

There are no reports of groundwater flooding within the District. Any residual risk of groundwater flooding may be mitigated by raising finished floor levels above ground level and incorporating appropriate flood resilient construction techniques below ground floor level.

Surface water flooding comprises pluvial flooding, and flooding from sewers and highway drains and gullies. Pluvial flooding results from rainfall-generated overland flow, before the runoff enters any watercourse or sewer, or where the sewerage/drainage systems and watercourses are overwhelmed and therefore unable to accept surface water.

The proposed site layout should be designed to ensure that any overland flows may be directed safely across the site without affecting properties.

Sewer flooding can occur when the capacity of the sewer system is overwhelmed by heavy rainfall, becomes blocked or is of inadequate capacity, resulting in flooding of land and/or property.

Recognising the requirements of the NPPF, the EA3, Building Regulations Approved Document H and the Code for Sustainable Homes Technical Guide (Category 4), surface water runoff from the proposed site should demonstrate:

- No increase in existing flow rates discharged to watercourse/public sewer
- The use of SuDS as the preferred method of dealing with surface water
- How runoff up to the 1 in 100 year event plus an allowance for climate change will be dealt with without increasing flood risk elsewhere

SuDS aim to mimic natural drainage and can achieve multiple objectives such as removing pollutants from urban runoff at source, controlling surface water runoff from developments, and ensuring that flood risk is not increased downstream.

The draft National Standards indicate that surface water should be discharged to ground where possible. It may be feasible to infiltrate surface water in the northwest portion of the site. However this would need to be confirmed through soakaway tests at the detailed design stage.

In terms of water quality Table C2 of the draft National Standards indicates that sites within source protection zones 1, 2 or 3 or a principal aquifer require one treatment stage for low hazard run-off, while medium hazard run-off should undergo three treatment stages.

Infiltration is unlikely to be feasible in the east and south portions of the site. The draft National Standards (paragraph A3) indicates that surface water runoff not discharged to the ground must be discharged to a surface water body where possible. Surface water runoff from the east and south portions of the site naturally drain to Spring Brook or its tributaries.

Water Services

Water abstraction boreholes are situated either side of Cur Lane, but these do not represent a significant constraint to development. There are a number of water mains that cross the site and these will have to be accommodated in-situ within any development layout. It may be necessary to reinforce the local water supply network, but this is perfectly feasible and viable.

Foul Water Drainage

The site is clear of any existing adopted or private sewers. Subject to the phasing of development and following improvement works, adequate capacity can be made available at either Redditch Priest Bridge and/or Redditch Spenal sewage treatment works. There may be a need for improvements to the sewerage infrastructure system which the water authorities will have a statutory duty to resolve. The contours of the site suggest that foul water will be discharged via on-site gravity sewers to new pumping stations and pumping mains to a suitable outfall sewer.

Severn Trent Water has welcomed early discussions regarding foul drainage and potable water supply. Further modelling will be undertaken in order to determine current capacity within the existing networks and the timescales for implementing upgrades required in order to accommodate the full extent of the proposed development

Environment Agency

Expect full hydraulic modelling of the watercourses to be undertaken to determine the potential flood risk. The results of this should be included with any future planning application.

We agree with the statement made in Paragraph 3.2.5 of the FRA in that the site is very large whilst the watercourses are of a relatively small size and that there should be more than ample land available in Flood Zone 1 for development once this assessment has been undertaken.

Agree that the alignment of culverted sections of the watercourses should be assessed at an early stage in order to inform the development layout. We would look to opportunities to open up these sections of culverted watercourses wherever possible.

The development of greenfield sites of this size has the potential to significantly increase flood risk elsewhere unless the surface water drainage is managed in a sustainable manner. We support the general approach and principles outlined in Section 4 of the FRA

Infiltration tests will need to be undertaken to see if this is a viable option in the northwest and central areas of the site. If not, the storage volume of just over 500m³ per built hectare of development outlined in the FRA to cater for the 1 in 100 year plus 30% storm seems reasonable at this stage in terms of determining the area of land required for surface water attenuation features.

The top end of the Bow Brook is augmented by flows from a Severn Trent Water Ltd groundwater borehole (18/54/19/0113) near the edge of the proposed development site. The proposed development must not have a negative impact on the flows in any watercourses. Surface water runoff from the site should be controlled and managed such that it brings about hydraulic benefits. Whilst detailed designs will need to be submitted and approved, again given the size of the site, there should be ample room to accommodate the attenuation features as demonstrated in the Indicative Drainage Layout included in Appendix E of the FRA.

A development of this scale is likely to be Schedule 2 EIA development where water quality issues will be of relevance.

