

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 139670/FO/2024
Date registered valid: 12 June 2024
Proposal: Erection of a detached dwelling house.
Address: 7 Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU
Ward(s): Old Moat Ward

Applicant: Mr Muhammad Asif
Agent (if any): Mr Muhammad Dabeer Rana, MD Design Consultancy
Case officer: Katie Raw
Tel: 0161 234 4164
Email: katie.raw@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Refuse
Date of recommendation: **6 August 2024**

Application details

Type of application: Full Application Consent

Development type: Minor Dwellings

Date of site visit: 24 June 2024

Standard consultations:

Printed: 20 June 2024 Expired: 11 July 2024

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 20 June 2024 Expired: 11 July 2024

Site notice

No site notice has been produced

Press advert

No press advert had been published

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: No

Tree Preservation Order: No

Description of area

The application site relates to 7 Deepdale Avenue within the south Manchester ward of Old Moat. The property sits to the north of Deepdale Avenue. Whilst the property previously sat close to the head of the cul-de-sac, residential development has taken place to the west and south of the site, which has in turn opened up the Avenue. As such, development to the immediate west and south is characterised by the two storey new build development (see planning reference: 116719/FO/2017 for further details). Development to the east is characterised by the same property types to that of the applicant site- a two storey, red brick, semi-detached dwellinghouse with hipped roof pushed against the eastern boundary of the site, with a north facing spacious garden.

The site relating to this application consists of the private amenity space of no.7 Deepdale Avenue and is sited against the western boundary of the site. At the time of the site visit this area took the form of a detached timber shed/structure with some areas of grass and some areas of hardstanding. The site is accessible from the road of Deepdale Avenue and has a site area of 572.7 square metres.

The surrounding area is residential in context and in main consists of properties of a similar age/ character. The property sits to the south of the Fallowfield Loop, to the east of Princess Road and to the north of Mauldeth Road West.

Description of development

The planning application seeks consent for the erection of a detached dwelling house. The dwellinghouse would sit within the existing property's side and rear amenity space and the trees/ shrubs against the western boundary of the site would be removed as a result of the proposal. The property would be accessible from Deepdale Avenue and the existing level access/ drop kerb would be made wider to allow for the proposed driveway access. The front elevation would face onto Deepdale Avenue with access from a front door.

The property would take the form of a three storey (two storeys and a roof dormer), red brick gable roof dwellinghouse with a rear roof dormer and single storey element to the rear. The proposal would involve the insertion of three windows and a door with a canopy to the front elevation, an obscure glazed window to the eastern elevation, two obscure glazed windows and further window to the western elevation and five windows and a set of patio doors to the rear elevation.

The proposal would accommodate three bedrooms across three storeys.

The proposal would involve a front and rear garden, an off street parking space against the eastern boundary of the site and a bin store sited behind a 2.1 metre boundary treatment.

Boundary treatment to be used across the site would involve:

- 1.8 metre high close boarded concrete post and panel fencing with 300mm trellis to 2.1 metre height.
- 2.1 metre high close-boarded timber gate.
- 0.9 metre high close boarded concrete post and panel fencing.
- Secure by Design transition panel between 0.9 high close boarded fence and 2.1 metre high close boarded/ trellis fence.
- 0.9 metre railing with flag on edge at low level.

Materials to be used would involve dark grey roof tiles, red facing brick, grey cladding board and grey steel window surround.

Negotiations during the course of the Application

The agent was informed by the LPA that the proposal gave rise to concerns and that the scheme could not be supported. The agent requested more time to decide whether to withdraw the application or receive a refusal on the application after employing another planning professional to assist on the scheme. The agent was informed an extension of time would not be given for this reason and the agent did not confirm they wish to withdraw the application- as such, the application will be assessed within this report.

Planning History

No planning history exists for this site.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Local Residents

Local residents were consulted and two responses were received. One response to support and one response to object.

The comment of support welcomed the appearance of the property and the opportunity for more off street parking. Within the objection representative, the response raised concerns that the loss of the existing pavement would result in a loss of parking for local residents.

Highway Services

Highway Services were consulted on the application and provided the following response:

Trip generation and junction capacity:

Given that the proposed development is resultant in one additional residential dwelling, the number of vehicular trips associated with site is expected to be minimal. It is therefore accepted that the adjacent highway network can facilitate such additional demands with no highway safety or capacity concerns.

Site Accessibility:

The site is well accessed by sustainable modes. Regular bus services, tram services and railway services are available within walking distance of the site.

