

## **Outstanding enquiries raised by the Town Council as a Statutory Consultee that have not been addressed**

Whilst amendments have been made to the planning application, the Town Council notes that the questions raised by the Town Council in our submission of the 7<sup>th</sup> November 2025 have not been addressed and that the Strategic Planning Board's reasons for deferral remain.

The Town Council would refer the Planning Officer and the Strategic Planning Board to our previous submissions of the 9<sup>th</sup> January 2024 and 7<sup>th</sup> November 2025.

For clarity and in summary (full details and reasoning as to why the information is required can be found in our previous submissions) the following information is still outstanding and should be provided before the planning application is determined:

1. Despite the significant change in the volume of the water (41.8% reduction) and the assurance by the Applicant that they would undertake a review the reservoir flood risk in a “wet day scenario” this has not been undertaken.
2. The original RARS Tier 2 screening breach and consequence should be rerun and section 4 of the original options report dealing with the consequences and existing risk of failure should be updated based on the accurate information that is now available.
3. Evidence has been provided that the catchment area is incorrect as detailed in Appendix 1 of the Town Council’s submission of the 7<sup>th</sup> November 2025. No response has been provided by the Applicant. A reduction in the catchment could significantly change the flood modelling. The catchment should be redrawn and the flood and hydraulic study repeated with the amended data.
4. No explanation has been provided by the Applicant in relation to the discrepancies in the overtopping figures in the various reports submitted in support of the application.
5. The overtopping predicted by the flood modelling does not match the historic flood record. The explanation provided is based on factual inaccuracies which we have challenged in our previous submission. The Applicant needs to set out why the modelling is at odds with the historical flood record.
6. The likely risk of the dam failing has not been quantified, despite a member of the Strategic Planning Board asking the Applicant to quantify the risk of the dam failing.
7. In relation to the impact of the dam failure, the Applicant continues to use the wet day scenario figures even though they acknowledge that “the other important factor in evaluation of the potential impact of dam failure on a wet day

(relevant to spillway capacity) is the flood would be happening anyway even with no dam failure.” The Applicant is over exaggerating the risk of the dam failing and the supporting documents should be amended to show the dry day figures of 274 people being impacted and the likely loss of life is 0.12 rather than the use of fluvial as well as reservoir flooding.

8. Ground investigation has still not been carried out despite the Applicant being advised to do so repeatedly. The structure of the dam, level of clay and geotechnical properties of the embankment should be investigated before the planning application is approved. This was specifically requested by the Strategic Planning Board meeting. A fundamental of the scheme according to the Planning Case Officer is that it will “Have the crest in intimate contact with the clay embankment to prevent flow going under the kerb and removal of roots under the kerb which would provide a flowpath.” Without ground investigation, the level of the clay in the embankment is unknown. It is possible that the “crest in intimate contact” will not be achievable.
9. The issue of root decay and potential seepage and internal erosion of the embankment has still not been addressed by the Applicant despite an overwhelming body of publications that highlight the risk of removing trees. These are detailed in our response to the November consultation. The Town Council would ask that this issue is addressed as a matter of urgency.
10. Despite raising concerns about the comparison of existing options in the Jacobs Supplementary which do not accord with the Planning Officer’s own report the comparison of existing options has not been amended.

### **Additional enquiries**

The 2024 Section 10 Inspection Report, at 13.2 *Measures to be taken in the interests of safety under Section 10(3) (c)* stated:

*As a Category B dam retaining a reservoir which poses a risk to life and damage to those living downstream, I recommend that:*

1. *“the input data and methodology for the Jacobs 2019 flood study is reviewed. This shall include the overflow dimensions and levels along with the derivation of the incoming flows to the reservoir during the annual probability of exceedance for 0.01% (1:100), 0.001% (1:1000) and 0.0001% (1:10,000). This recommendation should commence at the earliest opportunity and be completed by 17 January 2025.”*

However, the Hydrology and Modelling Report does not model the 1 in 100 year (1:100 event). The report does not therefore comply with the recommendation of the Section

10 report and requires amendment to include the information requested by the Inspecting Engineer.

### **Amended proposal**

The Town Council welcomes the reduction in the number of trees which will be felled. However, the Town Council is concerned that uncertainty remains over the exact number of trees which will need to be removed and this won't be fully addressed until the detailed design stage. As a minimum, the Applicant has stated that 17 trees will be lost and a further 17 trees are at risk of loss and many of these trees are mature. However, in addition to the 17 trees felled, 59 trees and 10 groups of trees will be impacted. No information is provided as to how many trees are in the groups of trees that will be impacted. 25 Trees will suffer Root Protection Area encroachment and a further 7 trees will have minor Root Protection Area encroachment.

In April 2024 the Cheshire East Arboriculture Officer stated in relation to Root Protection Area Encroachment "It should be noted however that the AIA further states that the majority of the trees associated with the scheme are likely to experience root disturbance as a consequence of the proposals due to the narrowness between the pool and the highway. The impact of any encroachment and the monitoring and implementation of any tree protection measures is uncertain, but given the restricted working area, I remain concerned that further removals will not be avoidable." As the scheme remains largely the same the Town Council remains concerned that further loss of trees will be inevitable.

Friends of Poynton Pool believe that over 100 trees will be removed from the site. The Friends of Poynton Pool alternative scheme would only involve the felling of one tree, and we would refer you to our comments on the merits of the two schemes set out in our previous consultation response of the 7<sup>th</sup> November.

In addition to the loss of trees the complete clearance of the understory will result in a significant loss of vegetation and will include the removal of smaller and multi stemmed trees, particularly holly and hawthorn. The Applicant states that "overall it is recognised that such clearance works would change the character of the embankment." It should be noted that even with the amendments proposed by the Applicant, The Cheshire East Ecology Officer states in their response "I advise that the loss of woodland associated with the proposed development will result in a significant adverse effect upon the LWS."

### **Conclusion**

The Town Council would request that before any determination by the Strategic Planning Board the questions raised, and outlined in summary in this document, are responded to. This information was requested by the Strategic Planning Board meeting:-

“1 To consider and update where necessary any inaccuracies in the submitted data to ensure modelling is accurate;

2 To review the current condition and risks associated with the existing dam wall, and the impact caused by the removal of the trees”

Whilst the Town Council questions remain unanswered the reason for deferral remains.