

# Comment for planning application 20/03619/F

<b>Application Number</b>	20/03619/F
<b>Location</b>	Heyford Park Camp Road Upper Heyford OX25 5HD
<b>Proposal</b>	Construction of attenuation basin including associated infrastructure and landscaping
<b>Case Officer</b>	Andrew Lewis
<b>Organisation</b>	
<b>Name</b>	Marc Thielke
<b>Address</b>	18 Harris Road, Upper Heyford, Bicester, OX25 5TR
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>I often walk the 388/4 footpath where Gallos Brook originates at the tanks at the Phase 9 southern fence. At this point the stream is 1m wide and up to 500mm deep and flows quickly. I continue thru South Street in Caulcott to the 289/2 to Aves Ditch/Northbrook. In Caulcott the flow from Gallos Brook overwhelms the culvert under the B4030. The brook flows over the road and makes crossing the B4030 and South Street impassable without welly boots. The proposed pond is itself ineffective in reducing discharge rates. If further discharge is allowed into the existing infrastructure then flooding in Caulcott will increase. The other proposed future interrupter tanks, larger attenuation pond and new discharge point that bypass the old tanks should be done first. Dorchester should not be allowed to continue construction of homes at Heyford Park until the completed infrastructure is complete. Infrastructure like roads and drainage have often lagged behind and if a storm water issue is created by granting permission to this one little upstream part of the system then it could be several years before the problem is rectified. A similar issue has happened on the east side of Heyford Park and homes in Heyford Leys are experiencing flooding for the first time in decades due to the high discharge rates from the new 430 Camp Road attenuation pond. Given the flooding in Caulcott, how can the planning documents assert "The Environment Agency has confirmed that existing drainage serving the areas for retention and refurbishment on the Upper Heyford development do not require attenuation of existing surface water flows."? How is it appropriate to use an estimated discharge from Phase 9 or an allowable discharge from the Phase 9 site as its actual flow could be measured now and we know it floods Caulcott? Where is the outflow going to be directed from this attenuation pond if not the tank? I have been informed by a Dorchester site manager that the tank is not connected to the storm water system now and any water flowing out of it is "only residual water". This "residual water" is enough to flood Caulcott and must not be allowed to increase. This one attenuation pond of the overall storm water system should not be approved by itself. Instead the whole system including the downstream pond and the ultimate new outflow to Gallos Brook should be done too. I suggest the applicant request permission for the whole system and construction not continue until the majority of the Phase 9 storm water system is complete. Additionally, the attenuation pond seems to be located partially atop a completed school play field.</p>
<b>Received Date</b>	27/01/2021 12:36:17
<b>Attachments</b>	