Parking and Access:

One driveway space will be located within the site's curtilage, thus equating to a provision of 100%. It should be noted that all individual driveway parking spaces should be a minimum of 3.0m x 6.0m to ensure that vehicles / pedestrians do not impact on the adopted highway.

In order to provide access the existing dropped kerb will be extended to provide access to the proposed driveway. It should be noted that highways will not accept anything greater than a double dropped kerb.

Should the planning application be approved, the applicant will be required to enter into a Section 184 agreements for the alterations to the existing highways, and for construction of the proposed vehicular access and dropped kerbs on Deepdale Avenue and will require a crossing licence/agreement. This will require the agreement with MCC's Highways Applications and Network Resilience teams via Contact Manchester (Tel. 0161 234 5004). This will be funded at the applicant's expense.

EV Charging:

It is required, in line with MCC Residential Guidelines, that the provision of an Electrical Vehicle charging point (minimum 7kW) is made available.

Cycle Parking:

In line with MCC Residential Guidelines, secure and sheltered cycle parking provision should be made, within the curtilage of the site, at a provision of one-per-unit.

Boundary Treatments:

It is recommended that all fencing / railings adjacent to the adopted highway are visually permeable from a distance of 600mm upwards to ensure adequate visual permeability for child pedestrians.

The applicant should be advised that all gated accesses will need to provide inward opening gates to ensure they do not impact on the adopted footway or highway.

Refuse and Servicing:

Designated refuse storage has been accommodated for the dwelling with kerbside collection noted from Deepdale Avenue, as per the existing arrangements.

Highways consider this to be acceptable in order to prevent any obstruction to passing pedestrians on the adjacent footway.

Construction Management:

The applicant is advised that any requirements for licensing, hoarding / scaffolding and any associated temporary traffic management arrangements will need discussion and agreement with the council's Highways Applications and Network Resilience teams via Contact Manchester (Tel. 0161 234 5004) Email [-highwaylicences@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:highwaylicences@manchester.gov.uk).

Environmental Health

Environmental Health were consulted on the application and the response can be summarised as followed:

- Suggests a demolition/ construction hours condition be attached to any approval granted.
- Suggests a refuse condition be attached to any approval granted.
- Suggests an air quality 2 (EVC and boilers etc) condition be attached to any approval granted.
- Suggests a CLAND01 (1) new applications, no previous contaminated land condition be attached to any approval granted.

Neighbourhood Team Leader (Arboriculture)

Neighbourhood Team Leader (Arboriculture) was consulted on the above application and viewed the proposals and the associated Arboricultural impact assessment and confirmed they would have no objection to the proposed works.

The trees listed for removal were of limited amenity value, however, the Team Leader would request that the loss of these trees be mitigated as part of the development as proposed in the AIA (section 7).

MCC Flood Risk Management

MCC Flood Risk Management Team were consulted on the application and objected to the proposal due to insufficient consideration of the NPPG Standing Advice for Flood Risk Assessment in matters which cannot be Conditioned.

The following amendment to the FRA is required to lift the objection:

- Assessment of the estimated flood level for the Site.
- Details of Finished Floor Levels set in accordance with Standing Advice.
- If floor levels cannot be raised in line with Standing Advice, details of flood resistance and resilience measures and access/escape plans in line with Standing Advice.

Sustrans

Sustrans Community Group (Fallowfield Loop) were consulted on the application and no responses were received.

United Utilities

Although not consulted on the application, UU made contact during the course of the application and provided the following response:

UNITED UTILITIES WATER MAIN (THIRLMERE AQUEDUCT) - NEED FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

It is important for the applicant and the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to understand we recommend clarification on the following points below PRIOR TO DETERMINATION to ensure there are no issues further into the development process.

The access for the development is proposed close to the Thirlmere Aqueduct and as United Utilities will not allow development in close proximity to critical assets, our position must be to OBJECT to the application until the applicant understands the EXACT location of the infrastructure within the site boundary. Therefore, our recommendation to the LPA is that the application is not progressed further until the EXACT location of the aqueduct is confirmed with us and so that the implications for the proposed site layout can be fully understood and redesigned if necessary prior to determination.

Further detailed response was provided.

Issues

POLICY

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2023)

The document sets out the Government's Planning Policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development in terms, "For plan-making" and "For decision-taking", (paragraph 11).

