy. The NPPF demands guaranteed, long-term, and enforceable maintenance to prevent system failure—a key vulnerability highlighted by the 2014 floods and the general condition of regional waterways.

7. Sedgemoor Local Plan: Specific Local Protection

The Sedgemoor Local Plan reinforces the national policy with a clear local mandate for flood risk management, directly relevant to North Petherton as a Key Rural Settlement within the Sedgemoor area.

Sedgemoor Core Strategy Policy CP5: Sustainable Flood Risk Management

- **Policy Link:** This policy typically requires a comprehensive understanding and management of flood risk. It mandates that new development is advised to **not increase flood risk elsewhere** and is advised to seek to reduce it where possible. It also requires the assessment of **all sources of flood risk**, including fluvial and surface water.
- **Report Weight:** Policy CP5 strengthens the report's argument that the sheer scale of the 1,080 applications may need to be assessed for its **cumulative impact** on the wider Levels. The argument that the development increases the risk to Moorland directly violates the policy's primary requirement of preventing flood risk increase elsewhere.

Sedgemoor Local Plan Policy SU1 (or equivalent Development Management Policy on Drainage): Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)

- **Policy Link:** This policy requires major developments (10 dwellings or more) to incorporate SuDS to control surface water flow rates and volumes, with post-development runoff expected to be restricted to greenfield rates where feasible, and in high flood-risk or hydraulically constrained areas, further reductions often sought.
 - **Report Weight:** The report correctly identifies that even achieving greenfield runoff rates is frequently insufficient in a compromised and capacity-limited system such as the Somerset Levels, particularly in light of historic flood events such as 2014. While SuDS are required by Policy SU1, the cumulative discharge from 1,080 dwellings would still introduce a significant volume into an already over-capacity drainage network, demonstrating that reliance on greenfield runoff rates alone is insufficient to meet the objectives of the policy.
-

Summary of Policy Application

The report's claims are therefore a direct test of compliance with national and local policy:

- **Cumulative Risk:** The 1,080 dwellings challenge **NPPF 169** and **Policy CP5** by threatening to *increase* flood risk elsewhere (Moorland).
- **Pumping Capacity:** The failure to account for the limited capacity of the existing pump network fails to demonstrate, as required by NPPF paragraph 169, that the development can be made safe for its lifetime without increasing reliance on an already overstretched pumping network.
- **SuDS Reliability:** The risk of SuDS failure due to maintenance requirements or groundwater interaction fails to demonstrate that the development can be made safe for its lifetime in accordance with **NPPF paragraph 169**, does not adequately meet **NPPF paragraph 182** on sustainable drainage, and conflicts with **Policy SU1**. Planning Practice Guidance further advises that mitigation measures must be demonstrably reliable and deliverable over the lifetime of development.

Appendixes - Next page

Appendix X

Estimated Runoff from Individual Applications (Piece-meal) & References for Assumption Calculations

Purpose and scope (short):

The table below gives order-of-magnitude estimates of additional runoff generated by each planning application considered in this report. The estimates are **scenario-based** (not site-specific hydraulic model outputs) and intended for comparative and cumulative accounting only.

Assumptions (conservative/default):

1. Assumed impermeable area per dwelling = **200 m²** (roofs + hardstanding/drive).
2. Runoff coefficient (impermeable surfaces) = **C = 0.90**.
3. Annual rainfall = **800 mm = 0.8 m** (typical Somerset order).
4. Design storm intensity for peak runoff calculation = **i = 30 mm/hr** (example extreme short-duration intensity).
5. Peak runoff estimated using the Rational method:

$$Q = C \times i \text{ (mm/hr)} \times A \text{ (m}^2\text{)} / 3600 \text{ (m}^3\text{/s)}$$
$$Q = C \times \frac{i \text{ (mm/hr)}}{1000} \times \frac{A \text{ (m}^2\text{)}}{3600} \text{ (m}^3\text{/s)}$$
$$Q = C \times 1000i \text{ (mm/hr)} \times A \text{ (m}^2\text{)} / 3600 \text{ (m}^3\text{/s)}$$

then convert to litres per second (l/s) by multiplying m³/s × 1,000.

