
From: Hall, Madeline (Cllr)
Sent: 29 May 2023 14:54
To: Planning (HPBC); Haywood, Ben
Cc: Claff, Godfrey (Cllr); McKeown, Anthony (CLLR); Quinn, Rachael (CLLR)
Subject: Re: HPK/2023/0192

Categories:

Dear Ben

I write primarily to second Cllr Quinn's summary of our concerns with the application submitted.

I'd add that the resubmission of an old flood risk assessment on the assumption that it covers the ground since the number of housing units is reduced indicates lack of care. This is evident too in the dismissal of effective mitigation measures. The chart of SuDS says mitigation by use of green roofs will not be done as the houses don't have flat roofs. The houses could be redesigned. Do planning authorities have powers to press for intelligent design of this type? Similarly, no reason is given why grey water recycling can't be included.

As Rachael highlights, the flood risk statements are exclusively within the development site. No account is taken of impact downstream. I plan to review law and precedent. Can you offer initial pointers?

I also looked through the community engagement report. It's surprising that only 25 people out of 445 contacts responded to the private consultation - especially since people not included in the pre-application consultation (including me for example) heard of the exercise and sent in responses.

I note that the first item noted and responded to in the consultation report is on flooding. The applicants have no answer beyond saying the risk is low. EA maps and data identifying a flood alert area challenge that assertion. Again, Rachael and I will be reviewing the data shared by EA and other groups engaged in remediation work on the moors above Lightwood to inform more detailed responses to the planning consultation exercise now underway. A direct response from the EA would be most helpful.

Best wishes
Madeline

Madeline Hall, Councillor for Corbar Ward

Facebook:

On 29 May 2023, at 11:50, Quinn, Rachael (CLLR) wrote:

Hi,
This weekend. Madeline,(Councillor Hall), and myself have been sifting through the planning application for the land at Hogshaw and we are rather concerned by the flood risk assessment. Firstly, the assessment is dated 2019 and covered the whole Hogshaw area, this is going to cause considerable disquiet and confusion, as on the plans, the rec is included. More pertinently, in this case, the flood risk assessment is for the whole site and includes a number of attenuation pools. The plan for the actual application will include only one and this will not be sufficient,(for the reasons

below)

The assessment is only for that site and pays no attention to the high flood risk covering Brooklands, part of Lightwood Road and Charles Street and going lower down as the brook hits the River Wye. The report claims that the flood risk is considered low and says that a flood will be a one in a hundred year event. Ironically there was a severe flood in 2019, as a resident I remember 3 such events since my daughter was born in 1997.

The plans for the run-off include allowing the extra water to flow into NunBrook, therefore increasing the flood risk in the area- it seems amazing that this can be suggested slightly upriver from a high flood risk area. The last flood event in 2019 followed closely upon the Network rail workings when hard surfaces led to the water cascading into the brook. I know that the reason given was the collapse of the culvert but look back and in the previous floods the culvert collapsed because of the excess flow of water.

There is no provision for the residents who will be most affected by this, the residents of Charles Street, Brooklands and that section of Lightwood Road. There is also no move to consult the Environment Agency about mitigation, the need for mitigation is ignored.

The EA ran a flood risk event in the Pavilion Gardens last year to highlight the high risk of flooding in the area, I find it unbelievable that the applicants have not been advised of this by officers. There are attempts to mitigate flood risk already (along the Hogshaw Brook) it seems totally unbelievable that an application would seek to worsen the risk by increasing the flow of water into a water course that is a high flood risk. If the council allowed this, would we be liable, being that we are aware of the risks and are willing to increase them.

I would ask that the EA are included as consultees, as are the residents of the affected areas and I would ask that the applicant gives residents the courtesy and respect of a proper and up to date flood risk assessment.

I feel sure that Councillor Hall will also offer her thoughts on this.

Rachael Quinn

Sent from my iPad

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>