**Objection to planning application MW.0027/22 including Regulation 25 information**

**Email:** [**Matthew.Case@Oxfordshire.gov.uk**](mailto:Matthew.Case@Oxfordshire.gov.uk)

**Dear Matthew Case,**

**I object to the planning application for the channel of OFAS:**

* 85% of the flood-risk reduction comes from maintaining existing defences and new floodwalls and earthworks compared to the destructive, ineffective, and expensive channel.
* The EA has admitted that the scheme is untested on this scale, that the 2018 flow modelling was limited by available computing power and attempts to remedy this have failed.
* Devastating effect on the environment, a minus 1% Biodiversity loss of over 2,000 trees and miles of hedgerow with mitigation offsite not yet secured.
* Loss of irreplaceable Hinksey Meadow and Kennington Pit Local Wildlife and no evidence of exceptional reasons for altering the green belt.
* The scheme should be subject to a public inquiry.
* Unacceptable levels of pollution, impact on traffic, loss of public space and amenity.

I support the questions raised by Hinksey and Osney Environment Group re the Regulation 25 letter:

1. OCC Peer Reviewer to report on whether the comparison process with the no channel option has been even-handed, the impact from the avoidable removal of 10ha from the east floodplain on the effectiveness of flood alleviation and on the safety of the experimental channel following ‘unsuccessful’ modelling reported by the EA.
2. OCC Highways to confirm that, compared to Jacob’s `elegant solution’ for a single off-line bridge, the twin bridges design is optimal.
3. Network Rail to confirm that with the existence of an additional track, the 0.36m water level difference presents no risk to the railway.

**I strongly oppose the channel component of the scheme** and thus the current planning application.

Yours sincerely,

Your Name