

# Examination of Carlisle District Local Plan

Matter 2 Issue 1&2 ; Matter 3 Issue 1&2

Rep. reference number 043 - Mr & Mrs Ingham

Strategic Vision & SP 2 Strategic Growth & Distribution – Policy H01 & R5.

## Flooding

The aftermath of the December 2015 floods in Carlisle reinforces one of the central points of our submission in April. Carlisle's strategic infrastructure is not resilient enough to cope with the existing level of development in the City, let alone the future major expansion being proposed.

As stated in our April submission "much of the essential infrastructure supporting Carlisle is at, or near capacity, and unless major investment takes place Carlisle will be a much less pleasant place in which to live." Post floods, we are now even more pessimistic about the future of the City if the proposed level of development contained in the Local Plan is permitted to go ahead.

Even if the flood barriers are strengthened, this will not prevent the existing highway and foul sewers from backing up again and flooding much of the central and Warwick Road area. Furthermore given Carlisle's position, dissected by 3 major rivers it will always be vulnerable to future flooding. Various national politicians have stated "lessons must be learnt". If this is not to be seen as simply empty rhetoric, the Local Plan should be amended to reflect the new reality, that the 1 in a 100 year floods have already happened twice in a decade.

Whilst as a whole, site R15 off Hillhead wasn't flooded by the beck, much of the north western part of the site was under water for many days and in fact was covered in standing water for most of December and early January. As United Utilities and the Environment Agency acknowledge "there are potential drainage issues on the site". No doubt the developer will contend that a scheme can be designed to drain the site, but the off site problems will remain. The highway drain and sewer in Scotby are at capacity, already overflowing on Scotby Road in times of heavy rain before causing further backing up in the City. In light of this and previous information, we contend that site R16 is not appropriate for development.

Good planning aims to prevent land use problems arising, we can only hope by highlighting these issues now future problems can be avoided, rather than be exacerbated.

David & Judith Ingham