

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held at the Council Offices,
Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 18 January 2022
commencing at 10:00 am**

Present:

Chair
Vice Chair

Councillor J H Evetts
Councillor R D East

and Councillors:

R A Bird, G F Blackwell, M A Gore, D J Harwood, E J MacTiernan, J R Mason, P W Ockelton,
A S Reece, J K Smith, P E Smith, R J G Smith, P D Surman, R J E Vines, M J Williams
and P N Workman

also present:

Councillor G J Boeking

PL.50 ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 50.1 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was advised to those present.
- 50.2 The Chair gave a brief outline of the procedure for Planning Committee meetings, including public speaking.

PL.51 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

- 51.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M L Jordan. There were no substitutions for the meeting.

PL.52 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 52.1 The Committee's attention was drawn to the Tewkesbury Borough Council Code of Conduct which was adopted by the Council on 26 June 2012 and took effect from 1 July 2012.
- 52.2 The following declarations were made:

Councillor	Application No./Agenda Item	Nature of Interest (where disclosed)	Declared Action in respect of Disclosure
M A Gore	Agenda Item 5a – Land to the East of High Beeches, Snowhill	Had spoken to the Parish Council on the telephone in relation to the application but had not expressed an opinion.	Would speak and vote.

- 52.3 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

PL.53 MINUTES

- 53.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 21 December 2021, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as correct record and signed by the Chair.

PL.54 DEVELOPMENT CONTROL - APPLICATIONS TO THE BOROUGH COUNCIL

- 54.1 The objections to, support for, and observations upon the various applications as referred to in Appendix 1 attached to these Minutes were presented to the Committee and duly taken into consideration by Members prior to decisions being made on those applications.

21/01243/FUL - Land to the East of High Beeches, Snowhill

- 54.2 This application was for retention of a stable with tack room. The application had been deferred at the Planning Committee meeting on 21 December 2021 for a Planning Committee Site Visit in order to assess the impact of the proposal on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Planning Committee had visited the application site on Friday 14 January 2022.
- 54.3 The Planning Officer advised that the application sought permission for the retention of the stable and tack room building which was connected to High Beeches on a triangular paddock that rose to the east. The application site was within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Planning Committee had deferred the application at its last meeting in order to allow a site visit to take place to assess the impact of the proposal on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. An assessment of the material considerations was included at Pages No. 30-32 of the Committee report and, as set out in the report, Officers considered that the stable building would not be overtly prominent within the landscape, nor would it be of significant detrimental impact on the landscape and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to warrant a refusal. As such, the proposal was recommended for permission, subject to conditions relating to additional planting and the painting of the stable block.
- 54.4 The Chair indicated that the Officer recommendation was to permit the application and he sought a motion from the floor; however, he first asked for clarification as to what planting was proposed and the Planning Officer drew attention to condition 3 at Page No. 33 of the Committee report which required planting of a Beech hedgerow, as indicated on the plans. A Member noted from the Planning Committee Site Visit that the building was close to a Cotswold drystone wall so she asked where the hedge would go and whether it would have an impact on the building given that Beech hedges could be quite large. In addition, she asked whether it was necessary to have rooflights on the stable roof. In response, the Planning Officer drew attention to the site plan, circulated at Page No. 35 of the Committee report, which showed the proposed Beech hedge behind the drystone wall; this was what had been put forward by the applicant but the Planning Officer indicated that it may be possible to request additional planting around the sides as an alternative if Members were not content with the proposal. The Chair indicated that, in his view, it would be impossible for a Beech hedge to grow satisfactorily in the space between the wall and the back of the building. He expressed the opinion that the hedge needed to be on the other side and felt it was a shame that the applicant had chosen to build the stable in the precise location – had it been located slightly further down the hill it would have been shielded by the existing hedge so he could appreciate the frustration of local residents. He asked whether it would be possible to plant the hedge on the verge side and the Planning Officer confirmed this was something which could be looked into; however, she suspected it would be outside of the applicant's ownership and was likely to be highways

land.

