

APPLICATION NO: 16/01337/FUL		OFFICER: Mr Ben Hawkes
DATE REGISTERED: 27th July 2016		DATE OF EXPIRY : 21st September 2016
WARD: Charlton Park		PARISH:
APPLICANT:	Mr Andrew Yapp	
LOCATION:	1 College Gate, Cheltenham	
PROPOSAL:	Erection of double garage (resubmission of application 13/00127/FUL)	

OFFICER REPORT UPDATE

1. CONSULTATIONS

The land drainage officer has provided additional details on his original response, with further analysis of the application and the reasons behind his conclusion.

Land Drainage Officer

24th October 2016

I am satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated a material change to the circumstances that pertained at the time of the 1992 planning inspector's report. I am further satisfied that the construction of a double garage for which consent is sought via this application (16/01337/FUL), will not increase the flood risk to this or adjacent properties.

Further comments

11th November 2016

In 1992, the planning inspector dismissed an appeal in connection with the construction of a double garage at 1 College Gate, on the grounds that the proposed garage would significantly worsen the consequences of flooding. This conclusion was based upon comments made by the appellant's consultant that the garage should be sited a minimum of 2m from the boundary wall and 8m from the site entrance in order to provide sufficient clearance for the overland flow to bypass the garage and prevent water backing up beyond the site entrance. In my opinion, those dimensions are fairly random and a garage sited accordingly would not necessarily facilitate flow through the site and could be argued to present more of an obstruction. However, prior to this most recent application, and with due respect to the inspector's 1992 decision, I had not been presented with any new information that would allow me to confidently contradict his findings.

With regard to the material change to the circumstances that pertained in 1992, the most significant is the alteration to the road levels within the College Gate development. The currently existing reduced levels now mitigate the risk of overland flow backing up beyond the site entrance and encourage any such flow towards the collection chamber at the rear of No. 1. Overland flow is further encouraged around and beyond the proposed garage by locally raised kerbs immediately adjacent the entrance to the site and the garage itself.

The proposal does not compromise the existing boundary wall and in fact some minor improvements to the wall are proposed. In addition, sufficient space shall be provided between the garage and the wall to facilitate any future maintenance activities. The boundary wall returns in a south-easterly direction towards the site entrance. In my opinion,

14th November 2016

it is sensible to “tuck” the garage in behind this return to minimise any obstruction to overland flow entering the site. This, in conjunction with the lowered road levels and the proposed locally raised kerbs serves to mitigate the risk of any backing up of water beyond the site entrance.

Cox’s Meadow flood storage area overtopped during the flood event of July 2007 and undoubtedly overland flow from the direction of Old Bath Road entered the site. Operational failures at Cox’s meadow were a contributory factor. Since then, the Environment Agency (EA) have carried out a number of improvements to the defences afforded by Cox’s Meadow and the River Chelt flood alleviation scheme generally. Whilst the risk of flooding resulting from such an event cannot be totally eliminated, the improvements carried out by the EA post 2007 have certainly reduced flood risk in this locality.

No. 1 College Gate lies within Flood Zone 3 (high probability), but is the construction of a garage as proposed going to significantly increase the flood risk to this or adjacent properties? I cannot argue that it will.