

Ecology response for condition 9 DC/22/93211 Land to the North and East of Boorley Green, Winchester Road, Botley, SO32 2UA

Discharge of conditions 7 (Levels & Retaining Walls), 8 (Access roads/lighting), 9 (Foul and Surface drainage) and 16 (Central garden spaces for Blocks B, C, D & E) of planning permission F/19/86233 for demolition of existing buildings and dwelling with the construction of a mixed use retail and residential development comprising an A1 retail convenience store and flexible retail floorspace (A1 and A2 Use Class), and 67 residential units (C3 Use Class) with associated access, parking, landscaping, drainage, and ancillary infrastructure including pedestrian and cycle links.

Liz Harrison

7/2/23

I have reviewed the amended SuDS Management and Maintenance Plan (rev B, January 2023). Section 3.6 Driveways & Private Roads has not been changed. It still mentions an **impervious (not allowing fluid to pass through) surface of permeable (allowing liquids or gases to pass through it) paving**, which is a contradiction as I have explained earlier. *Driveways & Private Roads will either be constructed as an impervious surface of permeable block paving macadam surface drained via traditional yard gullies or aco drains discharging into a permeable high-void aggregate sub-base layer beneath. This sub-base allows for filtration of pollutants from the runoff which is then discharged to the main piped network.*

There is also still no information about maintenance of permeable paving in this document as previously requested. In future, please provide a **highlighted** copy so it is clear where changes have been made.

I have reviewed the applicant's brief response to HCC Flood and Water (11/1/23). The email describes the ditch as a man-made feature running from the building through the undergrowth. *The existing site in (is?) relatively steep with a large gabion retaining wall located to the north of the new building areas. Any future overland flow will drain through the gabion wall and into a new land drain fronting the wall, this then outfalls to the existing ditch network.*

This is also still not clear. Overland flows to the north have been addressed by this retained ditch, but there is no additional information given about capacity, or plans shown with maintenance responsibilities as was previously requested.

The LLFA response was: *The design appears to have changed from that agreed previously with the northern discharge rate increased from 5.6l/s to 8.6l/s. The southern discharge rate has been reduced from 5l/s to 2l/s. Although the overall discharge rate is comparable, it is essential that no additional flows are directed to new areas so this needs to be reviewed and amended. It is also noted that the northern catchment connects to the previous phases and it is not clear what capacity is available in that system. Calculations are also required to demonstrate that the drainage still has the*

capacity needed. There appears to be a watercourse on the southern edge of the site which goes beneath Block C and D. This was not referred to in the Flood Risk Assessment and should have been accommodated within the design. It appears to have been ignored and if this is to be removed, consent will be required prior to works commencing. Retrospective consent cannot be provided. Given that overland flows will head towards the development, it is essential that a new ditch or other suitable provision is provided in its place.In addition, *confirmation of maintenance responsibilities for the swales and ditch network surrounding the site need to be identified and these features highlighted on the plans.*

Lisa Malter

Ecologist