54.5 A Member expressed the view that, from the discussion which had taken place, it seemed Members and Officers were trying to find a way to make the building less obvious and she did not think that was possible, therefore, she proposed that the application be refused on the basis that it would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This proposal was duly seconded. A Member indicated that she would still like a response to the query regarding the rooflights and whether they were entirely necessary. The Chair suggested it may be possible to move the rooflights to the other side of the ridge; however, that would be very inconvenient as the light entering the stable would be limited. Nevertheless, it was an option which could be discussed further, should the motion to refuse the application fall. Another Member indicated that he disliked retrospective applications such as this and would be happy to support the motion to refuse subject to appropriate policy justification being put forward – he pointed out that the property was not overlooked by anyone so he was struggling to find a policy reason to refuse the application. In response, the Planning Officer clarified that the motion had been put forward on the basis of the adverse impact to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and policy SD7 of the Joint Core Strategy stated that “all development proposals within the setting of the Cotswold AONB will be required to conserve and, where appropriate, enhance its landscape, scenic beauty, wildlife, cultural heritage and other special qualities”. The Member indicated that he was happy with the policy; however, his view was that the Joint Core Strategy was going to be out of date and carried little weight at this point so he wished to seek assurance that the Council would be able to defend an appeal on that basis. With regard to the rooflights, the Development Manager advised that, whilst suggestions had been made as to how they may be repositioned, Members needed to determine the scheme before them. In terms of the landscaping scheme, Members needed to consider whether making changes would reduce the impact - from the photographs displayed it would certainly break the view but he was unsure whether that would lessen the harm. Ultimately, Members needed to decide whether the proposed conditions would mitigate the harm to the point where the scheme was acceptable, in which case it should be permitted; however, if they felt it was still unacceptable then it should be refused. The Planning Officer advised that, should Members be minded to refuse the application, the refusal reasons would also include reference to policies in respect of equine facilities, including Policy RCN4 of the emerging local plan.

54.6 Upon being put to the vote it was

RESOLVED That the application be **REFUSED** on the basis that it would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

21/00976/OUT - Land off Brook Lane, Twigworth/Down Hatherley

54.7 This application was for residential development (up to 160 dwellings) with associated works including demolition, infrastructure, open space and landscaping with vehicular access from the A38; all matters reserved.

54.8 The Development Manager explained that the applicant had questioned the financial contribution towards education provision and had requested more time to continue discussions with Gloucestershire County Council with regard to that. Furthermore, Page No. 58, Paragraph 7.57 of the Committee report set out that the tenure of the affordable housing would be split between affordable rented and shared ownership; however, the Council’s Strategic Housing Enabling Officer had highlighted this was an error and the tenure should be split between social rented and shared ownership, as such, it was necessary to have further discussions with the applicant to establish whether an acceptable affordable housing tenure could be

secured. Due to the ongoing conversations in relation to these fundamental planning matters, the Officer recommendation was now to defer the application.

- 54.9 The Chair indicated that there were public speakers registered to speak in relation to the application; however, as the Officer recommendation was to defer the application to resolve the outstanding matters in respect of the financial contribution towards education provision and the proposed tenure of the affordable housing, he intended to firstly seek a motion for a deferral and, should that fall, the public speakers would be invited to address the Committee. It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred in accordance with the Officer recommendation. A Member indicated that he would be happy to support the deferral and requested that additional information be provided to clarify the data year which had been used by County Highways for its 'robust assessment' as referenced on the Additional Representations Sheet, attached at Appendix 1, as he understood that 2015 figures were still being used; whether the proposed contribution towards off-site sports provision would go to Twigworth rather than GL1 as had happened before; and whether the £15,000 towards bus stop improvements on the eastern side of the A38 could also be used to ensure the pavement was wide enough for wheelchair users and people with pushchairs as it was currently very narrow and could be dangerous. The Member indicated that there were further matters he would wish to raise in respect of the Minutes of Council on 20 October 2021. The Chair indicated that, whilst he was grateful for these queries, it was necessary to focus on the motion to defer the application which had been proposed and seconded; should the motion fall, the Member would be able to ask these questions but if the deferral was approved then he should raise these requests directly with Officers outside of the meeting.

- 54.10 Upon being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED That the application be **DEFERRED** in order to resolve the outstanding matters in respect of the financial contribution towards education provision and the proposed tenure of the affordable housing.

20/01061/FUL - Kimberley, Church End Lane, Twyning

- 54.11 This application was for the erection of one dwelling and associated detached garage to replace existing mobile home and provision of associated vehicular access, parking and turning areas.

