

Minutes of a Public meeting of South Hinksey Parish Council *Flood Alleviation Scheme Sub-Committee regarding: Planning Application MW.0028/18: “A flood alleviation scheme to reduce flood risk in Oxford”*

**South Hinksey Village Hall
6.00pm, Friday 18th January 2019**

For the South Hinksey Parish Council *Flood Alleviation Scheme Sub-Committee* (the “Sub Committee”):

*Michael Cochrane (MC), Chairman South Hinksey Parish Council;
Matthew Frohn (MF), SHPC; and
Pat Jones (PJ), SHPC.*

Attending

*Councillor Emily Smith, Vale of White Horse District Council;
Neil Fawcett, on behalf of Layla Moran MP;*

Richard Peacock (Manor Rd); Janet Cochrane (Hinksey Hill); Richard King (St Lawrence Rd); Linda Goodhead (Hinksey Hill); Dudley Goodhead (Hinksey Hill); Maggie Stopard (Barleycott Ln); Stella Campion (Hinksey Hill); David Minns (Manor Rd); Polly Blay (Manor Rd); Linda Bloch (Manor Rd); Hilary Briffett (Isis Court); Martin Lester (St Lawrence Rd); Francis Ledru (Manor Rd); Jo Slater (Manor Rd); Linda Slater (Manor Rd); Matt Wells (Manor Rd); Ian Whitfield (Manor Rd); Chris Jankowicz (Manor Rd); Nick Frearson (Manor Farm); Christine Madsen (St Lawrence Rd); Vicki Nash (Manor Rd); Tom Paul (?) (Manor Rd); Sarah Strawbridge (Manor Rd); Pauline Hartmann.

Agenda

To discuss and receive public feedback on *Planning Application MW.0028/18: “A flood alleviation scheme to reduce flood risk in Oxford”* with an emphasis on the direct impact of the engineering works on the Parish.

1. Introduction
2. The movement of spoil from the site and other traffic movement
3. The placement and management of the Works Area
4. The diversion of the Devil’s Backbone
5. Communications and the Community Infrastructure Levy
6. What can you do?

Minutes

MC called meeting to order at 6.00pm, made introductory comments and explained the agenda. He noted that anybody who wished to speak should limit their comments to 3 minutes.

1. Introduction

PJ gave an introduction to the flood alleviation scheme (the “Scheme”) and the associated planning application. PJ noted that, should the Scheme get planning permission, the engineering works (the “Works”) will surround the village. PJ noted that the Parish Council have complained directly to the EA, as well submitting a written response to the planning consultation, about the most unreasonable impacts of the Works on the Parish.

PJ noted that planning decision could be taken at the March 2019 planning committee although certain statutory bodies have requested further information, so a March consideration is unlikely - although it will be considered eventually.

2. The movement of spoil from the site and other traffic movement

PJ noted that the Works envisage 167 lorries of spoil being moved each day through the South Hinksey A34 junction, exiting the Works site through the gate between Parker Road and the Hinksey Farm track.

PJ noted that access to the A34 from this junction will be extremely difficult and slow for large, loaded trucks. PJ noted that there would be a temporary traffic order limiting A34 speed to 50mph through this stretch. PJ noted that the Sub-Committee have proposed that spoil is moved ideally by rail through the adjacent 'goods yard' line. PJ noted that a second proposal is that a temporary exit to the A34 is created at the point of the recently closed layby just north of South Hinksey junction. A third proposal is that lorries exit the Works area no closer than 100 metres from the closest residential boundary (this equates to an exit close to the mini roundabout). PJ noted that we have also proposed Active Traffic Management. PJ noted that we have requested that any planning approval is conditioned on these mitigating actions.

Public comments:

- Jo Slater asked why an exit to the A34 through Redbridge Hollow at the southernmost point of the works being considered. JS was concerned about the ability of lorries to exit onto the A34 at the SH junction.
- Emily Smith noted that there was a planned exit route at Seacourt Tower at the northern end of the Works, but that she was not sure if this is a spoil exit or simply access for plant and employee transport.
- Ian Whitfield asked how the dust from vehicles would be dealt with.
- Chris Jankowicz also asked why an exit couldn't be made at Redbridge Hollow.
- Nick Frearson (Manor Farm) noted that EA have confirmed to him that they will not be using the farm track.

3. The placement and management of the Works Area

MF introduced topic noting that the planned Works area would be located in the two fields immediately to the north of, and adjacent to the village. MF noted that the site would be used for the storage of plant, site offices and toilets, the movement of vehicles, and the storage of spoil whilst it was allowed to dry out. MF noted that this risked rendering the adjoining gardens unusable for much of the duration of the Works. MF noted that the Sub-Committee had proposed to the EA (and in their response to the planning consultation) that the Works area is moved one field north, to incorporate a field owned by Corpus Christi College, and currently used for grazing. This would require the agreement of Corpus, but if not forthcoming, would require a Compulsory Purchase Order (for temporary usage). MF noted that this would enable a one field 'buffer zone' to stand between the Works area and the village. In the event that this field was not available, MF noted that a second proposal was for an fixed 'buffer zone' of not less than 100 metres between the Works area and adjacent residential boundaries.

