

APPLICATION NO: 15/02131/FUL		OFFICER: Mr Craig Hemphill	
DATE REGISTERED: 15th December 2015		DATE OF EXPIRY :	
WARD: Charlton Park		PARISH:	
APPLICANT:	Cheltenham Borough Council		
LOCATION:	Land off Sandy Lane, Charlton Kings		
PROPOSAL:	Construction of a low contoured earth flood bund in the grazing meadow to the south of Southfield Manor Park. Its purpose being to intercept and attenuate out of channel flow from Southfield Brook and overland surface water run-off from the Cotswold escarpment. In addition, a second smaller earth bund is proposed immediately south of properties in Hartley Close. The proposed scheme provides the benefit of reduced flood risk to properties in Southfield Manor Park, Hartley Close and Sandy Lane.		

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	8
Number of objections	5
Number of representations	1
Number of supporting	2

11 Southfield Manor Park
Sandy Lane
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9DJ

Comments: 11th January 2016

I support this plan. It doesn't appear to create any hassle, hindrance or nuisance to anyone (after construction), and should prevent both minor and catastrophic flooding to several properties adjacent to and downhill from the fields in question. It will have some visual impact for properties nearby and walkers passing through, as the bund will block some of the view and may be unsightly in the first couple of years while it's still new and not clothed with grass etc, but this seems a minor price to pay for security for people's homes.

21 Hartley Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9DN

Comments: 5th January 2016

I would like to object to this application on the grounds that from my own interpretation of the presented plans then it appears that the changes in the location designated as Site B will in fact present a greater risk of flooding to our property at 21 Hartley Close rather than an alleviation of the existing problem.

Let me briefly explain the current situation which will allow you to understand my concerns. Currently the existing ditch in the area of Site B runs roughly east to west from the rear of Number 17 to a new storm drain that has been put in place just beyond the end of the rear of Number 23. This drain was put in place in the spring of 2015, but before that the existing ditch was not really a ditch, more trench with no defined exit for the water at either end. It times of

heavier, although not excessive rain the ditch/trench would fill up and overflow, flooding through our garden and also out of the far west end and in to Highland Road. In the years between buying the house in 2009 and the fitting of the drain in 2015 then we regularly had a stream of water running across our lawn, along the side of our house and out in to Hartley Close. On many occasions we had to sandbag the side of the house to avoid water entering the houses air bricks. After the fitting of the new storm drain matters have improved, but unfortunately in my opinion the drain entry has been fitted too high, and this is borne out by the constant high level of standing water that is in the ditch behind our house and also number 23. The level of the ditch behind our house and number 23 is lower than both the levels at the storm drain entry to the west side and the ditch behind Number 19 at the east side, forming a bowl where water collects under any level of rain. Since October 2015 the ditch behind our house has been full of water constantly. The level remains reasonably constant as it is kept supplied from water draining in to it off the meadow and escarpment and also from some springs which appear in the autumn and winter months in the meadow. When it fills to with some 10 to 15cm from the top of the ditch behind our house before it starts to run out in to the storm drain. In times of prolonged rain the amount of water entering the drain means that the height of the water in the drain rises due to flow restrictions. Across the very wet period over the Christmas Holidays the level of water in the ditch has risen to just 3 to 5cm from the top of the ditch behind our house and we were once again concerned that it would overflow in to our garden.

So now to my concerns about the proposed scheme. The building of the proposed earthen bund at the farthest east end of Site B and the addition of the extended ditch to join up with the existing one will clearly channel more water from east to west along the back of the houses in Hartley close. At times of high or exceptional rainfall I am convinced that the flow of the ditch in to the storm drain will not be sufficient to cope with the additional water that will be channelled in to the existing ditch from the new works and it will once again overflow at the lowest point of the ditch behind our house and in to our Garden. I would rather that the outcome of these proposals were that it improve the drainage and reduced the risk of flooding for everybody, rather than improve it for some at the expense of increasing the risk for others.

There is mention in the plans of improvements to the existing ditch, but no mention of any changes to the entry height of the storm drain. Perhaps this is in the plans but just not mentioned. Also the use of Filter Drains are mentioned for Site B but I have no idea what these are and the areas they will be used in are not clearly marked on the plans.

It could be that all of my concerns are already considered in these plans, but if so it is not clear to me. My simple view from the plans is that it is very likely to make an already bad situation behind numbers 21 and 23 Hartley very much worse and so it is on these grounds that I would like to object to the application for the actions at Site B.

7B Hartley Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9DN

Comments: 12th June 2016

Having just spent half an hour shovelling up significant amounts of debris from Sandy Lane at the junction with Highland Road following a flash flood, in support of a property owner whose house was very nearly flooded, I support this application. Of course I agree with the comments from a neighbour in Hartley Close in that I wouldn't want this scheme to have a knock on negative effect to other properties in the Close and also the comments about flooding further down stream (but I thought the aim of this scheme was to hold the water back, so as to help reduce the likelihood of this, not increase it?) - but on both these points I would expect the experts to have this covered? If not, then of course they should have. My only question is whether this scheme goes far enough? The aforementioned flash flood today was in part due to blocked drains caused by debris being washed down from the lane alongside Lillybrook Golf club and off the new access

route to the farm at the top of Sandy Lane (as mentioned by another person who commented about this and whose prediction came true within a week of them making their comment!) This scheme may help flooding downstream and is therefore to be welcomed - but I think the experts need to have another look at how a once in a few years (not a 100) flood can be prevented and thus deal with the issue of Sandy Lane beyond the tarmacked part being washed away. Or perhaps that is a matter for CBC and our local councillors to resolve?