- 54.12 The Development Management Team Leader (South) advised that the site was located along Church End Lane in Twyning and was occupied by a static residential mobile home where the applicant currently resided. The application proposed the replacement of the mobile home with a detached two storey, three bedroom dwelling, similar in size and scale to the two dwellings immediately to the west of the site that were allowed on appeal in 2020 but had not yet been constructed. A new access was proposed off Church Lane with a parking and manoeuvring area contained within the site and a large double garage proposed towards the back of the site. As set out in the Committee report, the application site lay outside of the Twyning settlement boundary, as defined in the Neighbourhood Development Plan, and Officers had concluded that, as the proposal was for the replacement of a mobile home with a dwelling, it was contrary to the relevant Borough Plan and Neighbourhood Development Plan policies and would also result in the loss of an existing traveller pitch. Notwithstanding this, the proposal must be considered in light of the current lack of a five year housing supply and the relevant test was therefore whether the identified harms significantly and demonstrably outweighed the benefits assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework policies as a whole. In terms of the recent appeal, it was relevant that in allowing the replacement of a mobile home with two

dwelling on the neighbouring site, the Inspector - whilst agreeing that the proposal was contrary to development plan policy – concluded that, in view of the tilted balance being engaged, the adverse impact of the proposal did not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Although each case must be considered on its merits, a similar conclusion had been reached in this instance. As stated in the Committee report, there was a conflict with development plan housing policy which weighed against the proposal; however, whilst the proposal would result in the loss of a traveller pitch, the applicant currently lived in the mobile home and had chosen to move into bricks and mortar, subject to the application being permitted, therefore the overall need for traveller sites would be unaffected and the impact would be neutral. There were no other harms identified in the Committee report and, in view of the tilted balance, it was concluded that the adverse impact of the proposal did not outweigh the benefits which included the economic benefits during construction, ecological benefits and potential improvements to surface water drainage which were required by condition. As such, the Officer recommendation was to permit the application.

- 54.13 The Chair indicated that there were no public speakers for this item. The Officer recommendation was to permit the application and he sought a motion from the floor. A Member indicated that he was concerned about setting a precedent as Twyning had several static caravans so he asked whether permitting this application could have an impact on other areas. In response, the Development Management Team Leader (South) reiterated that every case should be assessed on its own merits; whilst there was general policy protection for static mobile homes, in this case although it was classed as a traveller pitch, there was a clear distinction in that the occupiers had decided to move into bricks and mortar. Members would be aware of the appeal in 2020 and, insofar as the existing mobile home being replaced by two dwellings, the Inspector had considered that, in view of the tilted balance, it was acceptable and the appeal had been allowed. On that basis, the Member indicated that he would be happy to propose that the application be permitted in accordance with the Officer recommendation. Another Member pointed out that this was not a designated traveller site, therefore, he was struggling to understand how a traveller site would be lost if this application was permitted. The Development Management Team Leader (North) explained that the site was not allocated in the local plan as a traveller site but it did count towards the supply. This was a slightly odd site in that it was not allocated but the description of the development said that the site should be for family members so the applicant had been clear they did not want it to be made available for other travellers. As such, it was considered that the harm that would be caused by permitting the application was not significant. A Member drew attention to Page No. 92 of the Committee report and pointed out that new wording had been agreed in relation to the condition requiring installation of electric vehicle charging points so condition 8 needed to be amended to reflect that. The proposer of the motion indicated that he was happy for that amendment to be made and the proposal was duly seconded.

- 54.14 Upon being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED That the application be **PERMITTED** in accordance with the Officer recommendation, subject to an amendment to condition 8 to reflect the amended wording which had been agreed in relation to the installation of electric vehicle charging points.

20/00089/FUL - Phase 1B East Site, Homelands, Gotherington Lane, Bishop's Cleeve

- 54.15 This application was for the removal/variation of conditions 2 (plans as set out),

4 (landscaping compliance) and 11 (noise assessment) of planning reference 17/01131/FUL. The application had been deferred at the Planning Committee meeting on 21 September 2021 in order to investigate installation of bollards or other measures to address highway safety concerns; to allow revised plans to be submitted to address the minor discrepancies in relation to the location of the cycle storage area and landscaping; and to enable the Environmental Health Officer to explain in more detail the response to the Parish Council's concerns regarding the noise assessment being outdated.

