

Meeting Note

Client:	Countryside		
Project:	Lotmead, Swindon	Ref:	COUA3000
Venue:	Teams	Date:	07 February 2022
Attending:	<u>Swindon Council</u> Janet Busby [JB]; Richard Bennett [RB] <u>Countryside Sovereign Swindon (CSS)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Emma Geater, Countryside [EGe]- Emma Gillespie, Countryside [EGi]- Paul Greenland, Countryside [PG]- Andrew Cull [ACu]- Simon Mirams, Hydrock [SM]- Nick Jerrom [NJ]- Dave Bathurst, Hydrock [DB]- Laura Eimermann, Turley [LE]- Amy Cooper, Turley [AC]		
Apologies:	Peter Eggleton		
Objective:	Pre-Application – LLFA – Condition 46		

1. Intro –

1.1 AC provided a planning overview as follows:

1.1.1 PPA in place – tight timescales and requirement to submit strategic drainage information for approval before RM approval.

1.1.2 PPA applies a frontloaded approach with pre-apps. The PPA sets 8 week determination target for conditions, allowing for statutory 21 day consultation.

1.2 Hydrock keen to run RB through detail prior to him issuing written response so will setup a one to one call in due course. Meeting to be arranged via JB.

2. Flood level requirement vs. attenuation level –

2.1 SM queried why drainage basins need to be above flood level.

2.2 PG confirmed this would have major deliverability implications as a number land parcels would need to be raised by 3.5m. This is a non-starter as it would involve importing too much material.

2.3 SM referenced the Amazon scheme, noting basins were permitted within flood levels.

2.4 RB expressed a strong view that drainage infrastructure needs to be above flood level. The Amazon scheme was approved in 2012 under different circumstances. The NEV comprises development that has to work around two floodplains, creating islands of development which are shaped by Dorcan and Liden Brooks + River Cole. The NEV is supported by a SuDs Vision.

- 2.5 LLFA wants the basins to be maintenance free and does not want flood levels to back up into the pond.
- 2.6 SM/DB confirmed the team has inherited the scheme and are finding issues upon further assessment of the Stantec model, resulting in 2x additional ponds to be necessary to ensure attenuation above flood level.

3. Drainage strategy -

- 3.1 RB criticised the Surface Water strategy that was shared ahead of the meeting, identifying the large ponds shown within the Green Infrastructure (GI) to be a 'regional approach' which conflicts with National guidance and the Outline drainage principles.
- 3.2 RB made reference to Stantec's FRA Addendum Plan, identifying that the discharge rates for each development parcel on the plan are what has been approved at outline and needs to be adhered to. Large ponds are not part of the approved parameters.
- 3.3 AC confirmed that the Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan identifies 'tertiary attenuation features' (i.e. ponds within the development's GI) indicating that ponds are an agreed feature.
- 3.4 RB strongly emphasised the LLFAs requirement for small ponds and soft features throughout the parcels rather than large ponds.
- 3.5 DB clarified at source measures (e.g. rain gardens) and swales will be applied, recognising the water quality benefits of this approach, however these alone will not provide adequate storage space. Additional ponds will be required within the development parcels.
- 3.6 AC and EG expressed major concerns with this approach. EG raised deliverability issues and difficulty of achieving the approved no of units, community facilities and open space without flexibility around the drainage approach. It will impact the ability for the scheme to deliver the number of units that have been agreed (2,500).
- 3.7 AC highlighted that there are a number of Parameter Plans which the development must accord with, including a Land Use Plan where residential and green infrastructure is identified. The introduction of parcel ponds will present a change to the Parameter Plans.
- 3.8 EG confirmed CSS wish to work with the Council and are highlighting a problem that needs to be resolved collaboratively. Sought advice from JB and need for a planning balance on this matter, noting that the approved parameter plans and LLFA drainage principles seem to conflict.
- 3.9 JB proposed that Hydrock prepare a Technical Note which applies the outline drainage parameters and identifies what conflicts this has on the approved Parameter Parameters.

HYDROCK TO REVIEW SITE WIDE IMPLICATIONS OF OUTLINE DRAINAGE PRINCIPLES. TURLEY TO ASSIST WITH COMPARISON NOTE. SEEK TO ISSUE BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING WITH SBC (23RD) SO THAT THIS CAN BE A KEY DISCUSSION POINT.
- 3.10 RB conceded that some form of pond feature will be needed near the outfall points however, these will not be significant in scale.

- 3.11 PG questioned whether national standards exist that dictate the maximum size of ponds. RB confirmed there is not however SuDs Manual seeks at source and on site measures in preference to 'regional' measures.
- 3.12 PG highlighted that Stantec's document appears to suggest there may need to be variation to the catchment areas to achieve discharge rates.
- 3.13 SM queried if soft and hard measures could be applied to the parcels. RB confirmed mainly soft with permeable paving. Soft features to be as shallow as possible.

4. Urban Creep

- 4.1 DB sought confirmation that consideration of UC is not needed, noting that it had not been applied to the Redland scheme. RB thought 10% had been applied on Redland but will clarify with Emma Chiltern. If 10% is applied, DB noted this will further exacerbate the challenges expressed earlier.

ACTION: RB TO CLARIFY LLFA URBAN CREEP REQUIREMENT OF 10%.

Contact

Amy Cooper
amy.cooper@turley.co.uk