

Proposed Works at Marble Hill Park, Twickenham

Flood Risk Assessment

On behalf of **English Heritage**



Project Ref: 40611/4001 | Rev: E | Date: November 2018



Document Control Sheet

Project Name: Proposed Works at Marble Hill Park, Twickenham

Project Ref: 40611

Report Title: Flood Risk Assessment

Doc Ref: 001

Date: November 2018

	Name	Position	Signature	Date
Prepared by:	Charlotte Cullimore	Assistant Engineer	CC	17.03.17
Reviewed by:	Naomi Ashcroft	Associate	NKA	17.03.17
Approved by:	pp Chris Downs	Director	JNP	17.03.17
For and on behalf of Peter Brett Associates LLP				

Revision	Date	Description	Prepared	Reviewed	Approved
-	17.03.17	FOR PLANNING	CC	NKA	JNP
A	13.08.18	Updated following amendments to proposals	DJW	NKA	AH
B	31.08.18	Updated following further development amendments	DJW	NKA	JNP
C	04.09.18	Updates to J&L Gibbons drawings	DJW	NKA	JNP
D	19.11.18	Updated following LB of Richmond comments – changes highlighted in yellow	RMW	NKA	JNP
E	20.11.19	Re-issue to LB of Richmond	RMW	NKA	JNP

Peter Brett Associates LLP disclaims any responsibility to the Client and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of this report. This report has been prepared with reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the Contract with the Client and generally in accordance with the appropriate ACE Agreement and taking account of the manpower, resources, investigations and testing devoted to it by agreement with the Client. This report is confidential to the Client and Peter Brett Associates LLP accepts no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report or any part thereof is made known. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.

© Peter Brett Associates LLP 2018

Contents

Executive Summary	v
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Scope of Report.....	1
1.2 Sources of Information	1
1.3 Policy Context.....	2
1.4 Caveats and Exclusions	3
2 Site Setting.....	5
2.1 Site Description	5
2.2 Topography	6
2.3 Hydrological Setting.....	6
2.4 Existing On-Site Drainage Arrangements	6
2.5 Geology and Hydrogeology.....	7
2.6 Existing Flood Defences.....	7
2.7 Planning History	7
3 Overview of Flood Risk	9
3.1 EA Flood Maps	9
3.2 Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment.....	12
3.3 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.....	12
3.4 EA Modelled Flood Data – River Thames.....	13
3.5 Impact of Climate Change.....	15
3.6 Summary of Flood Risk	15
4 Proposed Development and Sequential Test.....	17
4.1 Proposed Development.....	17
4.2 Flood Risk Vulnerability.....	17
4.3 NPPF Sequential Test.....	18
5 Flood Mitigation Strategy	19
5.1 Flood Storage Compensation Scheme	19
5.2 Safe Access.....	19
5.3 Surface Water Drainage.....	19
6 Residual Risk.....	21
7 Conclusions.....	22

Figures

Figure 2.1: Site Location Plan (not to scale)	5
Figure 3.1: EA Flood Zone Map	9
Figure 3.2: EA Reservoir Breach Flood Risk Map	10
Figure 3.3: EA Surface Water Flood Risk Map	11
Figure 3.4: EA Thames Tidal Upstream Inundation Modelled Flood Extents	14

Tables

Table 3.1: EA Modelled River Thames Flood Levels (TE2100)	13
Table 3.2: EA Maximum Likely Water Levels (TE2100).....	14
Table 3.3: Summary of Sources of Flood Risk.....	15

Appendices

Appendix A	Proposals
Appendix B	Topographical Survey
Appendix C	Ground Investigation Figures
Appendix D	EA Product 4 Data
Appendix E	PFRA Figures
Appendix F	SFRA Figures
Appendix G	Previous Environment Agency Correspondence

Executive Summary

This Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been prepared by Peter Brett Associates LLP (PBA) to support a planning application for the proposed works at Marble Hill Park in Twickenham. The proposals include the refurbishment of the ground floor of the Stables, landscaping improvements across the park, conservation works to the exterior and interior of Marble Hill House and reconfiguring of the Sports Block.

In accordance with the fundamental objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the FRA demonstrates that:

- i. The development is safe in terms of flood risk;
- ii. The development does not increase flood risk; and
- iii. The development does not detrimentally affect third parties.

The Environment Agency (EA) Flood Zone map shows the majority of the site is within Flood Zone 1 'Low Probability' and the south and southwest of the site lies partly within Flood Zone 3 'High Probability' of the River Thames (as defined in NPPF Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) 'Flood Risk and Coastal Change' Table 1) as follows:

Flood Zone 1 'Low Probability' (less than 1 in 1000 (0.1%) annual probability of river flooding, or greater than 1 in 200 (0.5%) annual probability of sea flooding).

Flood Zone 3 'High Probability' (greater than 1 in 100 (1%) annual probability of river flooding, or greater than 1 in 200 (0.5%) annual probability of sea flooding).

Detailed analysis of topographical survey and EA modelling data confirms the probability of flooding and Flood Zone classification. The SFRA and PFRA mapping aligns with the EA mapping.

The proposals for the café extension constitute a 'less vulnerable' land use, which is considered appropriate within Flood Zone 1, and the landscaping works constitute a 'water compatible' development, which is considered appropriate in Flood Zone 2 and 3 (reference NPPF PPG Tables 2 and 3).

The Sequential Test is passed as the works are associated with extending an existing café and landscaping works to enhance the existing contour arrangement. Therefore, this development cannot be located anywhere else.

The flood risk mitigation strategy for the development consists of the following elements:

- Continuous safe access from the site is provided at the 1 in 100 annual probability plus climate change flood level via Richmond Road.
- The small additional impermeable areas associated with the café service yard will drain via infiltration into the adjacent ground, therefore generating no additional run-off from the proposed development.

In summary, the FRA demonstrates that the proposed development is safe in terms of flood risk and in accordance with the requirements of national and local planning policy.

Appendix G includes the response from the Environment Agency (EA), dated 24th May 2017, on the previous planning application submitted in 2017. At the time the EA had no objections to the proposals submitted with the original planning application 17/1094/FUL. The 2018 revised development proposals are a smaller scale to those proposed in 2017.

This page is intentionally blank

1 Introduction

1.1 Scope of Report

1.1.1 This Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been prepared by Peter Brett Associates LLP (PBA), on behalf of our client, English Heritage, to support a planning application for proposed works at Marble Hill Park in Twickenham.