Public comments:

- Nick Frearson suggested a 10metre high bund as a site boundary which could be built using spoil.
- Vicki Nash asked if it is known where spoil is being stored whilst it dries, and whether this might increase flood risk for the village.
- Nick Frearson noted that he understood from EA that it is being stored in an area of the site that is above the flood plain.
- David Minns suggested that if spoil is stored 'nearer' the village, this might result in less noise and 'light pollution' impact on the village. A works 'city' will be lit and active 24 hours per day.
- Jo Slater asked why the already 'industrialised' area of the rail yard couldn't be used for the works site.
- Ian Whitfield was concerned to understand how the full length of Parker Road could be prevented from being used as a car park.
- Christine Madsen suggested that we ensure that the Active Traffic Management includes a requirement to ensure that there is no Works vehicles using St Lawrence Road and Manor Road, as well as Parker Road, as a car park.
- Matthew Wells was concerned that EA have not considered the impact on South Hinksey village at all.

4. The diversion of the Devil's Backbone

PJ noted that with the envisaged restrictions at the South Hinksey A34 junction, any further restrictions on the Devil's Backbone footpath have the potential to make the village totally inaccessible. PJ noted that the Devil's Backbone footpath will be diverted from the end of Manor Rd, through the field adjacent to the electricity substation, before rejoining the old path where the 'electric highway' joins it. PJ noted that we have requested that the temporary path is raised, hard standing, and no less useable than the existing Devil's Backbone footpath.

Public comments:

- Linda Slater noted that the Devil's Backbone is the ONLY route in and out of the village for those that do not drive.
- Francis Ledru asked if the Devil's Backbone will be returned to its original position.
- Jo Slater asked if it is possible to reinstate public transport to the village.
- Stella Champion noted that any new bridge must be accessible to bicycles.
- Nick Frearson noted that the planned new bridge over the flood channel will be accessible to vehicles as well bicycles and pedestrians.

5. Communications and the Community Infrastructure Levy

MF noted that SHPC had requested a regular meeting with senior EA project directors for the duration of the Works, and that we would not be satisfied simply with a community liaison officer. MF explained that Jo Emberson-Wines (EA, OFAS Project Director) had indicated verbally that a weekly meeting between them and SHPC was acceptable. MF noted that Jo Emberson-Wines and Richard Harding (EA, Project Manager) had told the Sub-Committee that no detailed logistical plans (on transport, removal of spoil etc) were yet in place, and would not normally be finalised until after the Contractor had been formally appointed (such appointment is imminent). MF noted that the Sub-Committee had requested that SHPC be present at planning meetings between the Contractor and EA to ensure that the Parish's concerns were adequately considered during the detailed planning stage.

MF explained that major development projects (particularly housing developments) attracted a charge on the developer called the Community Infrastructure Levy, which is then used by the local authorities to provide for additional infrastructure projects (often, but not necessarily, associated with the development). MF noted that he was not sure if the Scheme had a CIL levied but that, in their response to the Planning Application, SHPC had requested a share of the CIL and also compensation for the additional cost, work and time to be spent by SHPC in managing the impact of the Works on the Parish.

Public comments:

- Ian Whitfield noted that the contractor may have a lot of power in such discussions.
- Sarah Balaam asked if SHPC knew the size of any CIL.
- Polly Blay asked if other areas (e.g. Kennington) were expecting to receive any CIL payments.
- Jo Slater asked if the local MP (Layla Moran) supported South Hinksey's position.
- Councillor Emily Smith noted that Layla Moran is fully aware of the issue and that she (ES) will provide feedback to Layla Moran on this meeting. ES noted that LM had been invited to three meetings tonight so sent her Chief of Staff to represent her.
- PJ noted that she has spoken to Layla Moran previously on this subject, and that Layla Moran had indicated that she would speak on our behalf to Planning, and would speak on our behalf to the Ministry.
- David Minns asked what Parishioners could we do to help.

6. What can you do?

PJ noted that County Council will decide the application 'on advice'. PJ noted that a second round of consultation opened before Christmas 2018 and closes on January 22nd 2019. PJ noted we have prepared a template letter incorporating a link to the planning consultation WebPortal. MF noted that comments must be submitted over the weekend (before Tuesday 22nd). PJ noted that SHPC's comments have been submitted to Planning already, and also sent directly to relevant County Councillors.

Public comments:

- Ian Whitfield queried the impact on English Heritage within the village. PJ noted that the village only has Grade II buildings.
- Nick Frearson asked why lorries couldn't move at night (e.g. 10pm to 4am) when there will be limited traffic impact on the A34.
- Polly Blay noted that a temporary exit junction on the old layby would only be able to go southbound.
- Pauline Hartman noted that traffic must not restrict access to the burial ground.
- Linda Goodhead noted that if the volume of lorries is reduced, there is the risk that the project takes longer.
- Jo Slater asked if there would be compensation for negative impact property values.
- Polly Blay asked if lorries be extracting spoil for 12 months of the year. MC pointed out that EA only intend to operate the extraction and movement of spoil for 9 months of the year.

MC thanked MF and PJ, as well as all those that had attended and participated. MC closed the meeting at 7.30pm.