15 Southfield Manor Park
Sandy Lane
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9DJ

Comments: 11th January 2016

I object to the visual impact of the "embankment" being "2m" high on Site A as proposed in the Design Statement from CH2M.

7 St Judes Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7RU

Comments: 24th December 2015

I am seeking expert opinion from Cheltenham Planning Dept. I live right next to the Lilley Brook downstream of the planning proposal. If the planning proposal increases the flow of water in the Lilley Brook by reducing its ability to use a flood plain in times of heavy rain then this logically will increase the likelihood of it flooding the properties alongside the Lilley Brook downstream. Will this happen and has the Cheltenham Planning Dept. considered this increased risk of flooding and how will this be eliminated? I am seeking a formal reply.

Comments: 7th January 2016

7/1/2016 - No reply received to my comments of 24th December 2015.

Comments: 9th February 2016

In view of the comments of other interested parties and the lack of any assurances regarding the increased risk of flooding downstream from these proposals I am changing my comment to OBJECT from neutral. One has only to see the affect of this type of work on properties in the north of England to appreciate the real possibility of damage down stream. The answer is increasingly being shown to be containment and slow release of flood waters.

Brookside
32 Brookway Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HD

Comments: 6th January 2016

I chair the Charlton Kings Flood Action group, recently formed under the auspices of the National Flood Forum. In the near future we are looking to meet with representatives from the Cheltenham Borough Council and the Environment Agency so we can learn about the future water management strategy and flood mitigation measures for Cheltenham and our area.

In that light, I am writing on behalf of our members to object to the recent planning proposal for work at Sandy Lane, and also to request clarification on a number of issues. The main crux of our objection is that our strong impression is there are likely impacts downstream of this proposed work for areas of Charlton Kings, and indeed this seems to be acknowledged in the (possibly ambiguous) statement that peak flows in the Lilley Brook would be reduced although total discharged volume will increased. So we are concerned for residents specifically whose properties are adjacent to the Lilley Brook. At the very least this needs more explication, or we would need reassurance that this is not the case. Unfortunately, the time frame for consultation of a few weeks over Christmas does not leave us in a position to resolve this for ourselves with expert advice.

More broadly though, there is the issue of the need for more transparency about process and strategy for managing flood risk in Cheltenham. A few years ago a proposal to regulate the flow of water from Dowdeswell was abandoned, apparently on the grounds of cost. Residents of Charlton Kings felt that this would have been a measure that would have benefitted the whole area. So it would be interesting to know the cost-benefit analysis that takes this scheme - funded by the Environment Agency - forward, on behalf of Sandy Lane, which is maybe a more restricted area. Is it possible we could have a sense of this rationale in the two cases, and also a figure for the proposed scheme?

Related to this too, we acknowledge that this scheme is said to be NPPF compliant, but would like to be assured that it is compliant with the Environment Agency's Catchment Flood Management Plan for the River Severn, as well as for plans for Cheltenham generally. It may be that it is, but it is not immediately apparent in the proposal, where we can find no reference to this.

In terms of the scheme itself, as a water management proposal, the anxiety we have highlighted above - about moving water more swiftly downstream - is a function of the fact that there is no apparent design feature that would make for the retention or slowing down of surface water. Clearly again, if there had been more time, this could have been subject to expert scrutiny.

Finally, we very much appreciated the role played by the Cheltenham Borough Council's officers (indeed, those responsible for this application) in setting up this summer of a drop-in day on flood management issues, together with the Environment Agency, the Police and the County Council. Hopefully, the newly convened Charlton Kings group can have a voice, together with the National Flood Forum, in ensuring that Cheltenham develop a flood policy that benefits the whole area. It is also true, though, that the Council's officers might have increased the community involvement in this application, and at least have given a longer and more adequate consultation period.

8 St Judes Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7RU

Comments: 11th February 2016

I live adjacent to the Lilley brook downstream of the proposed works and am concerned about the impact of the scheme on the water flow near me. The flood risk assessment report figures in table1-1 state that the peak flow will reduce but that the total volume will increase. The paragraph immediately below this table states that both will reduce so the report is self-contradictory. The council needs to explain much more clearly the impact of the scheme for properties downstream and until it does so I will continue to object to the proposal.

76 Sandy Lane
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9DH

Comments: 8th June 2016

The plan may have to be re-assessed because the landowner behind the field owned by SMPRA has grubbed up the hedgerow at the bottom of Sandy Lane track to insert a new gate. This now exposes Sandy Lane to direct surface water run off from the fields that may bypass the proposed bund.

Comments: 13th June 2016

Having observed the deluge which flooded the junction of Sandy Lane and Highland Road on 12th June 2016 it's clear this proposal will have limited effect on preventing a recurrence. Most of the water that turned Sandy Lane into a torrent above this point was run off from Lillybrook golf course. See YouTube postings of the flooding at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TzTUn4uCw5g>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6QlidRfWY4w>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9uof7RVKWHQ>