1.1.2 The report is based on the available flood risk information for the site as detailed in **Section 1.2**, and prepared in accordance with the planning policy requirements set out in **Section 1.3**. The scope of the FRA is consistent with the 'Site-specific Flood Risk Assessment Checklist' from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Planning Practice Guidance:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change#Site-Specific-Flood-Risk-Assessment-checklist-section>

1.1.3 The required content of the checklist is detailed below along with specific cross-reference to the content in the FRA as follows:

- 1) **Development site and location** – see Section 2;
- 2) **Development proposals** – see Section 4;
- 3) **Sequential Test** – see Section 4;
- 4) **Climate change** – see Section 3.5;
- 5) **Site-specific flood risk** – see Section 3;
- 6) **Surface water management** – see Section 5.3;
- 7) **Occupants and users of the development** – see Section 4;
- 8) **Residual Risk** – see Section 6;
- 9) **Flood risk assessment credentials** – PBA has many years of experience in, amongst other areas, the assessment of flood risk, hydrology, flood defence and river engineering. The authors and reviewers of the document are all experienced engineers and members of chartered institutions such as the Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management (CIWEM) or the Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE).

1.2 Sources of Information

1.2.1 The FRA has been prepared based on the following sources of flood risk information:

- The **Environment Agency (EA) online flood maps** at <https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/> and <https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk>.
- **EA Product 4 Data** (HNL38511JH), dated 07/03/17.
- London Borough of Richmond-Upon-Thames (Richmond) **Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment** (PFRA), dated March 2011.
- Richmond **Strategic Flood Risk Assessment** (SFRA), dated March 2016.

- Richmond **Local Flood Risk Management Strategy** (LFRMS), dated August 2015.
- **PBA Flood Risk Investigation**, dated September 2005.
- Shakespeare, Pullen & Slade Ltd. (SPS), **Initial Assessment “The Flood Risk Investigation” Report**, December 2016.

1.3 Policy Context

1.3.1 This FRA has been prepared in accordance with the relevant national, regional and local planning policy and statutory authority guidance as follows:

- National policy contained within the **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)** dated July 2018, issued by Communities and Local Government, with reference to Section 10 ‘Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change’;
- The **NPPF Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)** released in March 2014 (‘Flood Risk and Coastal Change’ section);
- Regional planning policy contained within **The London Plan** (‘Consolidated with alterations since 2011’ dated March 2016), with particular reference to Policy 5.12 ‘Flood Risk Management’ and Policy 5.13 ‘Sustainable Drainage’;

- Policy 5.12 Flood Risk Management states:

“...B - Development proposals must comply with the flood risk assessment and management requirements set out in the NPPF and the associated Technical Guidance on flood risk over the lifetime of the development and have regard to measures proposed in Thames Estuary 2100 (TE2100 – see paragraph 5.55) and Catchment Flood Management Plans.

C - Developments which are required to pass the Exceptions Test set out in the NPPF and the Technical Guidance will need to address flood resilient design and emergency planning by demonstrating that:

- a) *the development will remain safe and operational under flood conditions*
- b) *a strategy of either safe evacuation and/ or safely remaining in the building is followed under flood conditions*
- c) *key services including electricity, water etc. will continue to be provided under flood conditions*
- d) *buildings are designed for quick recovery following a flood.*

D - Development adjacent to flood defences will be required to protect the integrity of existing flood defences and wherever possible should aim to be set back from the banks of watercourses and those defences to allow their management, maintenance and upgrading to be undertaken in a sustainable and cost effective way”.

- Policy 5.13 Sustainable Drainage states:

“Development should utilise sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) unless there are practical reasons for not doing so, and should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible in line with the following drainage hierarchy:

1. *store rainwater for later use*

2. use infiltration techniques, such as porous surfaces in non-clay areas
3. attenuate rainwater in ponds or open water features for gradual release
4. attenuate rainwater by storing in tanks or sealed water features for gradual release
5. discharge rainwater direct to a watercourse
6. discharge rainwater to a surface water sewer/drain
7. discharge rainwater to the combined sewer

Drainage should be designed and implemented in ways that deliver other policy objectives of this Plan, including water use efficiency and quality, biodiversity, amenity and recreation”.

- Local planning policy contained within the Richmond’s ‘**Core Strategy**’ (adopted April 2009), with particular reference to policies CP3;

“3.B Development in areas of high flood risk will be restricted, in accordance with PPS25, and using the Environment Agency’s Catchment Flood Management Plan, Borough’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and site level assessments to determine risk.”

- Local planning policy contained within Richmond’s ‘**Local Plan**’ (adopted July 2018), with particular reference to policies LP 21 – Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage;

“C. The Council will require the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in all development proposals. Applicants will have to demonstrate that their proposal complies with the following:

1. A reduction in surface water discharge to greenfield run-off rates wherever feasible.
2. Where greenfield run-off rates are feasible, this will need to be demonstrated by the applicant, and in such instances, the minimum requirement is to achieve at least a 50% attenuation of the site’s surface water runoff at peak times based on the levels existing prior to the development.”

1.4 Caveats and Exclusions

- 1.4.1 This FRA has been prepared in accordance with the NPPF and Local Planning Policy. The proposed flood management (including ground floor level recommendations) and surface water management strategies are based on the relevant British Standards (BS8533), the standing advice provided by the EA or based on common practice.
- 1.4.2 The revised Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015 (CDM Regulations) came into force on April 2015 to update certain duties on all parties involved in a construction project, including those promoting the development. One of the designer’s responsibilities is to ensure that the client organisation, in this instance English Heritage, is made aware of their duties under the CDM Regulations. Further information on the CDM Regulations is provided in the client guide available at <http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/indg411.pdf>
- 1.4.3 The approach for the FRA and proposals for the surface water management strategy are based on the requirements of the EA and London Borough of Richmond-Upon-Thames in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).
- 1.4.4 It should be noted that the insurance market applies its own tests to properties in terms of determining premiums and the insurability of properties for flood risk. Those undertaking development in areas which may be at risk of flooding are advised to contact their insurers or the Association of British Insurers (ABI) to seek further guidance prior to commencing development.
- 1.4.5 PBA do not warrant that the advice in this report will guarantee the availability of flood insurance either now or in the future.