The Spring Brook and the other small tributary watercourses form part of the upper Bow Brook catchment. The upper 'section' of the Bow Brook is referenced as water-body GB109054043820 (Bow Brook – source to Letts Mill). This water-body is classified for the purposes of the WFD as having 'Moderate' ecological status. Levels of phosphate and suspended solids are the major concerns and negative influences on the ecology of the water-body. This means that action is needed to improve the quality of the water-body to 'good status' by 2027 – a requirement of the WFD. Furthermore, no development should be permitted if it will result in deterioration in the quality of the water-body.

Where existing watercourse channels within and near to the development site have been straightened, culverted and/or deepened by previous land use (primarily to aid agricultural activities), we would expect to see the watercourse naturalised and 'opened up' as part of the development. Existing headwalls (as shown in photographs and identified in the report) should be modified, 'set back' or removed where possible, to promote improvements in water quality and create habitat.

No development must commence until a satisfactory scheme for disposal of foul drainage that also meets requirements of the WFD has been approved. Our preference would be for sewage to be diverted via the foul sewer system to Severn Trent Water Ltd's treatment works at Spenal, Redditch.

A Bedford-Smith is concerned about the flooding implications of the proposed development. Spill ponds are necessary to hold back storm water. The developer has refused to provide £300,000 to ensure water network is free of blockages.

L Wells asked if flood system will work for 3400 homes. E Baker responded that RBC believes there will be no increased flooding due to development. WCC is responsible for signing off on flood scheme and maintenance.

OPEN FORUM NOTES AT END OF MINUTES

- 10/13/04 **TO CONSIDER PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/228/OUT THE PADDOCKS
ASTWOOD LANE**
8 dwellings proving a mix of 4x2 bed, 2x3 bed 2x4 bed, one of which will be replacement dwelling for the Paddocks.
- RBC Cllr Clayton "called the application in". The application is due to be heard by the Planning Committee on 26 November.
- Chair Williams left the room during Council debate. Cllr Hawker Chaired this section of the meeting.
- After much discussion and deliberation, the Council resolved to support the application on a 4 to 1 vote. Cllr White voted against the motion. Factors influencing the decision included the brownfield nature of the site, its visual impact on the approach to the village, the small number of houses in total and the inclusion in the plan of a significant proportion of small houses. Additional issues include additional pavements, parking and drainage.
- ACTION: The Clerk and Cllr Hawker to draft a response to be posted on the RBC website by 21 October.**

CLERK'S UPDATE

- 10/13/05 During the next 6 month period a mobile unit manned by civilian staff will be intermittently in operation on the B4090.
- 10/13/06 W Poole resigned as a member of the Council. RBC has been notified and the Notice of Vacancy was posted on 17-10-13. Mr S Arthur stated an interest in being co-opted.
- 10/13/07 **Schedule of Correspondence Not Yet Replied To**
RBC: Overview & Scrutiny Review – comments due 31 Oct (emailed to cllrs 2-10-13):
The Council chose not to respond to this consult
- 10/13/08 **Schedule of Correspondence Received** (not otherwise noted)
Prism brochure
- 10/13/09 **Schedule of Correspondence Sent** (not otherwise noted)

PLANNING MATTERS

- 10/13/10 **FOR PARISH COUNCIL CONSIDERATION**
- 10/13/11 **RBC APPROVALS**
- 10/13/12 **RBC REFUSALS**
- 10/13/13 **RBC PENDING**
2013/146/FUL Grove Farm Droitwich Road: Creation of an on-line pool to improve habitat for fish SUPPORT

2013/182/LBC Upper Bean Hall: Extension & conversion of existing garage into habitable accommodation SUPPORT

2013/181/FUL Upper Bean Hall: Extension & conversion of existing garage into habitable accommodation SUPPORT

2013/217/FUL 33 Alcester Road: Two storey side extension and alteration to form new access SUPPORT

2013/228/OUT The Paddocks Astwood Lane: 8 dwellings proving a mix of 4x2 bed, 2x3 bed 2x4 bed, one of which will be replacement dwelling for the Paddocks SUPPORT

2013/228/OUT The Paddocks Astwood Lane: 8 dwellings proving a mix of 4x2 bed, 2x3 bed 2x4 bed, one of which will be replacement dwelling for the Paddocks SUPPORT
- 10/13/14 **APPEALS**

COUNCILLOR REPORTS & Future Agenda Items

- 10/13/15 Mill Lane improvements
10/13/16 2014/15 Budget
10/13/17 Clerk's 2013/14 contract
10/13/18 New member for planning delegation
10/13/19 Speed camera

FINANCIAL MATTERS

- | | | |
|----------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 10/13/20 | Schedule of Invoices/Payments | |
| | Clerk Sept Stipend & Expenses | £409.67 LGA'72 101,11,12 |
| | HMCR Clerk tax | £51.20 LGA'72 101,11,12 |
| | Village Shop grant | £500.00 LGA 72 s137 |
| | WCALC cllr training | £10.000 LGA 72 s111 |
| 10/13/21 | Schedule of Receipts | |
| | Sept Interest | £0.82 |
| | Lengthsman march thru Aug | £1151.85 |

Date and Venue of Next Meeting

- 10/13/22 Council Meeting at 7:30pm on 21 November 2013 at Feckenham Village Hall.

