

PL/26/0736 – 2 Bridge Street - Condition 1 (Flood Emergency Plan)

CADRA recognises that the Inspector granted permission subject to a satisfactory Flood Emergency Plan (FEP). Having reviewed the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), we consider that **Condition 1 cannot be discharged** because key requirements remain unmet.

1. Escape Route – Missing Detail and Management

The Inspector required *details and management* of the escape route from the extension.

The FRA confirms flood depths of **over 1m** across the terrace during a 1% AEP event.

The submitted FEP does **not** provide:

- a defined, scaled escape route from the terrace;
- any management measures to keep this route permanently unobstructed;
- any alternative that was approved by the Inspector.

Without this, safe evacuation cannot be assured.

The FRA also suggests that a flood proof door has been installed between the terrace and the lower floor of the restaurant. Later in the document, the diagram suggests that this is sliding door. Sliding flood doors are rare and normally contain compression or inflation seals. **The applicant should confirm that this is the case.**

The FRA suggests that the water height of the flood could be 1m above the height of the terrace. If that was the case, then the hydrostatic pressure on the sliding door would surely be immense. Typically, it is suggested that water is only kept out to a depth of 600mm without structural strengthening of the buttressing. **The applicant should confirm that this is the case.**

2. Debris Management – No Maintenance Schedule

Because the terrace structure interacts directly with the river channel, the Inspector required a debris management plan.

The FEP contains **no proactive inspection or clearance schedule** for debris beneath or against the platform. This omission fails to meet the condition.

Whilst debris collecting around the terrace structure will mostly be carried there by the river, it can also originate from the premises itself. **Staff and management training procedures must include explaining the importance of ensuring that no waste or debris from the restaurant is allowed to enter the river.**

3. Floodline Registration – No Evidence Provided

The FRA states that all managers *will* register for Environment Agency flood warnings.

The FEP provides only an intention to register.

Evidence of **live registration** for the relevant Flood Warning Area is required before the condition can be discharged.

The FRA also suggests an evacuation plan that is unlikely to work in reality. The suggestion is that the on Flood Alert 'Critical equipment, documents, and movable assets should be prepared for relocation to upper floors where safe refuge is available'. This fails to recognise the length of time that the river is now on flood alert at this location. In 2024 and 2026 the river was on Flood Alert for a period of months. How will staff be expected to be on guard for a period of months? The speed with which water rises between Flood Alert and Flood Warning is rapid as the river will have burst its banks and all of the wire gates will be open and so no mitigating action can be taken. The Flood Alert can mean that flooding will happen within 30 minutes. At this point the speed of water rise is rapid. **Actions should therefore have been taken prior to this point and during the Flood Alert phase of the warnings, in our opinion.**

Conclusion

Given these omissions, the submitted FEP does not satisfy the Inspector's requirements.

Condition 1 should not be discharged until the escape route details, debris management schedule, and proof of Floodline registration are provided. Thought should also be given to the evacuation plan given the

nature of Flood Alerts and Flood Warnings at this location and the length of time that the location is on Flood Alert for.