Paragraph 8 - Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):

- a) an economic objective
- b) a social objective
- c) an environmental objective

The following specific policies are considered to be particularly relevant to the proposed development:

- Chapter 5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- Chapter 8. Promoting healthy and communities
- Chapter 9. Promoting sustainable transport
- Chapter 11. Making effective use of land
- Chapter 12. Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012.

The Core Strategy is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. It replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as the document that sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development. Of relevance are:

Policy DM1 (Development Management);
Policy SP1 (Spatial Principles);
Policy EN19 (Waste);
Policy H1 (Overall Housing Provision);
Policy H6 (South Manchester);
Policy T1 (Sustainable Transport).

Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies

Large elements of the UDP have been superseded by the Core Strategy. The following saved policies are of relevance in the consideration of this application:

DC7.1 states the Council will negotiate with developers to ensure that new housing is accessible at ground floor level to disabled people, including those who use wheelchairs, wherever this is practicable. All new developments containing family homes will be expected to be designed to be safe areas within which children can play and, where appropriate, the Council will also expect play facilities to be provided.

DC26.1 states the Council intends to use the development control process to reduce the impact of noise on people living and working in, or visiting, the City. In giving effect to this intention, the Council will consider both:

- a. the effect of new development proposals which are likely to be generators of noise; and
- b. the implications of new development being exposed to existing noise sources which are effectively outside planning control.

DC26.2 states new noise sensitive developments (including large scale changes of use of existing land or buildings) such as housing, schools, hospitals, or similar activities, will be permitted subject to their not being in locations which would expose them to high noise levels from existing uses or operations, unless the effects of the noise can realistically be reduced. In giving effect to this policy, the council will take account both of noise exposure at the time of receiving a planning application and of any increase that may reasonably be expected in the foreseeable future.

DC26.4 states where the council believes that an existing noise source might result in an adverse impact upon a proposed new development, or where a new proposal might generate potentially unacceptable levels of noise, it will in either case require the applicant to provide an assessment of the likely impact and of the measures he proposes to deal satisfactorily with it. Such measures might include the following

- a) engineering solutions, including reduction of noise at source, improving sound insulation of sensitive buildings or screening by purpose-built barriers
- b) layout solutions, including consideration of the distance between the source of the noise and the buildings or land affected by it and screening by natural barriers or other buildings or non-critical rooms within a building; and
- c) administrative steps, including limiting the operating times of the noise source, restricting activities allowed on the site or specifying an acceptable noise limit.

Any or all these factors will be considered appropriate for inclusion in conditions on any planning permission

DC26.5 states the council will control noise levels by requiring, where necessary, high levels of noise insulation in new development as well as noise barriers where this is appropriate.

Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance, Adopted April 2007.

The Guide aims to help to develop and enhance a unique and positive sense of place within Manchester and its neighbourhoods. The guidance is grouped under seven key principles recognised by CABI as being those urban design characteristics which create successful places. These are: character and context, continuity and enclosure, ease of movement, quality of the public realm, diversity, legibility, and adaptability. It advises that high quality design is a vital attribute of successful neighbourhoods.

Manchester Residential Quality Guidance 2016

Sets out the direction for the delivery of sustainable neighbourhoods of choice where people will want to live and raise the quality of life across Manchester. The delivery of high-quality, flexible housing will be fundamental to ensuring the sustainable growth of Manchester. To achieve the City's target of carbon neutrality by 2050, residential schemes will also need to be forward thinking in terms of incorporating the most appropriate and up to date technologies to significantly reduce emissions. It is therefore essential for applicants to consider and integrate the design principles contained within the draft guidance into all aspects of emerging residential schemes. In this respect, the guidance is relevant to all stages of the development process, including funding negotiations, the planning process, construction and through to operational management. The guidance sets standards for securing high quality and sustainable residential development in Manchester. The document includes standards for internal space within new dwellings and is suitable for applications across all tenures.

Places for Everyone (2022-2039)

Places for Everyone is a long-term plan of nine Greater Manchester districts for jobs, new homes, and sustainable growth. It has been published by the GMCA on behalf of the nine districts and took effect and became part of the statutory development plan on March 21, 2024.

The Plan and its policies are now a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Plan and its policies must therefore be given full weight in the planning balance.

The following policies are relevant:

JP- S1- Sustainable development

JP- H1- Scale, distribution and phasing of new housing

JP- H2- Affordability of new housing

ISSUES

Principle of Development

The submitted application seeks planning consent for the erection of a detached dwelling house. The creation of an additional dwelling house would create a new family house and is considered acceptable to help overcome the current housing shortage across Manchester and

would be pursuant to Policy H1 and H6 within the Core Strategy (2012). The property would sit within a residential area which is characterised by more recent residential development (see planning ref: 116719/FO/2017 for example).