The Meeting closed at 9:00pm.

Signed
Chairman

Date

OPEN FORUM NOTES

- 10/13/23 Chair Hawker stated FPC is merely consulted on planning applications, it has no authority to make decisions on planning applications. She urged parishioners to register personal comments directly with RBC.
- 10/13/24 A Smith, architect and agent for the applicant, gave a short presentation concerning the application and reiterated that additional flooding due to the development is not allowed.
- Mr Smith responded
- 10/13/25 One parishioner was concerned about an approximately 10 meter high hedge bordering the development. He wondered if it no longer met code if the developer would be responsible for the trimming. He also stated there was a covenant on the land in question.
- Mr Smith responded hedge is 12 meters from nearest home and that the covenant does not impede the development.
- 10/13/26 Chair Hawker stated FPC will decide to support or object to the proposal. The application is due in front of the Planning Comm on 26 November.
- 10/13/27 A parishioner stated that 37 years ago a large development for Bradley Green was rejected, thus preserving the village atmosphere of Feckenham. He watched a large development essentially join Blackwell with Barnt Green and is concerned the same could eventually happen at Feckenham.
- 10/13/28 Two parishioners do not believe there is a headwall as shown on the planning proposal. Would like to know how pond will be enlarged. Is also concerned about style of houses not reflecting the rural nature of the site.
- Mr Smith responded that this is an outline application. The details offered are only meant to give a flavour of what might be built. Details about houses would follow in reserve matters.
- 10/13/29 A parishioner thought the application was an excuse to build cheap houses and that the village shop does not denote a sustainable village.
- Mr Smith responded that the shop is one element of sustainability.
- 10/13/30 Some concern over shared drive for properties. As there is no parking on Astwood Lane, parking on site a concern.
- Mr Smith stated the plan for parking will be compliant with RBC regulations.
- 10/13/31 A parishioner was concerned this development is the thin edge of the wedge and there is a duty to be against the development.
- Mr Smith replied only this plan is under consideration. Possible future applications are not at issue.
- 10/13/32 Some concern about keeping the ditch free-flowing.
- Mr Smith stated the site must not flood worse than currently.
- 10/13/33 Sewers are quite low.
- Mr Smith stated there will be 2 foot drains and may use pump if necessary.
- 10/13/34 Water ways altered to make water flow toward Village Green and wall needs to be reinforced to reduce erosion in hill.
- Mr Smith stated this is an issue for detailed planning.
- 10/13/35 Not against if 50% could be affordable homes. The village needs younger people and businesses to create jobs. Drainage is a key problem for the development.
- Mr Smith agreed that the village needs small developments.

- 10/13/36 Another villager stated the village needs young people and thought Yeates' Acre a success.
- 10/13/37 Yeates Farm/Rock Hill Farm is up for grabs. Frontage of Astwood Lane will be developed. Traffic access for 90 car movements a day is an issue. Would like scale of development to match village. Safety concern for children walking to school.
- 10/13/38 NDP not carried through because no development was scheduled for Feckenham. What next?

Chair Hawker reiterated that the point of the meeting was to discuss the current application.

Mr Smith responded the site is zoned for light industry and more traffic if the site were a business rather than homes. Footpath will be extended to ease footfall. Visibility to road will conform with Highways regulations.
- 10/13/39 Cllr Atkins hopes houses will fit in with village atmosphere. Access to site needs to be improved.
- 10/13/40 Cllr Eaton agreed with Cllr Atkins.
- 10/13/41 Chair Hawker stated the site was outside settlement boundary. National Guidelines mention brownfield site within a greenbelt should not have an increased footprint for the buildings.

Mr Smith stated new build in greenbelt is normally inappropriate, however, partial development allowable if not detrimental to the site.
- 10/13/42 RBC Cllr Clayton stated Local Plan #4 will address sites outside of village.
- 10/13/43 A parishioner was concerned about the modern road signs in village.
- 10/13/44 A parishioner wanted to know if the parish will be consulted again.

Mr Smith stated it is good practice to continue consulting.
- 10/13/45 A parishioner was concerned that the nursery school numbers were low; need young people in the village.