- 1.4.6 The findings of this FRA are based on data available at the time of the study and on the subsequent assessment that has been undertaken to date. They relate to the current 2018 development proposals as outlined in **Section 4**.

2 Site Setting

2.1 Site Description

- 2.1.1 The 26.7-hectare (ha) site, Marble Hill Park, is located in the town of Twickenham in London (postcode TW1 2NL, site centre OS grid reference 517,300m m E, 173,600m N – see **Figure 2.1**).
- 2.1.2 The town of Twickenham lies within the administrative boundary of London Borough of Richmond-Upon-Thames (Richmond).

Figure 2.1: Site Location Plan (not to scale)



- 2.1.3 The site consists of Marble Hill House at the centre of the site, a café within the historical Stables and courtyard, landscaped gardens including terraced lawns, sports pitches and associated amenities. The landscape plans are included in **Appendix A**.
- 2.1.4 The site is bordered by Richmond Road to the north, Meadowsida to the east, Orleans Road to the west and the River Thames to the south.
- 2.1.5 Access to the site is via Richmond Road to the north of the site.

2.2 Topography

- 2.2.1 A topographical survey of the site has been undertaken by Greenhatch Group (August 2016) included in **Appendix B**. The topographic survey indicates the ground levels across the site vary significantly. At the southern boundary the ground levels vary from 3.70 mAOD in the south-western corner of the site rising steeply, reaching 8.45 mAOD in the vicinity of the house before falling to 6.55 mAOD at the northern boundary.
- 2.2.2 The Thames Path is adjacent to the southern boundary at a varying level from 4.80 mAOD to 5.01 mAOD sitting on a river embankment.

2.3 Hydrological Setting

- 2.3.1 The **River Thames** flows in a north-easterly direction adjacent to the southern boundary of the site before flowing north towards Richmond.
- 2.3.2 The **River Crane** is located 680 m to the northwest of the site, flowing north before outfalling into the River Thames approximately 1.5 km north of the site.

2.4 Existing On-Site Drainage Arrangements

- 2.4.1 The site consists primarily of open park land and the surface water appears to drain via natural infiltration into the underlying ground, reported to be Langley Silt Member and Kempton Park Gravel, detailed in Section 2.5.
- 2.4.2 The existing impermeable areas within the site are limited to the House, Stables, courtyard and road/footpaths and drain via the existing underground surface water drainage systems within the site.
- 2.4.3 The PBA 'Flood Investigation Report' provides the following assessment:

'The drainage records for the park are limited; however, the drainage associated with the house is recorded on the 1988 topographical survey undertaken by Engineering Surveys Ltd and is believed to drain north towards Thames Water sewers in Richmond Road.'

'Park staff are aware of the existence of an old sewer or drain running from the south side of the house towards the river. The line of the sewer can be clearly traced above ground level due to the slight depression and greener grass growth that is visible. The sewer is reported to be egg-shaped and constructed from brick.'

There is a penstock at the downstream end of the sewer which is believed to control the outflow of the drain to the River Thames. However, from inspection of a manhole located within the embankment of the towpath *'The route towards the house is blocked by a brick wall of relatively recent construction.'*

- 2.4.4 Therefore, it is understood that the impermeable areas of the House, Stables and courtyard currently drain to Thames Water sewers heading north. The original function of the brick sewer draining south is unknown.
- 2.4.5 A CCTV survey and pressure jetting was undertaken in October 2016 to determine the condition of the existing drainage system at the Stables. The findings of the survey are detailed in the 'Round 2 Report' produced by J & L Gibbons and summarised below.
- 2.4.6 The CCTV survey found pipes were showing signs of corrosion and minor leaks. The report recommends that the drainage runs within the Stables courtyard are replaced. Other recommended repairs include improved ventilation to the system, replacement of several manhole connection joints, and the replacement of two manholes.

- 2.4.7 The repair schedule will be confirmed when the works proceed, based on the results of a CCTV survey programmed for the start of the works.

2.5 Geology and Hydrogeology

- 2.5.1 The British Geological Society (BGS) online geology viewer provides the following information on the geology of the site:

- Bedrock: 'London Clay Formation – Clay, Silt and Sand';
- Superficial Deposits: 'Langley Silt Member – Clay and Silt' across the majority of the site with 'Alluvium – Clay, Silty, Peaty, Sandy' deposits adjacent to the River Thames.

- 2.5.2 A ground investigation was carried out by CET Infrastructure in the November 2016 and the report is contained within the 'Round 2 Report'. The investigation comprised of two window sampler boreholes, a single hand augured exploratory hole and a series of hand dug trial pits. Plans showing the location of the investigations are included in Appendix C.

- 2.5.3 The investigation found Made Ground to a maximum depth of 1.4 m, underlain with Langley Silt Member to a maximum depth of 2.5 m. The two window sampler boreholes encountered Kempton Park Gravel Formation to depths of 4.0 m, where the boreholes were terminated. The London Clay Formation was not encountered during the investigation.

- 2.5.4 In terms of surface water drainage, the ground investigation report notes that *'The Made Ground and underlying Langley Silt Member are likely to be unsuitable for the discharge of surface water however the granular Kempton Park Gravel Formation may be considered.'*

- 2.5.5 The Cranfield University online 'Soilscapes' website provides an overview of the drainage potential of land across Britain. This indicates the north of the site is within an area where the soil is defined as *'Freely draining slightly acid loamy soils'* and the south of the site is within an area where the soil is defined as *'Loamy and clayey floodplain soils with naturally high groundwater.'*

- 2.5.6 The EA groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) maps indicate the site does not lie within the catchment of a groundwater source.

2.6 Existing Flood Defences

- 2.6.1 The topography of the site naturally rises from approximately 3.70 mAOD in the southwest corner to approximately 8.45 mAOD in the centre of the site at the House. This rising ground forms a natural flood defence and contains the flood water in the southwest of the site.

- 2.6.2 There is also a formal river defence embankment running between the southern boundary of the site and the River Thames. The Thames Path runs along the top of this embankment. See Section 3.1.5.

2.7 Planning History

- 2.7.1 A previous planning application (Ref 17/1094/FUL) was made in March 2017 for the revival of Marble Hill Park. The Environment Agency's (EA) response to this original planning application is included in **Appendix G** and advises that the EA had no objections at that time. The 2017 planning application was subsequently withdrawn in March 2018.