How to use: replace any of the assumptions above (A per dwelling, C, annual rainfall, i) to re-compute scenario figures.

Calculations (step-by-step) and results

Notes on the arithmetic convention used: every multiplication and division below is shown step-by-step (digit by digit) to avoid arithmetic mistakes.

Common intermediate arithmetic

- Assumed impermeable area per dwelling = 200 m².
 - To compute *total impermeable area* for a site: Total area (m²) = Dwellings × 200.
 - To compute *annual runoff volume* (m³/year): Annual vol = Total area × Annual rain (m) × C.
 - To compute *peak Q* (m³/s) for the design storm: Q(m³/s) = C × (i/1000) × Total area / 3600. Convert to l/s by Q(l/s) = Q(m³/s) × 1000.
-

Site-by-site worked calculations

1. 37/25/00044 — Park Lane — 64 dwellings

- Total impermeable area: $64 \times 200 = 12,800 \text{ m}^2$.
- Annual runoff (m^3/yr):
 - $12,800 \times 0.8 = 10,240$ (this is area $\times$ annual rain)
 - $10,240 \times 0.9 = 9,216 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$ (apply C).
- Peak runoff (design storm 30 mm/hr):
 - $i/1000 = 30 / 1000 = 0.03 \text{ m/hr}$
 - Area $\times 0.03 = 12,800 \times 0.03 = 384 \text{ m}^3/\text{hr}$
 - $384 / 3600 = 0.1066666667 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$
 - $0.1066666667 \times 0.9 = 0.096 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ (apply C)
 - $0.096 \text{ m}^3/\text{s} \times 1000 = \mathbf{96 \text{ l/s}}$

2. 37/25/00055 — Gateway — 15 dwellings

- Total impermeable area: $15 \times 200 = 3,000 \text{ m}^2$.
- Annual runoff:
 - $3,000 \times 0.8 = 2,400$
 - $2,400 \times 0.9 = 2,160 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$.
- Peak runoff:
 - $3,000 \times 0.03 = 90 \text{ m}^3/\text{hr}$
 - $90 / 3600 = 0.025 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$
 - $0.025 \times 0.9 = 0.0225 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$
 - $0.0225 \times 1000 = \mathbf{22.5 \text{ l/s}}$

3. **37/25/00042 — Gateway — 346 dwellings**

- Total impermeable area: $346 \times 200 = 69,200 \text{ m}^2$.
- Annual runoff:
 - $69,200 \times 0.8 = 55,360$
 - $55,360 \times 0.9 = 49,824 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$.
- Peak runoff:
 - $69,200 \times 0.03 = 2,076 \text{ m}^3/\text{hr}$
 - $2,076 / 3600 = 0.5766666667 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$
 - $0.5766666667 \times 0.9 = 0.519 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$
 - $0.519 \times 1000 = \mathbf{519 \text{ l/s}}$

4. **37/22/00126 — Vistry Gateway — 150 dwellings**

- Total impermeable area: $150 \times 200 = 30,000 \text{ m}^2$.
- Annual runoff:
 - $30,000 \times 0.8 = 24,000$
 - $24,000 \times 0.9 = 21,600 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$.
- Peak runoff:
 - $30,000 \times 0.03 = 900 \text{ m}^3/\text{hr}$
 - $900 / 3600 = 0.25 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$
 - $0.25 \times 0.9 = 0.225 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$
 - $0.225 \times 1000 = \mathbf{225 \text{ l/s}}$

5. **37/25/00023 — Stafflands Farm — 190 dwellings**

- Total impermeable area: $190 \times 200 = 38,000 \text{ m}^2$.
- Annual runoff:
 - $38,000 \times 0.8 = 33,600$
 - $33,600 \times 0.9 = 27,360 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$.
- Peak runoff:
 - $38,000 \times 0.03 = 1,260 \text{ m}^3/\text{hr}$
 - $1,260 / 3600 = 0.35 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$

- $0.35 \times 0.9 = 0.285 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$
- $0.285 \times 1000 = \mathbf{285 \text{ l/s}}$

