5 High Street

West Cowick

DN14 9DZ

8th December 2015

For the attention Anthony Devay

Dear Sir,

PLANNING APPLICATION NO 15/03487/STPLF

Proposed erection of ninety two houses South West Of Goole Road, West Cowick East Riding Of Yorkshire DN14 9TL

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well as my property is adjacent to it. I wish to object strongly to the development of these houses in this location.

**The priority concern is that of increased risk of flooding and inadequate drainage.**

The land lies on an incline towards the first 8 properties on High Street, West Cowick which means this development places our homes at further risk of flooding. This is due to both the dwellings and it’s drainage facility being at an elevated level in regards to our properties. The drainage layout does not indicate any provision for an overflow system; either from the housing plots or the drainage pond.

We do not believe sufficient consideration has been applied to an emergency overflow from the site and from the drainage pond caused by heavy rainfall. There is no indication on the plans to show how the risk of flooding to the existing properties would be mitigated.

The drainage serves to drain the whole area which is hard landscaped with roadways and paths on the development. There are no assurances that the drainage pond can sustain the capacity of run-off required in the event of heavy rainfall. The lack of provision for an outfall from the drainage pond places our properties at an increased risk of flooding.

Currently the proposed site becomes water logged with standing water during high rainfall periods. As current met office and government research highlights higher rainfall over shorter periods is more likely this must be taken into consideration as an essential requirement for planning any development on this site.

Our concerns are exacerbated due to your previous reasons behind the rejection of draft plans for area SNA8/r because of flooding. This development contradicts this ruling and we would advise you that the flooding in recent years has become more prevalent and therefore further examination is needed in respect of flooding.

Should these plans be reviewed and the overflow diverted, downstream on the drainage system, we do not believe (based on current performance) the existing drains along the High Street can accommodate the extra capacity. The extra run-off from the drainage pond and hard landscape will cause flooding at front of our properties instead of at the rear.

In addition, West Cowick is a small settlement adjacent to Snaith where development proposals should be considered very carefully: infilling will ruin the character of the village while estate development will overwhelm it.

The Local plan for Snaith and the proposed major changes have been strongly objected to. As West Cowick and this site are within a mile of Snaith, the same conclusions and objections apply.

In our opinion the most prominent objections being-:

1. The effect of the development on the character of the neighbourhood. This is an unwanted development in West Cowick. Where there is a small need to offer affordable housing to local residents- e.g. local people starting on the property market. This development doesn’t achievethis objective as less than 20% of the properties fit within this remit.
2. This development will increase the size of West Cowick on an excessive scale. There are currently 140 residential dwellings in West Cowick. This development will increase that to 232 an increase of 40%

Please refer to your policy *H7 'housing development in existing villages should meet an identified local need, particular for affordable housing but also to support existing village services. Development should be limited in scale with a preference to previously developed sites, infill plots and conversions’*

1. It would appear that you are changing the Snaith/Cowick boundary to facilitate this development. There are several references in proposals and policies that the boundary should be maintained. I refer to your policy S33 which *states '19.5 hectares [48.2 acres] of land between Snaith and West Cowick, will remain undeveloped to avoid the coalescing of the two settlements and to maintain the individual identity of each'*

*Also within the ‘Draft Local Plan Proposed Major Changes' page 84 you reject development in SNA11 because ‘Development would close the gap between Snaith and West Cowick and lead to coalescence of these settlements'.*

1. The development could adversely affect highway safety or the convenience of road users. There is no provision for improvement in transport links. Either in public transport services or road infrastructure. We have a particular concern in regards to additional vehicles travelling on the A1401 in the direction of Snaith towards Pontefract Road to travel to Selby, the A1, A64 or M62 westbound. The main intersection to these commuter arterial routes is currently serviced by a small roundabout. The existing Newland Bridge diversion system and the consequent increase in traffic at this intersection demonstrates the overburdeningof this local route and the impact it has on the area. We have seen this exacerbated further with an introduction of the temporary and inadequate traffic light management system. The residents of this development, in particular commuters, would use this route regularly causing the breakdown of our transport infrastructure.

*We refer you to the refused planning application no. DC/10/00840/PLF for 5 dwellings in West Cowick on a site less than 130 metres from the proposed development. This was refused on the grounds that quote ‘There is limited practical public service to provide access to the nearest locations where employment and local services can be found. It is therefore considered that there is no policy support for the proposed dwellings. It can also be considered that future occupiers of dwellings on this site would likely to be reliant upon private transport to access facilities, services and place of employment. Given the limited amount of local services, there is no reasonable suggestion that the proposal would help to sustain existing local services in the immediate locality. As a consequence the proposed development is considered to be incompatible with the important core principles of sustainability and accessibility’*

1. School Capacity. We are concerned that both Snaith Primary and Snaith High School do not have the capability for any more pupils. Our local schools will therefore be unable to accommodate the additional childrenresiding on the proposed development.
2. Parking in Snaith Town Centre. Further development will bring greater pressure on the limited parking in the town centre.
3. The Medical Centre is already overburdened and the proposed development of area SNA8 will restrict any future expansion the Practice may have needed to accommodate more patients in the Snaith area.
4. The adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours and the local community, by reason of noise and disturbance. The close proximity and the excessive scale of the development will rescind the quiet and secluded benefits expected from residents living in West Cowick. In addition the proposed playground will inevitable attract youths congregating outside of reasonable child playground playtimes. Disturbing this peace further.

If this applicationis to be decided by councillors, please take this as notice that I and a number of my neighbours would like to speak at the meeting of the committee. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.

I await your detailed response to the nine objections stated above.

Yours faithfully,

Alex Tate