- 2.7.2 The 2018 revised development proposals are a smaller scale to those proposed in 2017. The 2018 development proposals include refurbishment of the ground floor of the Stable Block and hence the increase in impermeable hardstanding is much reduced.
- 2.7.3 Due to archaeological reasons the proposed landscaping works to the historic terraced lawns is no longer proposed. Hence there will be no change to the site topography.


3 Overview of Flood Risk

3.1 EA Flood Maps

Flood Zone Map

- 3.1.1 The first phase in identifying whether a site is potentially at risk of flooding is to consult the EA's Flood Zone maps, available on the EA's website. This provides an initial indication of the extent of the Flood Zones, which is refined by the use of more detailed site-specific level survey and modelled flood levels.

Figure 3.1: EA Flood Zone Map




- 3.1.2 **Figure 3.1** indicates the majority of the site including the House, Stables and café are within Flood Zone 1 'Low Probability' (less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of river or sea flooding).
- 3.1.3 The centre of the East Meadow is shown to be within Flood Zone 2 'Medium Probability' (between 1 in 100 (1%) and 1 in 1000 (0.1%) annual probability of river or sea flooding).
- 3.1.4 The south and southwest of the site lies within Flood Zone 3 'High Probability' (greater than 1 in 100 (1%) annual probability of river flooding or greater than 1 in 200 (0.5%) annual probability of tidal flooding).
- 3.1.5 The map also shows that there is a flood defence dissecting the site from the southeast corner to the western boundary. It is believed that the existing ground levels within Marble Hill Park are forming the 'flood defence'.

Flood Risk from Reservoirs Map

- 3.1.6 The EA provide maps showing the risk of flooding in the event of a breach from reservoirs, based only on large reservoirs (over 25,000 cubic metres of water). These confirm that the site is in an area at risk of such flooding in the event that the embankments of an upstream reservoir failed and released the water it holds.
- 3.1.7 The mapping, see **Figure 3.2**, indicates a flood depth of over 2 m across the southwest of the site and 0.3 to 2.0 m across a section at the east of the site.
- 3.1.8 Based on this mapping the House and Stables buildings are not impacted in the event of a reservoir breach.

Figure 3.2: EA Reservoir Breach Flood Risk Map



- 3.1.9 It should be emphasised that the risk of flooding from reservoir breach is very small in any case; the EA are the enforcement authority for the Reservoirs Act (1975) and all large raised reservoirs are inspected and supervised by Reservoir Panel Engineers. As is stated on the EA's website:


'Reservoir flooding is extremely unlikely to happen. There has been no loss of life in the UK from reservoir flooding since 1925. All large reservoirs must be inspected and supervised by reservoir panel engineers. As the enforcement authority for the Reservoirs Act 1975 in England, we ensure that reservoirs are inspected regularly and essential safety work is carried out'.

- 3.1.10 The risk of such an occurrence is therefore considered negligible.

Flood Risk from Surface Water

- 3.1.11 The EA 'Surface Water Flood Risk Map' shows where areas could be potentially susceptible to surface water flooding in an extreme rainfall event.
- 3.1.12 It should be noted that the surface water maps are generated using a generic methodology on a national scale, whereby rainfall is routed over a ground surface model. The analysis does not take account of any specific local information on below-ground drainage infrastructure and infiltration, although an adjustment is included in urban areas to account for the impact of sewerage and a standard infiltration allowance based on soil type. Consequently, the mapping provides a guide to potentially vulnerable areas based on the general topography of an area.

Figure 3.3: EA Surface Water Flood Risk Map



- 3.1.13 **Figure 3.3** indicates that the majority of the site is at 'Very Low' (less than 1 in 1000 (0.1%)) risk of surface water flooding. There are discrete areas at higher risk of surface water flooding at the southern boundary, at the centre of East Meadow, the northwest corner of West Meadow and the northern corners of the site.

Historic Flooding

- 3.1.14 The EA Product 4 Data, in **Appendix D**, holds no records of historical flood events.
- 3.1.15 The 'Flood Risk Investigation' produced by PBA in 2005, states '*In recent years the frequency of flooding in the park has increased. Extensive flooding across the southern extents of the park often occurs and is now reported to occur up to 20 times a year.*
- 3.1.16 *Flooding of the park occurs due to the river overtopping the embankment along the southern boundary. Due to this river defence being in the form of a terraced embankment, once flood water has overtopped the embankment it tends to become trapped on the park and takes time to drain away, once the flood peak has passed.*

- 3.1.17 *Park staff also report flooding from two other sources. Water is believed to seep through the river embankment beside the park entrance, adjacent to the black walnut tree. Flooding also occurs from overland flow originating from low ground to the west of the park.'*
- 3.1.18 The SPS 'Initial Assessment "The Flood Risk Investigation" Report' states '*in the past flood waters reached the lower hillock, immediately before the house, but water has not reached the house*'.
- 3.1.19 The mechanism of flooding is unconfirmed; whether the flood water overtops the River Thames embankment or is a result of rising groundwater.

3.2 Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment

- 3.2.1 The Richmond Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA) provides a high level screening exercise which involves collecting information on historical and potential future floods for the area. The information of specific relevance to the site is as follows:
- **PFRA Figure 1** '*Surface Water Flooding Incidents and Fluvial Flooding Incidents*' does not show the site as being impacted by flooding.
 - **PFRA Figure 2** '*Increased Potential for Elevated Groundwater*' shows the site is not at risk from elevated groundwater. There is a discrete area at the eastern boundary that has increased potential for elevated groundwater and an historical groundwater incident is shown to the north of the site boundary.
 - **PFRA Figure 3** '*Sewer Flooding Incidents*' shows the majority of the site is in an area that has no records of sewer flooding. The western boundary of the site is in an area that has 1-5 records of sewer flooding.
 - **PFRA Figure 6** '*Surface Water Depth (m) 1 in 100 chance of rainfall event occurring in any given year (1% AEP) plus climate change*' shows the majority of the site is not impacted by surface water flooding. There are discrete locations in the east of the site and at the southern boundary that are impacted by depths of 0.25 - 0.50 m.
- 3.2.2 Copies of the aforementioned Figures are provided in Appendix E. It should be noted that the resolution of the aforementioned map prevents a clear assessment of the locations, and the impacts, of flooding to the site as they provide a Borough-wide overview.

