

Core Policy 42

Flood Risk

The claim is that the proposed site immediately adjacent to Letcombe Brook is "neutral" in terms of flooding. I am unsure how the Vale arrived at this conclusion when it flies in the face of all recent evidence. This village has flooded four times in the past seven years from both surface water and the brook breaking its banks. This has caused damage to many properties and caused an enormous amount of stress to people's lives. I have lived in the village for thirty years and can remember only a few problems prior to 2007. Those floods followed the large scale building up stream in Wantage and caused the most widespread damage to our village and Grove when the brook broke its banks. In order to justify this building programme, assurances were given about flood risk.

An area on the plan map for the southern development (EHAN05B) was previously shown as "undeliverable". One of the given reasons was flooding. I can testify that this piece of land is locally regarded as useless because of the flood risks. Without an explanation this piece of land is now included as part of the South of the village development.

East Hanney is known as an "Island Village" (---ney is Saxon for island). As this would suggest, water drainage has and continues to be a serious concern to the villagers. To build 200 properties up stream is a worry when one adds to that the potential run off from the thousands of houses proposed up stream in Grove and Wantage. Where do the "experts" think the water is going to go? The risk is that it is going to end up in our roads and houses.

The Vale's contention that the South of the village site contains a small risk of flooding is unjustified in the sense the Vale may be able to protect the *site* but leave the rest of us at risk and that applies to any large scale development plan in East Hanney. Vague statements of mitigation through drainage for the site seem to completely miss the point. It's all too easy to say these difficulties will be taken care of but those that make such claims bear neither the consequences nor are held accountable when things go wrong.

The NPPF makes two statements that have been ignored. That the plan should "ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere" and "development should not be permitted if there are reasonably available areas with a lower probability of flooding". No evidence is provided to ensure the first and there are many areas of lower risk and they are not in East Hanney.

I believe the Plan proposed is not consistent with national policy and is unsound. As it stands, in my own words, I think this proposal feels reckless and irresponsible.