6. **37/25/00018 — Daws Lane — 175 dwellings**

- Total impermeable area: $175 \times 200 = 35,000 \text{ m}^2$.
- Annual runoff:
 - $35,000 \times 0.8 = 28,000$
 - $28,000 \times 0.9 = 25,200 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$.
- Peak runoff:
 - $35,000 \times 0.03 = 1,050 \text{ m}^3/\text{hr}$
 - $1,050 / 3600 = 0.2916666667 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$
 - $0.2916666667 \times 0.9 = 0.2625 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$
 - $0.2625 \times 1000 = \mathbf{262.5 \text{ l/s}}$

• **37/25/00088 — Dancing Hill — 140 dwellings**

Total impermeable area: $140 \times 200 = 28,000 \text{ m}^2$.

- Annual runoff:
 - $28,000 \times 0.8 = 22,400$ (this is area $\times$ annual rain)
 - $22,400 \times 0.9 = 20,160 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$ (apply C).
- Peak runoff:
 - $i/1000 = 30 / 1000 = 0.03 \text{ m/hr}$
 - $\text{Area} \times 0.03 = 28,000 \times 0.03 = 840 \text{ m}^3/\text{hr}$
 - $840 / 3600 = 0.2333333333 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$
 - $0.2333333333 \times 0.9 = 0.21 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ (apply C)
 - $0.21 \text{ m}^3/\text{s} \times 1000 = \mathbf{210 \text{ l/s}}$

Aggregated totals (for the seven sites / 1,080 dwellings)

- Total dwellings = $64 + 15 + 346 + 150 + 190 + 175 + 140 = 1,080$ dwellings.
- Total impermeable area = $12,800 + 3,000 + 69,200 + 30,000 + 38,000 + 35,000 + 28,000 = \mathbf{216,000 \text{ m}^2}$.
- Total annual runoff (sum of site annual vols) = $9,216 + 2,160 + 49,824 + 21,600 + 27,360 + 25,200 + 20,160 = \mathbf{155,520 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}}$.

- (Equivalently: $216,000 \times 0.8 = 172,800$ then $172,800 \times 0.9 = 155,520 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$.)
- Total design-storm peak (Rational sum) = sum of site Q (m^3/s) = $0.096 + 0.0225 + 0.519 + 0.225 + 0.285 + 0.2625 + 0.21 = 1.62 \text{ m}^3/\text{s} = \mathbf{1,620 \text{ l/s}}$

Estimated piece-meal runoff (method and results)

A simple scenario calculation was carried out to estimate the additional impermeable area and resulting runoff attributable to each planning application considered in this report. Assumptions used: impermeable area per dwelling = 200 m^2 ; runoff coefficient $C = 0.90$; annual rainfall 800 mm ; design storm intensity 30 mm/hr (Rational method). The site-by-site computations (worked arithmetic) and aggregated totals are shown below. These scenario figures are **indicative** only and is advised to be replaced by site-specific SuDS design outputs or hydraulic model results where required. (See Appendix X table and worked calculations.)

Application Ref	Site	Dwellings	Impermeable area per dwelling (m^2)	Total impermeable area (m^2)	Estimated annual runoff (m^3/yr)	Peak Q (design storm 30 mm/hr) (l/s)
37/25/00044	Park Lane	64	200	12,800	9,216	96
37/25/00055	Gateway	15	200	3,000	2,160	22.5
37/25/00042	Gateway	346	200	69,200	49,824	519
37/22/00125	Vistry Gateway	150	200	30,000	21,600	225
37/25/00023	Stafflands Farm	190	200	38,000	27,360	285
37/25/00018	Daws Lane	175	200	35,000	25,200	262.5
37/25/00088	Dancing Hill	140	200	28,000	20,160	210
TOTAL		1,080		216,000	155,520	1,620

Caveats and recommended next steps (brief)

- These estimates are **scenario** values for comparative/cumulative accounting; they are **not** substitutes for site-specific drainage design or modelled flood routing.