3.3 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

- 3.3.1 As noted in Section 1.2, the Richmond Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), dated March 2016, provides flood risk information on a Borough-wide scale, see Figures located in Appendix F. The information of specific relevance to the site is as follows:
- **SFRA Figure 1A** '*Historic Flooding*' shows the site has not been impacted by historic fluvial flooding.
 - **SFRA Figure D** '*Areas Benefiting from Defences and Groundwater Flooding Incidents*' shows that the site has not been impacted by sewer, drainage or groundwater flooding.
 - **SFRA Figure 5** '*Risk of fluvial and tidal flooding*' shows the majority of the site is within Flood Zone 1. A discrete area to the east of the House is shown to be Flood Zone 2 and the south of the site is in Flood Zone 3b 'Functional Floodplain'.
 - **SFRA Figure C3** '*Tidal Breach Flood Hazard – River Thames and River Crane Maximum Likely Water Level – Year 2100 Tidal Profile (Twickenham)*' shows majority of the site is rated as having a 'Low' breach hazard rating. The south of the site is shown as having an 'Extreme' breach hazard rating.

3.4 EA Modelled Flood Data – River Thames

3.4.1 The EA have also provided their detailed ‘Product 4’ flood risk information (EA ref HNL38511JH, dated 07/03/17, contained in Appendix D). This includes:

- Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)
- The Thames Estuary 2100 (TE2100) Flood Levels
- Thames Tidal Upstream Inundation Mapping and Levels
- Flood Defence Mapping
- Thames Tidal Breach Mapping

3.4.2 The EA have provided Maximum Likely Water Levels (MLWLs) from their Thames Estuary 2100 Study as part of their Product 4 Data. The TE2100 MLWL at the site was taken from Node 2.3a, which is located to the south of the site, and states:

Table 3.1: EA Modelled River Thames Flood Levels (TE2100)


Node	Present day Water Level	Future 2065-2100 Water Level	Future 2100 Water Level
2.3a	5.77 mAOD	5.95 mAOD	6.40 mAOD

3.4.3 The MLWL is the highest level permitted by the Thames Barrier when closed and relates to the 1 in 1000 (0.1%) level. It should be noted that at the site, there is a heavy influence from upstream (fluvial) flows. The flood defences are built to manage tidal flood risk only. With very high fluvial flows, the river levels in west London could be above the tidal defence level.

3.4.4 Therefore, the EA has also provided results for the Thames Tidal Upstream Inundation Modelling Study 2015. Upriver of the Thames Barrier, there is no return period for modelled levels as the levels are controlled by barrier closures. Therefore 2065 and 2100 epochs were modelled on that basis.

3.4.5 The model assumes the Thames Barrier is operational but all linear defences have been removed. It uses the TE2100 in-channel levels calculated in 2008, which includes an allowance for climate change.

Figure 3.4: EA Thames Tidal Upstream Inundation Modelled Flood Extents



3.4.6 **Figure 3.4** shows the modelled MLWL extent at the site and indicates that the majority of the site is not impacted; flooding is confined to the south and southwestern area of the site.

3.4.7 **Table 3.2** below shows the flood levels across the site including the location of the proposed landscaping works.

Table 3.2: EA Maximum Likely Water Levels (TE2100)

Point	Modelled Levels in Year 2100 (mAODN)	Ground Level (mAOD)	Depth of Flooding (m)
0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 11	n/a	Varies	0.0
6	6.320	4.01	2.31
7	6.324	4.09	2.25
8	6.430	4.08	2.35
9	6.420	4.81	1.61
10	6.421	7.75	0.0
12	6.775	6.04	0.735

3.4.8 This shows that the flood water depths in a MLWL event in 2100 are significant, up to 2.3 m deep at the southern boundary. Due to the nature of flooding at the site, it is anticipated that the flood waters will rise slowly and therefore users of the park will have sufficient time to evacuate the flood risk areas.

3.4.9 There is an anomaly at Point 11 which is located in close proximity to proposed landscaping works. The model output states this location does not flood, which appears to be an error in the model and has not been used in the assessment. Therefore, levels from Points 6 and 9 have been interpolated to give a flood water level at the location of the landscaping works.

3.4.10 The site lies outside of the Thames Tidal Breach Modelling and therefore no data is available.

3.5 Impact of Climate Change

3.5.1 In considering flood risk to the site, it is necessary to fully consider the potential impacts of climate change for the lifetime of the development within the mitigation measures.

3.5.2 The EA's 'Climate Change Allowance for Planners' guidance (which supports the NPPF) provides contingency allowances for potential sea level rise in Table 1, and for potential increases in peak river flow and rainfall intensity in Table 2 (it is noted that these allowances are consistent with the figures previously provided in the Technical Guidance to the NPPF and, prior to this, in PPS25).

3.5.3 The potential for increased flood probability as the result of possible climate change has been addressed through the use of climate change allowances in the hydraulic modelling and will be taken into account in the consideration of mitigation measures (i.e. ground floor levels, flood storage, surface water drainage).

3.6 Summary of Flood Risk

3.6.1 The following table provides an overview of the flood risk to the site, based on the information obtained and detailed in Section 3.

Table 3.3: Summary of Sources of Flood Risk

Source of Flooding	Risk of Flooding to Site	Comment/Justification	Source of data	Mitigation requirements for new development (see Section 5)
Tidal	Green	The site is adjacent to the tidal River Thames; however, the tidal risk is mitigated by the Thames Barrier.	EA Data (see Section 3.1)	n/a
Fluvial	Red	The majority of the site, including the House, Stables and café, is within Flood Zone 1 'Low Probability'. The south and southwest of the site is located in Flood Zone 3 'High Probability'. There are no historic records of fluvial flooding at the site.	EA Data PFRA & SFRA (see Section 3.2 & 3.3)	Commercial development located outside floodplain
Land Drainage (i.e. Surface Water/ Pluvial)	Green	The majority of the site is shown to be at a 'Very Low' risk of surface water flooding with discrete pockets at 'Medium' and 'High' risk.	EA surface water flood maps PFRA	Commercial development located in 'Low' risk areas
Ground water	Yellow	The majority of the site is shown to be at 'Low' risk of groundwater flooding. Historical site observations note that the south and southwest of the site are impacted by rising groundwater.	BGS Viewer SFRA Site Observations	n/a
Reservoir, Canals, Ponds and Other	Green	The site would be impacted in the event of a reservoir breach. However, the probability of breach is negligible.	EA Data (see Section 3.1)	n/a