- 54.16 The Planning Officer advised that the Environmental Health Officer had now provided a more detailed comment in relation to the noise assessment and the Parish Council had subsequently withdrawn its objection. Discussions had taken place with the applicant in respect of the Committee's concerns regarding public safety and the lack of a physical barrier between the road and grass verge and the possibility of installing bollards; however, the applicant's proposal was to extend the existing hedgerow, which had been retained in part, with additional planting along the boundary to the southern edge of the site and revised landscape plans had been submitted to reflect that. The Officer view was that the hedgerow would provide a barrier to the highway which would prevent children lying down on the verge and so would be an appropriate way forward in terms of the landscape character. It was noted that the additional hedge would be a mix of native species. On that basis, the Officer recommendation was to permit the application but with condition 9, as set out in the Committee report, omitted.
- 54.17 The Chair indicated that the Officer recommendation was to permit the application and he sought a motion from the floor. A Member indicated that she had raised the road safety concern as she regularly drove past the site; the site was outside of the 30mph speed limit and she had seen cars increase their speed when driving around the roundabout. She still had some concerns regarding the proposal to extend the hedgerow as it would take a long time for it to grow to the thickness necessary to provide the protection required. She felt something needed to be done more urgently and asked if it was possible to put a temporary measure in place whilst the hedge was growing – a few twigs in the ground would not provide adequate separation between pedestrians and cars in her view. In response, the Development Manager confirmed that it was possible to require a mature specimen which was fully grown when it was planted and would therefore be more of a deterrent. The Member agreed that it would stop people from lying on that piece of ground so she was happy with the proposal provided it was a mature specimen. Another Member asked whether 'fully grown' referred to thickness as well as height and assurance was provided that it would be required to reflect the existing hedge in terms of both thickness and height. It was subsequently proposed and seconded that the application be permitted in accordance with the Officer recommendation, subject to a condition requiring a mature specimen to be used for the extension of the existing hedgerow to reflect what was already there in terms of height and thickness.
- 54.18 Upon being put to the vote, it was
- RESOLVED** That the application be **PERMITTED** in accordance with the Officer recommendation omitting condition 9, subject to a condition requiring a mature specimen to be used for the extension of the existing hedgerow to reflect what was already there in terms of height and thickness.

PL.55 CURRENT APPEALS AND APPEAL DECISIONS UPDATE

- 55.1 Attention was drawn to the current appeals and appeal decisions update, circulated at Pages No. 112-120. Members were asked to consider the current planning and enforcement appeals received and the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and

Communities appeal decisions issued.

55.2

Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED That the current appeals and appeal decisions update be
NOTED.

The meeting closed at 10:39 am

Appendix 1

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS SHEET

Date: 18 January 2022

The following is a list of the additional representations received since the Planning Committee Agenda was published and includes background papers received up to and including the Monday before the meeting.

A general indication of the content is given but it may be necessary to elaborate at the meeting.

Item No	
5a	<p>21/01243/FUL</p> <p>Land To The East Of High Beeches, Snowhill</p> <p>Snowhill Parish Council is unable to attend Planning Committee to speak and has sent late representations on the application which are hereby attached.</p>
5b	<p>21/00976/OUT</p> <p>Land Off Brook Lane , Twigworth/Down Hatherley</p> <p>Additional Consultation Responses</p> <p>Local Highway Authority - Has undertaken a robust assessment of the planning application. Based on the analysis of the information submitted, the Highway Authority conclude that there would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or a severe impact on congestion. As such there are no justifiable grounds on which an objection could be maintained.</p> <p>Twigworth Parish Council - The Parish Council has submitted a document titled 'Flood Risk in Twigworth - A record of failure'. A copy of the document is attached in full.</p> <p>Updated Five Year Housing Land Supply Position</p> <p>Subsequent to publication of the Agenda it has become apparent that the November 2021 (April 2021 base) five year housing land supply statement had in error included three housing schemes within the Twigworth Strategic Allocation as part of Tewkesbury's supply. In fact, the supply from the Twigworth Strategic Allocation contribute to Gloucester City's needs and therefore must be deducted from Tewkesbury's deliverable supply. This is not an error that had been in previous five year housing land supply statements. This has the effect of reducing the (April 2021 base) five year housing land supply to a 3.83 year supply.</p> <p>Whilst this supply is lower than the 4.39 year quoted in the report (Paragraph 7.6), as set out in the report, the Council does not have a five year housing supply at this time and therefore the tilted balance is already engaged.</p> <p>Officer Update</p> <p>The applicant has asked for additional time to continue discussions with Gloucestershire County Council as Local Education Authority in respect of the requested financial contribution towards education provision. Given the level of provision has not yet been agreed and the uncertainty of the outcome Officers strongly recommend the application is deferred to allow the discussions to conclude.</p> <p>In addition, Paragraph 7.57 of the Committee report sets out the tenure of the affordable housing would be split between affordable rented and shared ownership. The Council's Strategic Housing Enabling Officer highlighted that this was an error in the report and the tenure should be split between social rented and shared ownership, not affordable rented. As such, the affordable housing tenure has not yet been agreed and therefore discussions are also required with the applicant to establish whether an acceptable affordable housing tenure can be secured. Due to this, Officers strongly recommend the application is</p>