- The choice of impermeable area per dwelling, rainfall depth, run-off coefficient, and design intensity strongly affects results — replace assumptions with measured/design values if available.
- For planning decisions, require each application to provide full SuDS design (infiltration tests, attenuation sizing, maintenance arrangements) and a cumulative hydraulic assessment (e.g., catchment model or linked storage/routeing) that accounts for downstream capacity constraints and climate change allowances.

Recommended Reference Sources for Assumptions

Assumption	Reference Source	Citation (suggested format)	Notes
Impermeable area per dwelling (≈150–250 m² typical)	CIRIA C753 <i>The SuDS Manual</i> (2015), Section 24.2; DEFRA/EA “Rainfall runoff management for developments” (R&D Report W5-074/A/TR/1, 2005)	“Typical residential plot impermeable area 150–250 m ² per dwelling, depending on plot density (CIRIA, 2015).”	CIRIA gives representative roof + paved area ratios; the DEFRA R&D report corroborates the range.
Runoff coefficient (C = 0.9 for impermeable surfaces)	CIRIA C753 (Table 24.2), BS EN 16941-1:2018 (<i>On-site rainwater harvesting systems – Design, installation and maintenance</i>), and EA Greenfield runoff guidance	“Impermeable surface runoff coefficients typically 0.85–0.95 (CIRIA, 2015).”	Commonly adopted for roofs, paving, tarmac, and concrete.
Annual rainfall 800 mm (Somerset order-of-magnitude)	Environment Agency Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH13), Vol. 2: <i>Rainfall frequency estimation</i> ; Met Office UK Climate Averages (1991–2020)	“Average annual rainfall for Bridgwater/North Petherton catchment ≈ 780–850 mm (Met Office, 2023).”	FEH grid (SAAR) data gives ~820 mm for local catchment.
Design storm intensity (30 mm h⁻¹)	FEH13, EA/DEFRA R&D Report W5-074/A/TR/1 (2005), Table 6.1; CIRIA C753 (2015)	“Short-duration design rainfall intensities (10–60 min) typically 20–40 mm h ⁻¹ for south-west England (FEH13; DEFRA/EA, 2005).”	30 mm h ⁻¹ represents a moderate-high short-duration event.
Rational Method (Q = C i A)	<i>Sewers for Adoption</i> 7th Edition (WRc, 2012); CIRIA C753 §24.3.1; EA/DEFRA R&D Report W5-074/A/TR/1	“Peak runoff estimated using Rational Method (Q = C i A) in accordance with WRc (2012) and CIRIA (2015).”	Standard approach for small catchments < 200 ha.

Reference Basis for Assumptions

The input parameters used in the above scenario calculations are derived from recognised UK guidance:

- CIRIA C753 (2015) *The SuDS Manual* — Table 24.2 (impermeable area, runoff coefficients, design intensities).
- DEFRA/Environment Agency (2005) *Rainfall Runoff Management for Developments* (R&D Report W5-074/A/TR/1).
- Environment Agency Flood Estimation Handbook (2013 update) — average annual rainfall (SAAR) and short-duration intensities.
- Met Office (2023) *UK Climate Averages 1991–2020* — regional annual rainfall data for Somerset.
- WRc (2012) *Sewers for Adoption*, 7th Ed. — Rational method formulation for peak discharge estimation.

These sources represent accepted national standards for preliminary surface-water runoff estimation and SuDS design inputs.

Disclaimer (Errors & Omissions)

This assessment is based on information available at the time of preparation. It is provided for technical and planning purposes only and does not constitute a legal document or precedent. While every effort has been made to ensure accuracy, the authors accept no liability for any errors, omissions, or reliance placed on the contents beyond its intended scope.

Clarification on peak flow calculations:

Any summed peak runoff figures presented in this document are retained for illustrative and scenario-based purposes only. They do not represent permitted discharge rates of approved schemes, which are subject to flow controls, attenuation, and detailed drainage conditions. The calculations are intended to highlight potential system loading under exceedance or stress scenarios, including blockage, loss of storage due to groundwater interaction, maintenance failure, or coincident extreme events.