Source of Flooding	Risk of Flooding to Site	Comment/Justification	Source of data	Mitigation requirements for new development (see Section 5)
Artificial Sources				
Sewers		The majority of the site is within an area of no historical sewer flooding incidents.	SFRA	n/a
Key:		Low/Negligible Risk – No noticeable impact to site and not considered to be a constraint to development		
		Medium Risk – Issue requires consideration but not a significant constraint to development		
		High Risk – Major constraint to development requiring active consideration in mitigation proposals		

4 Proposed Development and Sequential Test

4.1 Proposed Development

4.1.1 This FRA accompanies a planning application for works across the Marble Hill Park site:

- Stable Block and café:
 - Pedestrian path to service yard
 - Removal of raised lawns to form café seating area
 - Refurbishment of the ground floor of the Stables
- Marble Hill Park landscape works:
 - Discrete areas of levelling within sports fields
 - Children play trail
 - Tree planting
 - Habitat creation for species that enjoy wetter ground conditions to the southern boundary of the East and West Meadow
 - Land drains running to existing private sewer to aid water infiltrating into the ground at the south-western sports pitches. Drainage proposals subject to further design.
 - Private sewer outfall arrangement to River Thames to include new penstock and replacement of original brick sewer with cast iron pipe, including puddle flange, through river defence wall, all subject to Structural Engineer's design details.
- Marble Hill House and Sports Building:
 - Conservation works to the House and lift installation
 - Internal works to Sports Building
 - Releveling of landscape at Sports Building to comply with access requirements
 - Replacement of drainage sections

4.1.2 The landscape and the café proposals are included in **Appendix A**. The proposals lead to an overall increase in impermeable area of approximately 59m² at the Stables associated with the new pedestrian path and concrete paver terrace.

4.1.3 The café and park are open to the general public throughout the year, with sports pitches hired to local sports teams. The House is currently open for guided tours.

4.2 Flood Risk Vulnerability

4.2.1 NPPF PPG 'Flood Risk and Coastal Change' Table 2 confirms the '*Flood risk vulnerability classification*' of a site, depending upon the proposed usage. This classification is subsequently applied to PPG Table 3 to determine whether:

- The proposed development is suitable for the flood zone in which it is located, and;
- Whether an Exception Test is required for the proposed development.

4.2.2 The proposed café re-modelling is classed as 'Less Vulnerable' development and is located within Flood Zone 1. Table 3 confirms that this form of development is appropriate.

4.2.3 The proposed landscaping works and play equipment are classed as 'Water Compatible' development and are located within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3. Table 3 confirms that this form of development is appropriate.

4.3 NPPF Sequential Test

- 4.3.1 The NPPF follows a sequential risk-based approach in determining the suitability of land for development in flood risk areas, with the intention of steering all new development to the lowest flood risk areas.
- 4.3.2 A Sequential approach has been followed for the proposed works at Marble Hill Park; the proposed 'Less vulnerable' café development has been allocated within Flood Zone 1 and the proposed 'Water Compatible' landscaping works have been allocated within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3.
- 4.3.3 In accordance with Table 3, the proposed works are considered suitable for the Flood Zone that they are allocated within and the Exception Test is not required.

5 Flood Mitigation Strategy

5.1 Flood Storage Compensation Scheme

- 5.1.1 Any new development located in the vicinity of a watercourse should be constructed such that it does not detrimentally impact on flow routes or reduce the available floodplain storage over a site; either of which could potentially cause an increase in flood levels on-site or elsewhere. This is considered up to the benchmark of the 1 in 100 annual probability plus allowance for climate change fluvial flood level.
- 5.1.2 The proposals for the play equipment across the site are included in the latest Design and Access Statement, Landscape Proposals, September 2018. The location of the Parkland Play Stops is still to be finalised following the conclusion of a pre-construction badger survey. However, the volume of flood storage occupied by the equipment and impact on flood flows is expected to be negligible.

5.2 Safe Access

- 5.2.1 It is necessary to consider and incorporate safe access arrangements as part of the mitigation, to ensure the users/occupants of the development are safe in times of flooding.
- 5.2.2 The south of the site will experience flooding in the first instance. It is anticipated site staff would advise users of increased risk and take the necessary precautions during a flood event.
- 5.2.3 Staff and users of the park would be able to evacuate the site via the main entrance to the north of the site. The majority of the site including the House, Stables and café is located in Flood Zone 1 and therefore would not be impacted by flooding.
- 5.2.4 The main access/egress road, Richmond Road, is outside the flood extents and provides a route to the wider area. Therefore, safe dry access/egress is provided.

5.3 Surface Water Drainage

- 5.3.1 The NPPF recognises that flood risk and other environmental damage can be managed by minimising changes in the volume and rate of surface runoff from development sites, and recommends that priority is given to the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in new development, this being complementary to the control of development within the floodplain.
- 5.3.2 The Building Regulations Requirement H3 stipulates that rainwater from roofs and paved areas is carried away from the surface to discharge to one of the following, listed in order of priority:
- a) *an adequate soakaway or some other adequate infiltration system,*
 - b) *a watercourse, or where that is not practicable,*
 - c) *a sewer.*
- 5.3.3 The current requirements for surface water drainage in new development are set out in the DEFRA 'Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems' (March 2015).
- 5.3.4 The proposed increase in total impermeable area is approximately 59m² associated with the new pedestrian path to the service yard and a small area of new concrete paving at the Stables. The proposal is for surface water runoff to drain to the edges of the new impermeable area and infiltrate locally into the adjacent ground, therefore no additional runoff will be generated from the proposed development.

- 5.3.5 This approach is the preferred option within the SuDS hierarchy, is in line with local and national policy and will have no adverse impact on others. The drainage systems will be designed to current design standards as set out in the Building Regulations.

6 Residual Risk

- 6.1.1 It is difficult to completely guard against flooding since extreme events greater than the design standard event are always possible, however, it is practicable to minimise the risk by using suitable construction and management techniques.
- 6.1.2 The proposals for the café re-modelling and landscaping works are classified as 'less vulnerable' and 'water compatible' land uses respectively in terms of flood risk. As such, the residual flood risk is considered to be negligible and is acceptable for the lifetime of the development.