However, in this instance, the Local Planning Authority does not believe that the application site- amenity space linked to no.7 Deepdale Avenue- is a suitable development site. Whilst it is acknowledged development for a similar appearance of residential accommodation was approved and built under planning reference: 116719/FO/2017, the scheme developed empty land surrounding residential uses and following the demolition of two existing properties, and not land contained within a residential garden. As such, the principle of development is not considered acceptable given it is considered over development of the site resulting in an unacceptable relationship to the detriment of the host property and would create a property that does not compliment the character and visual amenity of the local area. Reasoning for the decision will now be discussed in further detail.

Visual/ Residential Amenity

The proposal would result in the existing amenity space connected with no.7 Deepdale Avenue being split in two with the proposed dwellinghouse sited close to the west of the site. No.7 benefits from amenity space to the side and rear. However, neighbours to the east to the top of Deighton Avenue are characterised by front gardens/ driveways which the applicant site is not afforded. Given this consideration, the amenity space afforded to the applicant site is not considered dissimilar to the amount of space for neighbouring properties. As such, the host property would lose amenity space and would have a narrower rear garden as a result of the proposal.

Given the applicant site benefits from a site with an eastern diagonal boundary, the orientation of the rear of the host property is in a north western direction. The proposed property would not sit on a splayed plot and would face in a northern direction. The primary elevation of the proposed dwellinghouse would sit further back from the highway than the host property. Therefore, the proposed development would be visible from the applicant property from the rear windows and when the applicant property utilises their rear amenity space. A 2.1 metre boundary treatment would be sited closer to the amenity space of the applicant site than is previously the case. As a result, the proposal would be considered to create an overbearing feature to the existing property by negatively impacting the sense of openness for the existing property and adversely impact the enjoyment of the host property when utilising their property/ rear amenity space.

Given the property is to be three storeys (2 storeys and a rear roof dormer), given it would be sited approximately 3.7 metres from the proposed boundary treatment separating the two properties and given it would be set back further from the highway than the host property, the property is considered to give rise to adverse implications in terms of overshadowing/ loss of light in the afternoon to the detriment of visual amenity. This is considered to impact no.7's enjoyment to their rear amenity space that they could reasonably expect to enjoy.

Whilst it is acknowledged the property is to be constructed for a self-build purpose, consideration must be given to any future residents residing at the existing property and it is considered the proposed detrimental impacts in terms of loss of light and overbearing could not be supported.

As such, the proposed development is contrary to policies DM1, H1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, policy JP-S1 of Places for Everyone, the Guide to Development in Manchester (SPD) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

No concern is raised in regard to the impact to other surrounding neighbours.

Design and Appearance

It is acknowledged that the property has been designed in a way to complement the existing residential development to the west and south of the site (see planning reference: 116719/FO/2017), in terms of design and appearance. However, the proposal would result in the creation of a dwelling house within the garden space of no.7 Deepdale Avenue which is not considered a development site. No other development to this effect has taken place in the immediate area. Whilst it is acknowledged development for a similar appearance of residential accommodation was approved and built under planning reference: 116719/FO/2017, the scheme developed empty land surrounding residential uses following the demolition of two properties, and not land contained within a residential garden. As such, the approved new build development is not considered a suitable comparable circumstance. As such, the proposal would constitute an inappropriate form of development which would be out of keeping with the character and pattern of development in the local area. As such, the proposed development is contrary to policies DM1, H1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, policy JP-S1 of Places for Everyone, the Guide to Development in Manchester (SPD) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Consultee Considerations

Highway Services did not raise any concerns to the proposal in relation to highway and pedestrian safety and requested the developer to enter into a section 184 agreement. Highways' requested an EV charging point and cycle parking be made available and if the scheme was to be recommended for an approval, this information could be conditioned. It is noted Highways would not accept any more than a double dropped kerb at the site.

Environmental Health requested a number of conditions be attached to any approval granted if the application be recommended for approval.

The MCC Neighbourhood Team Leader was also satisfied with the loss of the trees against the western boundary of the site and suggested the AIA recommendations should be conditioned within any approval granted.