Information limitations:

This document was prepared using information reasonably available at the time of drafting. Where later committee reports, decision notices or technical details were not yet published, reasonable assumptions have been made and are identified as such. The document should be read as an evidence-led review of cumulative flood risk considerations rather than a definitive finding of harm or non-compliance.

Version Control

Version	Date	Description
1.3	December 2025	Updated and expanded cumulative assessment, runoff calculations, policy analysis, and appendices
1.3	January 2026	Addendum created to be read in conjunction with main report
1.3	February 2026	NPPF Policies Updated
1.4	April 2026	additional information from the Parret Catchment Group and the ada Gazette, Spring 2026, which includes the IDB article. I have brought together the findings of these two items and added an Addendum No2 to the main report.

Addendum to the Cumulative Flood Risk Assessment of North Petherton

Implications of Recent Flood Events for Ongoing Development Proposals

Status:

Formal Technical Addendum (Statutory Consultee)

Related Document:

Cumulative Flood Risk Assessment of North Petherton
Version 1.3 – December 2025

Date:

27/01/2026

This Addendum should be read in conjunction with the December 2025 Assessment. It does not replace or amend the original document, but provides an evidence-led update reflecting observed flood events since its publication.

Addendum No 1 to the Cumulative Flood Risk Assessment of North Petherton (December 2025)

Implications of Recent Flood Events for Ongoing Development Proposals

1. Purpose of this Addendum

- Prepared to accompany the Town Council's Cumulative Flood Risk Assessment of North Petherton (Version 1.3, December 2025).
- Does not replace, revise, or withdraw any findings or conclusions of the December 2025 Assessment.
- Issued in response to recent flood events occurring since publication of the original assessment.
- Recent flood events constitute new and material planning evidence.
- Purpose is to assess implications of observed flood events for Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs), Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), and cumulative impacts.

2. Relationship to the December 2025 Assessment

- December 2025 Assessment identified unacceptable cumulative flood risk and hydraulic constraints.
- Addendum reaffirms all conclusions of the December 2025 Assessment.
- No new modelling or recalculations introduced.
- Evaluates whether recent flood events confirm previously identified risks.
- Original assessment should be read alongside this Addendum.

3. Observed Flood Events Since Publication

- Flooding has occurred locally and across the Somerset Levels since December 2025.
- Events characterised by prolonged or sequential rainfall and saturated ground conditions.
- Elevated river and drainage levels limited surface water discharge.
- Conditions reflect known flood mechanisms affecting the Somerset Levels.
- Observed flooding represents empirical evidence of system exceedance.

4. Implications for Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs)

- Many FRAs assume effective attenuation and available downstream capacity.
- Recent events show receiving systems may already be at or beyond capacity.
- Controlled discharge may be ineffective during high river levels.
- Greenfield runoff rate compliance does not equate to flood risk neutrality.
- FRAs relying primarily on rate control should be treated with caution.

5. Implications for SuDS and Attenuation-Based Mitigation

- Attenuation-based SuDS have inherent limitations in prolonged wet conditions.
- Recent flooding confirms storage can be compromised before peak rainfall.
- Groundwater levels may reduce available attenuation capacity.
- Submerged outfalls restrict discharge effectiveness.
- Reliance on SuDS in isolation does not provide robust mitigation.

6. Cumulative Impact: From Risk to Demonstrated Constraint

- Cumulative impacts previously identified as potential are now evidenced.
- Receiving systems are already under significant stress.
- Limited residual capacity exists during wet periods.
- Minimal tolerance remains for additional managed discharge.
- Cumulative effects are a material planning consideration.

7. Planning Implications

- Planning policy requires development to be safe for its lifetime.
- Development must not increase flood risk elsewhere.
- Recent flood events are a material consideration.
- Site-by-site assessment alone is insufficient.
- Precautionary approach is justified in flood-sensitive locations.

8. Conclusion and Recommendation

- Addendum reinforces findings of the December 2025 Assessment.
- Observed flood events validate identified flood risk mechanisms.
- Receiving environment is operating at or near capacity.
- Proposals relying solely on attenuation should not proceed unchanged.
- Further development must demonstrate clear flood risk betterment.