7 Conclusions

- 7.1.1 This Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been prepared by Peter Brett Associates LLP (PBA) to support a planning application for refurbishment of the ground floor of the Stables, landscaping improvements across the park, conservation works to the exterior and interior of Marble Hill House and reconfiguring of the Sports Block at Marble Hill Park in Twickenham.
- 7.1.2 This FRA concludes that:
- The majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. The south and southwest of the site are within Flood Zone 3. This has been confirmed by the EA modelling and the SFRA.
 - In the modelled MLWL 2100 flood event, the majority of the site is not impacted, however the south and southwest is impacted by flood water depths up to a maximum of 2.3 m.
 - Continuous dry safe access from the site is provided at the 1 in 100 annual probability plus climate change flood level via Richmond Road.
 - The additional impermeable area associated with the Stables will drain via infiltration (subject to soakaway tests) into the adjacent ground, therefore generating no additional runoff from the development.
- 7.1.3 A Sequential approach has been followed for the proposed works at Marble Hill Park; the proposed 'Less vulnerable' café development has been allocated within Flood Zone 1 and the proposed 'Water Compatible' landscaping works have been allocated within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3.
- 7.1.4 In conclusion, the future users of the proposed development will be safe from flooding and there will be no detrimental impact on third parties. The proposal complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and local planning policy with respect to flood risk and is an appropriate development at this location.

Appendix A Proposals

Drawings produced by J & L Gibbons:

- 581_PL_S_01_02 G Stables Café – Hard Landscape Paving Plan, dated 03.09.18
- 581_PL_S_01_03 G Stables Café – Soft Landscape Plan, dated 03.09.18
- 581_PL_L_01 J Illustrative Landscape Plan, dated 03.09.18
- 581_PL_S_01 I Stable Café General Arrangement, dated 03.09.18
- 581_PL_L_04 F Furniture Plan, dated 03.09.18

Extract from the Landscape Proposals, Design and Access Statement, prepared by J & L Gibbons September 2018:

- Play Strategy – 581-180903-MHR-Landscape DAS-FINAL - play extract

Drawing produced by van Heyningen and Haward Architects, dated August 2018:

- 533-L-2010 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan (Café)
- 533-L-2011 - Proposed Roof Plan (Café)

Drawings produced by the Morton Partnership:


- 19121/D/50-1/P03 Below Ground Drainage – General Arrangement Site Plan, dated 24th August 2018
- 17549/D/50/2-1/P03 Below Ground Drainage – Sports Pitch Drainage General Arrangement, dated May 2018
- 17549/D/50/3-1/P06 Below Ground Drainage – Historic House General Arrangement, dated May 2018

This page is intentionally blank



- KEY:**
- Evergreen screen planting
 - In-fill planting to Stables facade
 - Bulb planting
 - Turf
 - Category A tree / group
 - Category B tree / group
 - Category C tree / group
 - Category U tree
 - Tree RPA
 - Proposed tree removal
 - Proposed tree planting

Please refer to Arboricultural Development Statement, CBA10677, Aug 2018



+0.00 EXISTING LEVEL
 +0.00 PROPOSED LEVEL

Rev	Date	Issue	Description
1	02/01/16	01	Issue
2	04/01/16	01	Issue
3	08/01/16	01	Issue
4	08/01/16	01	Issue
5	08/01/16	01	Issue
6	08/01/16	01	Issue
7	08/01/16	01	Issue
8	08/01/16	01	Issue
9	08/01/16	01	Issue
10	08/01/16	01	Issue
11	08/01/16	01	Issue
12	08/01/16	01	Issue
13	08/01/16	01	Issue
14	08/01/16	01	Issue
15	08/01/16	01	Issue
16	08/01/16	01	Issue
17	08/01/16	01	Issue
18	08/01/16	01	Issue
19	08/01/16	01	Issue
20	08/01/16	01	Issue

J & L GIBBONS
 LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
 URBAN DESIGN

10 BERRY AVENUE
 LONDON
 N1 1SD
 T: 020 7228 1342

The information on this plan is copyright © J & L Gibbons Ltd. It is to be used only for the project and site for which it was prepared. It is not to be used for any other project or site without the written consent of J & L Gibbons Ltd.

Project: **MARBLE HILL REVIVED**
















Date: 16_01_17
 Scale: 1:100 @ A1
 1:200 @ A3

Status: For planning
 Checked: ND
 Approved: ND

Drawing title: **Stables Cafe Soft Landscape Plan**

Drawing Number: 581_PL_S_03
 Rev: G

Notes:
 Scaling from this drawing for planning purposes only.
 All levels are nominal. Detailed site survey to be carried out to establish tolerances.
 Figured dimensions are in millimetres.
 Spot heights are in metres.

-  Existing tree canopy
-  Proposed trees
-  Proposed orchard trees
-  Proposed hedges
-  Amenity grassland
-  Woodland meadow mix
-  Improved Habitat Edges
-  Wilderness
-  Flower garden
-  Thicket
-  Sweetwalk Shrubbery
-  Existing paths
-  Proposed footpath gravel paths
-  Area of Woodland Quarter / Sweet Walk where no works are proposed
-  Stables existing cobble & asphalt yard, patch repaired

1. Planted palisade
2. Ice House seat
3. Ninepin alley
4. Enhanced Grotto setting
5. Grove planting
6. Flower garden
7. Enhanced cafe
8. New play area
9. Improved habitat edges
10. Enhanced Sweet Walk planting
11. Enhanced Stables setting
12. Interpretative play feature
13. Natural play stops - indicative location
14. Path upgrade between gates onto Orleans Road
15. Cycle parking - indicative locations

- A. Pleasure Grounds
- B. Great Lawn
- C. Sweet Walk & Stable Block
- D. East Meadow
- E. West Meadow
- F. Car Park, Playground & Works Area
- G. River Terrace
- H. Marble Hill House
- I. Sports Block



Rev	Date	Initials	Description
J	03.08.18	VB	Update
I	29.08.18	VB	Update
H	22.08.18	VB	Update
G	08.08.18	VB	Update
F	02.08.18	VB	Update
E	31.08.17	VB	Update - colours
D	23.05.17	VB	Update
C	16.03.17	VB	Update
B	06.03.17	VB	Update
A	15.02.17	VB	Update

J & L GIBBONS
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
URBAN DESIGN

19 SWAN YARD,
LONDON N1 1SD
T: 020 7226 1345

The information in this drawing is copyright of J & L Gibbons LLP
Scaling from this drawing for planning purposes only.
All dimensions are to be verified on site prior to construction.
J & L Gibbons LLP to be informed of any variation between site conditions and dimensions.