deferred to allow time to reach a conclusion on this matter.

Update on All Other Outstanding Matters

At the time of writing the Committee report there were a number of outstanding matters required to be resolved. An update on each, in the order in which they appear in the Committee Report, is provided below:

- Comments from the Local Highway Authority have now been received, see 'Additional Consultation Response' section above.
- The applicant is in the process of preparing a Mineral Resource Assessment. Once this has been submitted this will be reviewed by Gloucestershire County Council in its capacity as Mineral and Waste Planning Authority.
- The Council's Ecological Advisor has reviewed the Briefing Note submitted by the applicant and confirmed that updated survey/information in relation to bats and the potential for roosting features and Great Crested Newts is not required prior to the determination of the application, unless works do not commence before the next bat activity season (May - September).
- The applicant has not submitted calculations of the Biodiversity Net Gain for the proposal. However, should permission be granted, Officers consider it would be reasonable to secure a minimum net gain of 10% biodiversity net gain via a condition.
- The Council's Community and Place Development Officer has confirmed a contribution towards off-site sports provision would not be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
- The Council's Community and Place Development Officer has confirmed a contribution towards off-site community facilities would not be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
- In addition to the planning obligations listed in Paragraph 7.97 of the Committee report the following obligations are also recommended:
 - The provision of a LEAP on-site
 - £54,240 towards a Travel Plan
 - £15,000 towards improvements to the bus stop on the eastern side of the A38 (Bus Stop - stopID glodgjdw)
- In terms of the contribution towards education provision, this matter is still outstanding.

Revised Recommendation

Due to the ongoing discussions in respect of the requested financial contribution towards education provision and the proposed tenure of the affordable housing, both of which are fundamental planning matters, it is strongly recommended that the application is DEFERRED to allow discussions to continue and a conclusion on the outstanding matters reached.

Additional Conditions

If the application were to be permitted a number of additional conditions would be recommended/revised, including those recommended by the Local Highway Authority and the Council's Ecological Advisor.

5c	<p>20/01061/FUL</p> <p>Kimberley, Church End Lane, Twyning</p> <p>Subsequent to publication of the Agenda it has become apparent that the November 2021 (April 2021 base) five year housing land supply statement had in error included three housing schemes within the Twigworth Strategic Allocation as part of Tewkesbury's supply. In fact, the supply from the Twigworth Strategic Allocation contribute to Gloucester City's needs and therefore must be deducted from Tewkesbury's deliverable supply. This is not an error that had been in previous five year housing land supply statements. This has the effect of reducing the (April 2021 base) 5 year housing land supply to a 3.83 year supply.</p> <p>Whilst this supply is lower than the 4.39 quoted in the report (Paragraph 7.16), as set out in the report, the Council does not have a 5 year housing supply at this time and therefore the tilted balance is already engaged. The recommendation to Permit the application in not affected.</p>
5d	<p>20/00089/FUL</p> <p>Phase 1B, East Site, Homelands, Gotherington Lane, Bishops Cleeve</p> <p>Additional update</p> <p>Bishops Cleeve Parish Council removed its objection to the application on 7 January 2022.</p>

Item No. 5a – 21/01243/FUL - Land To The East Of High Beeches, Snowhill

APPLICATION NO 21/01243/FUL: STABLE AT HIGH BEECHES, SNOWHILL - REPRESENTATION

Submitted by [REDACTED] Chair Snowhill Parish

I regret that I am unable to attend the meeting - [REDACTED]. Thank you for the opportunity to present our concerns.

