

From:

To:

Subject:

Re: SMD/2021/0234 - Drainage plan for proposed house on garden of Holly House

Date:

03 August 2021 10:35:24

Dear Sir or Madam

I live at Alley House, Sugar St, Rushton Spencer SK11 0SG and my property is opposite the site referred to in SMD/2021/0234.

I have read the drainage plans and have some concerns regarding the real world impact of this plan. I would be grateful if you would take the following observations into consideration.

My main concern is that the exceedence flow is planned to run off onto the road (Sugar St) and onto the school car park. As you will be aware the Chair of Governors of the school have already raised concerns about drainage impact of this development as they already experience long standing drainage issues.

At times of rainfall Sugar St becomes a flowing body of water which accumulates at the bottom of the road at the junction with Leek Old Road and slightly further down hill at the Royal Oak and onto the A523. The A523 at this point and slightly further round the corner towards Beat Lane regularly floods and it is commonplace for the Police to have to close the road at this point following heavy rain.

Houses on Sugar St between the Royal Oak and the school (I have permission to specifically mention Rushton Cottage) have flooded from the street in the recent past (within the past 10 years). The entire proposed exceedence flow will run towards these houses as the water collecting on the school carpark runs off onto Sugar St.

Despite the plan's assertion that the water will drain off into "the water body," which is unspecified but can only really mean the Feeder Channel, - there is no direct course for water to enter the Feeder from the road this area (hence the flooding on the road). Drainage of water from the Ivy Cottage / Land at Sugar St building site into the Feeder has been subject of recent litigation as the CRT will not permit water to enter the Feeder channel due to risk of flooding, their position was upheld and building work has been abandoned leaving the site derelict and the part built properties are subject to flooding at times of rainfall. The case was Bernel Ltd vs Canal and River Trust, Case number F30MA461.

The drainage plan states that the raised kerb on Sugar St will protect from flood. There is no kerb on Sugar St raised or otherwise.

At the site of the proposed build itself I would make the following observations - it is an elevated site standing behind stone walling on the road front and on the boundary with the school car park. There are no weep holes. How exactly will water flow through these walls which will already be at increased stress due to the effect of building in close proximity with no re-reinforcement? I expect that the walls will eventually fall onto the highway and the capark, this is clearly unacceptable.

The proposal states that the soil type on site is "likely" to be sand, however since the soil in our garden, the school and the Ivy Cottage development site is definitely clay it seems very unlikely that the soil is sand at Holly House - this needs to be properly analysed as all the drainage flow figures are based on a sandy soil type.

The proposal also uses modelling regarding predicted rainfall and climate change factors - fascinating that they use data from 1961-1990 when "six of the 10 wettest years on record have occurred since 1998". Furthermore, "over the last decade summers have been 13% wetter and winters have been 12% wetter than the period from 1961-1990". (Source of data is the met office). It is commonly reported that 1:100 year weather events are set to become more frequent and predicted to occur around every 1:10 years within the lifespan of a proposed new build. It is clear that the water flow predictions for this drainage system are unlikely to be realistic. The modelling data needs to be rectified because the consequences of underestimating the current situation let alone the impact of climate change are significant.

The proposal also fails to describe how the new drainage system will impact on or interact with the existing shared drainage system for Holly House, Daisy Cottage and Hillside.

Rushton is a Groundwater Source Protection Zone, I am not sure where the boundary of this Zone lies, it may be helpful to consult with United Utilities regarding this.

Finally, the proposal states that there is no watercourse on or near the development land but then provides documentation regarding a well on our property (is the well likely to be infiltrated by water from the proposed development and if so what is the risk to us of flooding? - this is not mentioned at all). In his hydrology report for the court case mentioned above, the hydrologist, Dr Brown, followed the course of a culverted water body which joins another source of water under the school car park. The source of water running downhill from the direction of Holly House / garden / paddock and joining the culverted channel was unidentified but it seems logical that it runs through the proposed development land albeit most likely underground. How will this interact with the proposed drainage system?

Yours sincerely

Jo Davies