Project:
MARBLE HILL REVIVED

Date:
29_06_2015

Drawn:
VB

Scale
1:1250 @ A1

Checked:
ND

Status:
Planning

Approved:
ND

Drawing title:
ILLUSTRATIVE LANDSCAPE PLAN

Drawing number:

581_PL_L_01 J

Rev:



- KEY:**
- Cobbled Stables courtyard - patch repaired
 - New staff only access path
 - Outdoor seating terrace
 - Retained wall
 - Refuse collection point store
 - New play area
 - Existing tarmac path retained
 - New yard gates
 - New fencing
 - New tree and evergreen screen planting
 - Bulb planting
 - Cycle stand parking

- Category A tree
- Category B tree
- Category C tree
- Category U tree
- Tree RPA
- Proposed tree removal
- + Proposed tree planting

Notes:

Scaling from this drawing for planning purposes only.

All levels are nominal. Detailed site survey to be carried out to establish tolerances.

Figured dimensions are in millimetres. Spot heights are in metres.

Rev	Date	Issue	Description
J	03.08.18	VB	Update
H	29.08.18	VB	Update
G	24.09.18	VB	Update
F	08.09.18	VB	Update
E	01.09.17	VB	Update
D	14.07.17	VB	Update
C	23.05.17	VB	Update
B	16.02.17	VB	Update
A	27.02.17	VB	Update
-	17.01.17	VB	Update

J & L GIBBONS
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
URBAN DESIGN

19 SWAN YARD
LONDON
N1 1SD
T: 020 7226 1345

The information in this drawing is copyright of J & L Gibbons LLP. Scaling from this drawing for planning purposes only. All dimensions are to be verified on site prior to construction. J & L Gibbons LLP to be informed of any variation between site conditions and dimensions.

Project: MARBLE HILL REVIVED			Drawing title: Stable Cafe General Arrangement	
Date: 16_01_17	Scale: 1:100 @ A1 1:200 @ A3	Status: For planning	Drawing Number: 581_PL_S_01	Rev: I
Drawn: VB	Checked: ND	Approved: ND		

Please refer to Arboricultural Development Statement, CBA10677, Aug 2018

- KEY
- STANDARD BENCH (INCLUDING MEMORIAL BENCHES)
 - PLEASURE GROUNDS BESPOKE BENCH
 - PLAY AREA SEATING
 - BIN
 - INTERPRETATION PANEL
 - INTERPRETIVE BENCH
 - CYCLE PARKING STANDS



Rev	Date	Initials	Description
F	03.09.18	VB	Update
E	29.08.18	VB	Update
D	22.08.18	VB	Update
C	07.08.18	VB	Update
B	10.08.17	VB	Update
A	16.03.17	VB	Update

J & L GIBBONS
 LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
 URBAN DESIGN

19 SWAN YARD,
 LONDON N1 1SD
 T: 020 7226 1345

The information in this drawing is copyright of J & L Gibbons LLP
 Scaling from this drawing for planning purposes only.
 All dimensions are to be verified on site prior to construction.
 J & L Gibbons LLP to be informed of any variation between site conditions and dimensions.

Project:
 MARBLE HILL REVIVED

Date:
 29_06_2015

Scale
 1:1250 @ A1

Status:
 Planning

Drawn:
 VB

Checked:
 ND

Approved:
 ND

Drawing title:
 FURNITURE PLAN

Drawing number:

581_PL_L_04 F

Rev:

4.7 PLAY STRATEGY

The Marble Hill Playcentre provides play for 0-5 years at their One O'clock Club including indoor and outdoor facilities. The Adventure Playground is for ages 5-15 years and includes aerial runways, climbing frames and a skateboarding ramp. Both play facilities are paid entry. The play area and buildings, located along the north-east boundary of the park, are leased from English Heritage.

Adjacent to Marble Hill Park is a playground in Orleans Gardens. It provides play for both under 7's and 7-13 year olds and is very popular. There is also a small café and toilet facilities. The challenge for the proposed play at Marble Hill Park will be to ensure the offer is not duplicated and offers a complimentary but different play experience.

The play strategy for the project aims to:

- Keep the current fenced free-play area as it is.
- Compliment this with an adjacent low-level play area for small children.
- Explore opportunities for play throughout the park.
- Improve relationships with the Playcentre and adjacent play offers to be mutually beneficial and to avoid competition.

Brief

Activities and types of play:

- Locomotive -climb / physical / sit / crawl / jump / balance / teamwork
- Social - role play / linguistic
- Active/sequential
- Socio-dramatic

Conditions:

- Minimal ground disturbance
- No high or densely massed structures
- No equipment that is overtly 'play equipment'
- Include seating provision for adults/parents




Proposed play strategy



NEW PLAY AREA


The new play area is proposed as an extension to the existing fenced free-play or dog-free area at Marble Hill Park, opposite the Stables cafe. The existing area will remain unchanged. The new area adjacent will have its own separate gated entry with an additional gate connecting the two areas. A natural 'dead hedge' boundary is proposed around the perimeter of the new play area as a more sympathetic solution to a traditional fence. New play features will be low-lying and natural in style, such as stepping logs, low wobble boards and barefoot paths. New tree planting is proposed to provide shade with a meadow understorey to create enclosure. A long curved timber bench will sit below an existing tree and could be used for outdoor lessons and activities. Additional benches are provided to ensure plenty of places for parents and carers to sit.

1. Existing dog-free area to remain unchanged
2. New low-level play equipment
3. New tree planting
4. Meadow grasses
5. Dead hedge boundary
6. Bench
7. Willow tunnel




Play area general arrangement






WORKERS REST STOP

- 1. Small child-size picnic table
- 2. Carved timber cups/plates, cooking tools, fixed to table



HORSE SEE-SAW

- 1. Wooden see-saw with carved horse seats



WOBBLE BOARDS

- 1. Low timber wobbling boards with animal footprints carved into the surface
- 2. Springs