We are not objecting to a stable in the garden of High Beeches.

But we are strongly objecting to the stable in its existing location - next to the boundary wall, on the highest part of the garden - ie in the most prominent location.

As noted in the Development Manager's report, there are 14 objections - this is a large number for such a small village which has less than half the properties owner/occupied full-time.

The key point of the objections is that the stable needs to be moved.

The report refers to the "*Principle of Development*":

- This requires that, quote "*there are no adverse impacts on landscape*" and "*they would not have an adverse effect on the rural character and landscape setting*". We consider **there is an adverse effect**.
- The report also states, quote "*the proposal is considered acceptable*"
We disagree

The report refers to "*Impact on the Landscape and Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty*":

- Quote "*developments are required to conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the landscape*". We consider **the proposal meets neither of these criteria**
- Views to be, quote "*conserved and enhanced*". We consider **the proposal does the opposite**
- It is claimed that the stable is "*logically sited*". We consider that the logical location would be **away from the boundary wall and the road, and say close to the fence on the other side downhill and towards the house**. Perhaps it is logically sited for a summer-house!

A field shelter had been erected in a nearby field close to the road - this was used as a precedent in the application. An enforcement notice was issued and we are pleased to note that this shelter has now been moved to the other side of the field.

Based on the location of the stable, we request that this application is rejected - or, if approved, to be conditional upon moving the stable to a less visible location.

Thank you.

17 December 2021

Item No. 5b – 21/00976/OUT - Land off Brook Lane, Twigworth/Down Hatherley

FLOOD RISK
in
TWIGWORTH

A record of failure

George Sharpley

1

Following increasing local concerns about worsening surface-water threats to properties and the failure of sewerage pumping stations, members of the communities of Down Hatherley and Twigworth met via Zoom on 29th March and again on 5th May 2021 with:

David Hudson, Environment Agency
(Environment Manager, Gloucestershire)

James Blockley, Gloucestershire County Council
(Principal Flood Risk Management Officer)

Sandra Ford, Tewkesbury Borough Council
(Head of Development Services)

Matt Jeynes, Severn Trent Water
(Waste Team Manager Worcestershire & Gloucestershire)

2

At these meetings we presented evidence of surface-water (pluvial) flooding during the winter of 2020/1, especially on the new building sites at

Twigworth Green (Bovis Homes)

and

Yew Tree Farm (Wainhomes)

There follows a summary of the evidence we presented.

3

This map shows both building sites marked in red. The dotted lines show sites with planning applications in process. The blue locates the photograph on the following page.



4

TWIGWORTH GREEN (24 December 2020)



5

Some weeks later, when the floodwater had to some extent cleared, the following photographs were taken from a drone.

The first two pictures show Twigworth Green.

The third page shows the neighbouring Wainhomes site at Yew Tree Farm.

6

TWIGWORTH GREEN (5 February 2021)



TWIGWORTH GREEN (5 February 2021)



YEW TREE FARM (5 February 2021)



9

Contractors and builders were unable to continue their work at Yew Tree Farm for some weeks.

Twigworth Green were also significantly hampered, although by the time this picture was taken the site had been partially drained by several industrial pumps clearing water to the Hatherley Brook.

10

The following map shows the authorities' pluvial flood map, with the building sites marked in red.

This map is used by developers when they submit their Flood Risk Assessments.

11

Pluvial floodrisk map



12

At our meetings with agencies, members of the community pointed out the inaccuracy of this flood map.

It is not the first time the vulnerability of this area to surface-water flooding has been raised with councils and agencies.

It is not the only location where surface-water flood risk is very poorly mapped.

13

On 16th July 2021, in further exchanges following our two meetings, David Hudson of the Environment Agency replied to some of our concerns:

George Sharpley, resident of Twigworth:

“Am I correct to infer that you agree that the official pluvial flood map is not accurate (and therefore not a safe guide for planners)? The evidence is overwhelmingly so, but it needs to be acknowledged by the relevant authorities.”