Addendum No. 2 (Version 1.4 – April 2026)

Cumulative Flood Risk Assessment of North Petherton

Forensic Review of System Resilience and Recent Flood Evidence

This Addendum should be read in conjunction with the December 2025 Assessment. It does not replace or amend the original document, but provides an evidence-led update reflecting observed flood events since its publication

Contents

1. Purpose of Addendum
2. Status of Original Report
3. New Evidence Considered
4. Review of System Resilience Claims
5. Implications for Hydraulic Capacity
6. Implications for Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs)
7. Implications for SuDS and Attenuation
8. Cumulative Impact – Confirmed Constraint
9. Planning and Policy Implications
10. Updated Conclusion

1. Purpose of Addendum

This Addendum (No.2, Version 1.4) should be read alongside the original Cumulative Flood Risk Assessment of North Petherton (Version 1.3, December 2025) and subsequent Addendum (January 2026).

The purpose of this document is to incorporate further evidence arising from:

- Environment Agency flood event reporting (2026)
- Observed flood conditions during recent events
- A forensic review of system performance under stress conditions

This document does not replace previous findings, but strengthens and clarifies them in light of new evidence.

2. Status of Original Report

All conclusions of the December 2025 Assessment and January 2026 Addendum remain valid and are reinforced by this Addendum.

In particular, the following findings are upheld:

- The cumulative impact of 1,080 dwellings represents a material increase in hydraulic loading
- The receiving system is constrained and sensitive to incremental change
- Site-by-site assessment is insufficient to determine overall flood risk

3. New Evidence Considered

This Addendum considers the following additional evidence:

1. Recent flood events (2025–2026), characterised by prolonged rainfall and saturated ground conditions
2. Environment Agency operational reporting indicating:
 - reliance on temporary pumping
 - constraints imposed by river levels
 - system dependency on operational intervention

This evidence provides empirical validation of previously identified risks.

4. Review of System Resilience Claims

Recent material indicates improved operational response to flood events. However, this reflects enhanced management rather than increased system capacity.

The system remains dependent on:

- favourable downstream conditions
- active pump deployment
- timely intervention

These characteristics indicate conditional performance rather than inherent resilience.

5. Implications for Hydraulic Capacity

The introduction of additional runoff from cumulative development must be considered in the context of a system already operating near capacity.

Observed conditions demonstrate:

- limited ability to convey additional flow during peak events
- reduced effectiveness of pumping under high river levels
- constrained discharge pathways

This indicates minimal residual capacity within the system.

6. Implications for Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs)

Many Flood Risk Assessments assume that downstream systems are capable of receiving controlled discharge.

Recent evidence challenges this assumption, demonstrating that:

- discharge may not be possible during critical periods
- compliance with greenfield runoff rates does not ensure flood neutrality

FRA methodologies should therefore be reviewed in the context of cumulative system constraints.

7. Implications for SuDS and Attenuation

Attenuation-based mitigation strategies are dependent on available storage and discharge conditions.

Observed flood events confirm that:

- storage systems may be compromised during prolonged rainfall
- groundwater levels may reduce available capacity
- discharge points may be submerged

This limits the reliability of SuDS as a sole mitigation mechanism.

8. Cumulative Impact – Confirmed Constraint

The cumulative impact identified in the original report has now transitioned from a theoretical risk to a demonstrated constraint.

The system has shown:

- limited tolerance for additional inflow
- sensitivity to prolonged wet conditions
- reliance on active intervention to prevent exceedance

This confirms that cumulative effects are a material planning consideration.

9. Planning and Policy Implications

Planning policy requires that development must not increase flood risk elsewhere and must be safe for its lifetime.

In the context of demonstrated system constraints:

- site-specific compliance is insufficient
- cumulative impacts must be considered
- reliance on mitigation measures must be critically assessed

The precautionary principle is therefore applicable.

10. Updated Conclusion

This Addendum confirms that the receiving environment is operating at or near its functional limits under stress conditions.

The cumulative development proposals introduce additional hydraulic loading into a constrained system, with limited evidence of available capacity.

The findings of the original assessment are therefore reinforced, and the need for a comprehensive, catchment-wide evaluation of flood risk is substantiated.