

## **SuDs and Foul Water Drainage**

---

We find the planning officer's defence of the lack of information requests slightly puzzling as this application not only took five months to determine but the same planning officer dealt with the earlier withdrawn scheme (09/00612/DET) which was almost identical apart from the inclusion of a private water supply. Therefore this application has been sitting on the case officer's desk with the same foul drainage and SuDs proposals from May 2009 to January 2010, during which time we instigated at least two meetings, instigated numerous telephone conversation and sent emails requesting if additional information was required. Not once was a request for any further information regarding SuDs, Foul drainage or flooding ever requested.

We have now included a detailed SuDs drainage design and a detailed proposal for foul water treatment. This represents further considerable expenditure for my clients for works which we still maintain are not required at this stage, especially if the planning officer has objections in principle for the scheme itself. However we are professionally obligated to advise our clients that this information is now a necessity as it has been re-iterated in the planning officer's response to our initial statement of appeal.

We therefore maintain our earlier stance that this is a matter for Building Standards; however these drainage proposals are included here to demonstrate not just feasibility but detail and will hopefully discharge reasons for refusal 3 & 4.

It should be noted at this stage that after investigations with the Land Registry our client owns lands all the way to the river boundary as shown on the revised ownership plan (Drawing number 0704/LR/01). This extended ownership allows our clients added flexibility in coming to the best drainage solution for this site but does not affect the red line boundary of the application.