

Comment for planning application 21/03522/OUT

Application Number	21/03522/OUT
Location	Os Parcel 3673 Adjoining And West Of 161 Rutten Lane Yarnton OX5 1LT Cross Parish Boundary Application: Begbroke and Yarnton Parish Councils
Proposal	The erection of up to 540 dwellings (Class C3), up to 9,000sqm GEA of elderly/extra care residential floorspace (Class C2), a Community Home Work Hub (up to 200sqm)(Class E), alongside the creation of two locally equipped areas for play, one NEAP, up to 1.8 hectares of playing pitches and amenity space for the William Fletcher Primary School, two vehicular access points, green infrastructure, areas of public open space, two community woodland areas, a local nature reserve, footpaths, tree planting, restoration of historic hedgerow, and associated works. All matters are reserved, save for the principal access points.
Case Officer	Samantha Taylor
Organisation Name	S W Smith
Address	8 Stocks Tree Close, Yarnton, Kidlington, OX5 1LU
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>FAILURE TO CONSIDER THE EXISTING FLASH FLOODING ISSUES IN YARNTON. Dear Members - please consider the current drainage strategy carefully before voting on this outline application. It seems to be limited to a study of flood impact on the application site and includes scant information about the existing village hydrology. PR9 is the only remaining open land at the foot of Spring Hill and might provide the ONLY remaining viable solution to existing flooding at the north end of Yarnton! It cost Oxford City Council 2.2 million to address flash flood in Northway and Marston following the over development of the John Radcliffe site. The flood strategy seems to be built on the premise that the new development will not increase flooding onsite or offsite. The WSP baseline flood model (green field run-off) rightly identifies the flooding that currently originates from the development site and freely flows into the existing village streets through the surgery site. It bears out that which residents have complained about for the past 30+ years. The design brief (approved earlier by members of CDC) failed to include the existing flooding issues and thus the developer has been given what seems to be a free hand to ignore the existing flood risk to the village. The previous ribbon development has directed the natural combined storm water and groundwater springs off Spring Hill towards the northern end of the village. The infill development has lead to the demolition of the natural northern bourn draining Spring Hill and has replaced it with roadways and what has proved to be an inadequate piped highway drainage system. This has lead to the current exceedance flows off Spring Hill flooding the highway network which has no apparent natural path downstream or back into the brook crossing the A44. The Lead Local Flood Authority and Cherwell District Council between them seem to be determined not to address existing flooding in conjunction with the outline application. In doing so they will continue to leave the village exposed to flood risk, the extent of which is largely unknown as it has not been investigated. But at some point in the not too distant future, flooding will again abruptly emerge into the public consciousness. An event that local politicians will not simply be able to claim that they had no previous knowledge when voting on this application. The new development proposes to use SUDS technology to mitigate flood risk on the site. Unfortunately, the previous infill development (which mostly predate SUDS) has now filled all of the remaining land parcels between the A44, Rutten Lane and Cassington Road. From what I can see, there is no open space left within the village that could be used to retrofit SUDS measures. Failure to consider the existing village flooding alongside the University's development will leave the County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority) in the position of having to address a flooding issue at a later date, with fewer tools at its disposal and subsequently will be much more difficult post development. The County Council (the Highway Authority) have a responsibility under highway law to keep roads free of flooding. The County have powers under the Highways Act to prevent water flowing onto the highway. Should the County Council decide to approve the drainage strategy for the development site, including the exceedance flows, it is my contention that they will be deemed to have expressly consented, by virtue of the Highways Act, to the existing and the continuation of the exceedance flows through our streets. Responsibility for flood damages to neighbouring private land will therefore, by reason of that express consent, become the single liability of the Highway Authority in perpetuity.</p>
Received Date	27/01/2022 11:45:52

Attachments