David Hudson (Environment Agency) in reply:

“They (the flood maps) are, I believe fit for purpose.”

14

On 28th June, after similar email exchanges, James Blockley of Gloucestershire County Council wrote the below about Twigworth Green, despite our sharing video and photographic evidence of the site overwhelmed with flood water, of pumps channelling water off the site, and of properties neighbouring the site experiencing unprecedented water ingress.

“Twigworth Green’s SuDS performance over the winter was not reviewed by the SuDS Engineer; we believe there was no need as there were no flood problems over the winter 2020/2021 that could be attributed to the developments at Twigworth.” James Blockley, Glos Cty Council, 28th June 2021

15

The concerns and the flood evidence of residents of Twigworth and Down Hatherley have been systematically disregarded now for some years.

It is continuing.

16

Tewkesbury Borough Council will soon be making a decision on a planning application for 164 houses, in a field between Brook Lane and Ash Lane, which borders both the Yew Tree Farm and Twigworth Green sites.

This below is from the letter of the statutory consultee on flooding, Gloucestershire County Council's Local Lead Flood Authority (13th Sep 2021):

“Surface water flood mapping indicates the site is not at risk of surface water flooding.” David Lesser, Sustainable Drainage Engineer

A picture of the site follows.

17



December 2020

18

Here is another inaccurate flood map from a recent application for 32 houses at the corner of Down Hatherley Lane and the A38. The flooding shown in the three photographs happens a lot more frequently than 1-in-75 years as shown in the diagram. The flooding of the road (bottom left) apparently last happened just after the reign of William the Conqueror.



19

This house close to Ash Lane is one of a cluster under construction. The blue pipe is transferring water to the drain. Is it any wonder residents were flooded and the pumping station failed when water that would previously sit in the fields is added to the sewers?



January 2021

20

And so it goes on.

The same can be said for sewerage. The Ash Lane pumping station in Down Hatherley failed last year, overwhelmed with flood water, which contributed to an unprecedented level of flooding of houses and properties in the Ash Lane area. It is evidently vulnerable to failure during major rainstorms. The pumping station has received some remedial attention from Severn Trent, but whether it will cope with the huge increase in usage from new developments remains to be seen. Residents believe that the next flood will once again cause it to fail, if it doesn't before. If the JCS allocation is followed through, it will be expected to cope with the sewage of hundreds of additional houses.

Two pumping stations in Twigworth also failed during the flooding last winter. These, to my knowledge, have not had any remedial work, despite being a part of the sewerage route, along with Ash Lane, for new developments.

We brought this to the attention of Severn Trent's Matt Jaynes, including the daily stench emanating from the Twigworth pumping station close to the entrance to Wallsworth. This remains ignored, except of course by residents close by.

21

The poet Ivor Gurney called these fields now under development Gloucestershire's 'water meadows'.

These meadows have for centuries acted as a sponge, holding water, with a very slow discharge.

The failure of people charged with monitoring our flood risk to record accurately the flood potential of these meadows of course puts many of us at risk. The truth is, soon, the sites under construction will indeed be relatively free of flood risk. For the ground will have been raised and covered with tarmac and concrete - with inevitable consequences for others nearby. The counter argument is that the attenuation ponds (SUDS) will compensate so that water run-off represents no greater threat off site than it did before. Of course, it becomes increasingly difficult to check such an assertion, as who has recorded or measured the previous run-off? And the assertion is ever more wobbly when we see the hopelessly inadequate assessments of flood potential before building started.

As those of us living close to these sites see an increasing volume of pluvial flood-water enter our properties, I suspect our official experts will try to pass it off as climate change.

George Sharpley
Twigworth
24th November 2021

22

If you have evidence or comments to add, please contact your parish council:

Twigworth: George Sharpley: [REDACTED]

Down Hatherley: David Evans: [REDACTED]

Also available:

Rainfall Patterns in Twigworth (George Hedley & Neville Cowin, 2021)

Observations on the Hydrology of Twigworth (Professor Ian David Cluckie, FREng, Acad.CAE, FRSA, 2017)

Video: floodwater flowing off Twigworth Green (Chris Weaver, 2021)

Twigworth Flood Threats - The Village Evidence (George Sharpley, 2017)

And how we got into this mess in the first place:

Poor planning leaves flood threat worse for Twigworth (George Sharpley, 2021)