However, both MCC Flood Risk Management and United Utilities raised concerns with the application. MCC Flood Risk Management objected to the scheme and requested several details be provided and amended to the Flood Risk Assessment. This needs to be supplied to lift the objection and allow the consultee to assess the application. United Utilities also raised concerns as access for the development is proposed close to the Thirlmere Aqueduct and as United Utilities will not allow development in close proximity to critical assets, they objected to the proposal until the exact location of the infrastructure is confirmed within the site boundary. United Utilities requested the details prior to determination of an application. The outstanding information is requested to be submitted for the consultees to fully understand the implications for the site. As such, the applicant has failed to provide details relating to the NPPG Standing Advice for Flood Risk Assessment and Thirlmere Aqueduct, to the detriment of preventing the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system. This is contrary to policies EN14 and EN17 of the Core Strategy.

Other Legislative Requirements

Equality Act 2010

Section 149 (Public Sector Equality Duty) of the Equality Act 2010 requires due regard to the need to: Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act and; Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The Equality Duty does not impose a legal requirement to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment. Compliance with the Equality Duty involves consciously thinking about the aims of the Equality Duty as part of the process of decision-making.

Human Rights Act 1998 considerations

This application needs to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants (and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations) have a right to a fair hearing and to this end the local planning authority must give full consideration to their comments.

Protocol 1 Article 1, and Article 8 where appropriate, confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Core Strategy and saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan, the Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing has concluded that some rights conferred by these articles on the applicant(s)/objector(s)/resident(s) and other occupiers and owners of nearby land that might be affected may be interfered with but that that interference is in accordance with the law and justified by being in the public interest and on the basis of the planning merits of the development proposal. She believes that any restriction on these rights posed by the recommendation given is proportionate to the wider benefits of and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

Recommendation: Refuse

Article 35 Declaration

The proposal was assessed with regards to policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies, Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan and other material considerations. Officers have worked with the applicant/agent in a positive and proactive manner. In this instance, concerns to the agent were raised during the course of the application. However, no revised proposal or additional information was supplied during the course of the application. The agent requested an extension of time for another planning consultant to review the application, however this was not possible and so a refusal will be granted on the scheme.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

- 1) The erection of a detached dwelling house would result in an overbearing and over-dominant feature to the applicant site by impacting the sense of openness for the existing property and would adversely impact the host property in terms of loss of light; both impacts are exaggerated by the existing orientation of the host property. This would undermine the living conditions of no.7 Deepdale Avenue. As such, the proposed development is contrary to policies DM1, H1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, policy JP-S1 of Places for Everyone, the Guide to Development in Manchester (SPD) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 2) The erection of a detached dwelling house would constitute an inappropriate form of development which would be out of keeping with the character and pattern of development in the local area. As such, the proposed development is contrary to policies DM1, H1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, policy JP-S1 of Places for Everyone, the Guide to Development in Manchester (SPD) and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3) The applicant has failed to provide sufficient details to fully assess the proposal. The following amendment to the Flood Risk Assessment is required to lift the objection received from the Manchester City Council Flood Risk Management Team:
- Assessment of the estimated flood level for the Site.
 - Details of Finished Floor Levels set in accordance with Standing Advice.
 - If floor levels cannot be raised in line with Standing Advice, details of flood resistance and resilience measures and access/escape plans in line with Standing Advice.

The applicant has failed to provide details relating to the NPPG Standing Advice for Flood Risk Assessment, to the detriment of preventing the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system. This is contrary to policies EN14 and EN17 of the Core Strategy.

- 4) The applicant has failed to provide sufficient details to fully assess the proposal. The access for the development is proposed close to the Thirlmere Aqueduct and United Utilities will not allow development in close proximity to critical assets. The developer must confirm the exact location of the infrastructure within the site boundary, so that the implications for the proposed site layout can be fully understood and redesigned, if necessary, prior to determination.

The applicant has failed to provide details to the Thirlmere Aqueduct in relation to the proposal, to the detriment of preventing the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system by ensuring access to the Thirlmere Aqueduct. This is contrary to policies EN14 and EN17 of the Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services
Environmental Health
Neighbourhood Team Leader (Arboriculture)
MCC Flood Risk Management
Sustrans

6C Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU
6B Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU
6 Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU
6A Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU
5A Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU
10 Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU
3 Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU
4C Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU
4B Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU
4A Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU

5 Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU
11 Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU
9 Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU
8 Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU
4 Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU
2 Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU
1 Deepdale Avenue, Manchester, M20 1GU

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4

Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - All Exceeding 90M

Flood Zones Type 2 (low to medium risk) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -

Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -

Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA