

Item 11 – Flooding related Development Issues - update

Members are aware of specific issues that we have been raising for sometime culminating in a letter sent to CEO CMBC – Appendix 1

We have received a response – Appendix 2

In addition to this we have also received the following email in respect of

Lidl - We have requested data for the combined sewer in Halifax Road to try and establish the return period for which the pipe floods however this has not been provided by Yorkshire water. As part of the data request for the flood event in February they advised that a CCTV survey is due to be undertaken on this combined sewer and this will be scheduled once Covid restrictions allow. We will follow this up to see if this has been programmed in yet.

Our next steps will be to commission a contractor to undertake a full survey of the drainage on the Lidl site and also the attenuation ponds. This will also include surveys to establish connectivity of highway drainage on Halifax Road. The flooding occurs in what is a bowl/low point in the road and connectivity and condition of Highway infrastructure needs to be determined. It was intended to undertake this survey work some months ago however Covid 19 restrictions and recovery work following Feb 20 flood events have hampered progress on this.

Sandholme – It is my understanding from a recent meeting with planning colleagues and Fraser from the EA that this development is being built in accordance with the approved planning permission and levels were agreed at the planning stage. As built survey will determine if the agreed levels have been adhered to.

Mill Bank Close – The 2003 application covers the entire Derdale Street Site and has been implemented by the building of houses on the middle section of the site and apartments to the east of the site. This permission allowed for raising of ground levels and was agreed with the EA. The western portion of the site had permission for industrial units. We have been approached by the agent who has stated that an application will be submitted in the near future which will be for residential houses in place of the industrial units. This would be a new application and I believe discussions are taking place between the agent and the EA around ground levels and modelling requirements to adequately consider flood risk. I have discussed SW drainage on the site with the agent to ensure the drainage is adequate and will not increase flood risk. This is likely to include on site attenuation and a restricted outfall to the YW SW sewer.

Next steps

The letter from the CEO of CMBC whilst sympathetic does not address the wider issue of a change in Policy.

The Town Clerk has therefore responded to CMBC Service Lead for Planning, specifically on the matter of seeking a change in Policy to more reflect flooding considerations as follows

“Having read Robins letter again, whilst I appreciate referring to the individual case officer is fine for that specific application, this does not cover off the need to consider a wider policy measure whereby a higher test of compliance may be needed to satisfy flooding related concerns.

Your flood scrutiny panel tonight has a report on it that references things like “slow the flow” and the need to reconsider developments in the light of increased flooding risk.

For us this includes individual developments that when on hillsides leads to green areas currently helping to slow the flow naturally, being lost or the water course being diverted.

We have just been invited to meet with a number of Town/Parish Councils to look at how collectively we could improve resident’s lives, and flooding impact will no doubt be high on the Agenda.

We will need to review our emerging Neighbourhood Plan in light of recent flooding events, and I wonder therefore whether it is your intention to review policies within your local plan to also reflect these concerns.

Development Committee Members are keen to engage with you on this to influence Policy change. I appreciate this is always a difficult balance between meeting govt targets for new dwellings but I feel Members here would want to lose a development rather than add to an already devastating impact on residents because of a singular approach to permissions rather than a Collective flooding impact view.

I look forward to hearing from you.”

Next steps

To continue to

- monitor these developments in question
- press for actions to be completed.
- Press for meeting to influence policy change