

PLANNING REF : 242067
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 2 Nursery Close
: 2 NURSERY CLOSE Hurst, Reading, Berkshire
: RG10 0EQ
SUBMITTED BY : Mr James Kiddie
DATE SUBMITTED : 05/09/2024

COMMENTS:

My wife and I have lived in Hurst for over 30 years. Our two sons went to school here. This proposed development although reduced from 200 homes to 99 homes should be rejected for all the reasons laid out in Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/W/22/3309202. In rejecting that appeal the Inspector stated that "...flooding or drainage...were matters raised by many interested persons in written representations and also by many of those who spoke at the Inquiry". (Para 114). He also noted in Para 116 that "landowners have a responsibility to maintain their ditches". I would add the following in my objection to the current Application 242067: -

1. The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) states that "Surface Water flood risk is dealt with by designing a drainage network to ensure any on-site development is protected". It then describes how ONSITE surface water flow is attenuated and then discharged at a maximum flow rate of 17.7 litres/sec.
2. FRA Drawing Number 409.010068.00001-SLR-HDG-500-01 shows the outfall from on-site water drainage via a 450mm dia. pipe in Section A-A. The dimensions of the existing ditch give a cross-sectional area 3.24m², which at 17 litres/sec gives a surface velocity of 1 metre every 3 minutes. The maximum surface velocity (South to North along similar X-Section) is more like 1 metre every 10 minutes, and at times of prolonged rain it is STATIC. In other words, the elaborate SuDS will cope with ONSITE surface water but pays no heed to the downstream ditch on which it is totally dependent.
3. The FRA appears to take no account of the high-water level arriving from upstream (i.e. South) which already threatens to flood the property at 11 Barber Close after prolonged rain.
4. The FRA Section 7.0 etc. Draft Maintenance Strategy gives details of components requiring maintenance but fails to mention the most essential link - the existing downstream ditch. As in the previous Application and Appeal the existing ditch appears to look after itself. This ditch (known as Hatchgate Ditch) on the western plot boundary has not been cleared once in the last twenty years. It is badly overgrown, and water overtops the brim regularly in winter.
5. Whilst the plot is designated as Low Risk the FRA shows the proposed discharge to the ditch roughly where the risk increases to Medium Risk. (FRA Page 8, Fig 4). Earlier this year floodwater covered an area roughly corresponding to the Medium Risk area shown in Fig 4. A large area of our garden at 2 Nursery Close and the adjacent plot to the north were flooded to a depth of 250-300mm. Fortunately, the water did not reach the house, but rising sea levels make that ever more likely. (Photographs available)
6. The FRA Section 5.10 Approvals accepts that "In order to build a new connection into the existing on-site watercourse an Ordinary Watercourse Consent/Environmental Permit is required...". Any Consent/Permit issued with knowledge of the above data will be accepting that flooding of adjacent land is inevitable.

I trust that these points will be carefully considered, and the Application rejected.

