

**Attendees:**

Swindon Borough Council	KC – Kim Corps	Head of Planning Services
	JB – Janet Busby	Principal Planning Officer
	PE – Peter Eggleton	Senior Planner
	NK – Nick Kemmet	Affordable Housing
	TP – Tim Price	Highways and Flood Risk
Lead Local Flood Authority	EC – Emma Chilton	
	RB – Richard Bennet	
Cllr	Cllr GS – Gary Summer	
Countryside Sovereign	DD – Darren Dancey	
	EGe – Emma Geater	
	EGi – Emma Gillespie	
	JR – Jo Rushton	
	PG – Paul Greenland	
	AC – Andrew Cull	
	OT – Owen Thornton	
Turley	JR – Jeff Richards	
TFA	DA – Dan Angell	

**Introductions**

DA – Introduction to purpose of the meeting to discuss inconsistencies within the outline planning permission and the need for a holistic, high level discussion on principles.

JF – Introduction on the purpose of the meeting in that the drainage strategy crucially needs to be resolved as the requests from the LLFA have viability and deliverability issues on the scheme. Reinforces the need to work together and that CSS want to work collaboratively with the Council to find a solution. Advises that QC opinion has been sought and CSS can share the written opinion once available. Key elements to be discussed:

- Inconsistencies between the approved FRA Addendum and the outline parameter plans
- Significant implications of the LLFA's requests
- Hydrock strategy is consistent with national policy and broadly in accordance with the FRA Addendum and that an independent review of this strategy by a chartered independent company can be provided.
- Strategy to move forward being submit Hydrock drainage to discharge the condition and if required a 96(a) to regularise the outline consent.

EGe – reinforces the need to collaboratively work together to resolve the issue.

KC – expressed surprise at the fact the drainage strategy which had extensive work done on during outline and was agreed by all parties was now being claimed to be undeliverable. The drainage strategy at outline was factored into the viability.

JR – confirmed the Hydrock strategy is broadly consistent with the outline and this is not moving away from the principles of the outline consent [example being in accordance with the GI parameter plan], however details within the outline are inconsistent with each other and this is coming out at detailed RM stage. This discussion and strategy is not to move away from outline principles, simple regularise inconsistencies.

KC – expresses concern from LPA POV if LLFA have concerns on the Hydrock scheme. Queries if there have been discussions with the EA.

PG – confirms that information has been shared but has passed back to LLFA by the EA.

KC – stated that it was a challenge during the outline stage to get EA on board with the development proposals and the EA asked for specific conditions which are referenced on the decision notice. Confirms that any changes being proposed to the EA requested condition will need consultation with the EA.

PG – reinforces that principles which the EA requested are not being changes. Modelling of the flood restoration works is required and CSS are currently doing the modelling and there are no concerns surrounding this. However, end of line storage is required on this site which the LLFA are objecting to.

RB – expressed concern about the significant flooding in the area and this site is building between floodplains and despite the restoration works, there is a natural flow route through the site which still form some connection to the floodplain. Expressed surprise at Hydrock promoting this scheme. Confirmed the purpose of SuDS vision is:

- In accordance with national guidance, SuDS Manuals and supplementary planning guidance
- Move away from traditional pipe and gully system due to maintenance problems associated
- Looking for shallow features not end of line storage
- Existing ditches and drainage routes are expected to be maintained
- Increased on plot drainage, i.e. shallow ponds and features which don't require land raising
- Details to be provided regardless of planning status, i.e. outline, RM, full all need to be treated the same
- Regional solution is not in line with emerging CIRIA guidance and current national guidance

KC – confirmed that the outline was approved as it had allowance for plot storage however the strategy for regional ponds surcharged against flood levels is a move away

RB – Confirmed maintenance issues of regional ponds are:

- ground water and silt issues in ponds.
- Maintenance liabilities.
- Shallow features are easier to maintain.

EC – confirmed that swales have been approved along highways on other scheme she has been working on. Under drain swales are only required when sufficient space for the swale hasn't been allowed for, if sufficient space is provided then there is no need for an under drain swale.

DA – reinforced that negotiations are often needed during an application and its key to remember that the FRA Addendum is inconsistent with the parameter plans and we need to focus on a holistic approach which everyone agrees on.

KC – suggested that an independent review is unnecessary as fundamental concerns are being raised by LLFA on principles. Questioned the need for land raising and by how much.

PG – confirmed 3m land raising.

EC – confirmed that the LLFA are expecting features to be above flood zone level.

PG – maintenance liability, we need to concern customers. Not saying no to swales, but just need to allow storage at end of line as its essential. And not have to lift it.

JF – Phase 1 parameter plan shows a drainage features on the GI plan which

EG – in accordance with national policy

PG – do not want flooding. SPD and guidance promotes end of line approach – biodiversity, landscape, AONB, green corridors to have features.

EC – not against regional features. Understand this will be required. Minimising the regional feature and having it as dual feature for biodiversity.

PG – lose NDA with storage on plot.

EC – main concern is that we are too reliant on the end of line ponds. Phase 1 is still a huge amount of water discharging into 1 pond. Maximising on plot attenuation before going to end of line. Happy to do workshop.

EG1 – suggest roundtable workshop.

GS – workshop collaborative way forward. Big flooding issues in the area and LLFA/LPA aware of this. Numerous flood events. Concerns at outline on the NEV due to flooding. EC/RB have the local knowledge.

PG – need flexibility. Storage below flood level needs to be agreed. Highways promoting gully for road safety. Combination of features needed.

KC – site-wide condition is key on this site due to flood restoration works. Infrastructure that's required early is in etc. KC asks JB/PE for mechanisms on changes.

PE – roundtable solution promoted. What is being suggested will not meet outline details, not just condition 46 but also 41. Not non-material in any way shape or form. EA need to agree to the condition changing. Local flood action group required. Must be a S73. Reserve position until discussions with LLFA. EA only lifted objection with the FRA Addendum. Land doesn't need to be raised as per LLFA objection. Can't deal with the CADC and Phasing plans. Need to consult on the changed FRA addendum so can't be NMA.

JR – QC advice is that it can be 96(a). Need to avoid S73 to avoid delay the delivery of homes.

PG – the FRA Addendum allows flexibility, might not require a new FRA Addendum, might just be an amended interpretation. Flood modelling is being done and can be delivered in terms of parameter plans. Level of storage and invert of pipe key things to discuss at roundtable.

PE – a matter for LLFA and Hydrock to discuss. Planners not needed in the room.

TP – asks when QC will be available. JR – end of week.

JB – requests EA correspondence.

PG – Questions land raising.

EC – still believe land raising is not required with storage above. Need to know implications of lifting above flood zone level. Will provide dates when they are available. JR/JB to help arrange.