

Drainage:

The developer continues to alter the application in response to challenges set by MSDC, withdrawing the application just prior to a decision. The previous applications and this new application rely on alerting land that the developer does not own, this includes the solution to deal with the drainage problems. This key information is not presented to the planning committee in the application.

Looking at the updated drainage information required by MSDC in May 2026 reflected in the 3rd (I think) application.

1. The survey only assessed the system directly outside no 48, this is a tiny part of the overall drainage system and not the part where the drainage proposal will cause a problem.
2. From no 48 the existing system runs downhill, to College Road for approximately 300 metres. Heavy (and not so heavy) rainfall regularly overwhelms the system, this is evidenced by water coming out of the drain covers and discharging along the length of Wickham Way (from about No 44) and the resulting stream that run down the surface road. The existing drainage does not have capacity for the current level rain surface water, the result is flooding at the junction with College Road. Note, this is despite regular professional clearing of the drainage system paid for by residents. The three photos below are evidence of the existing system being overwhelmed by a shower on 02/06/26. This is outside of No 48 and No 46, so just downhill from the proposed inlet to the existing system – this is a pretty mild example of the flooding that occurs.



3. There is no footpath along Wickham Way, so it is the pseudo-footpath that floods, forcing pedestrians into the centre of the road that is used by traffic.
4. It is pretty obvious that the existing drainage is already overwhelmed and it has no capacity to cope with this additional targeted discharge.
5. Drainage is a problem for the site (48's garden), presumably caused by the extensive development that the same developer has already undertaken on the same land.
6. The developer wants to fell two mature trees, these trees would assist with the drainage problems at the site. So why kill the trees as they might be beneficial to the application?
7. Page 11: *"The subgrade soil should be profiled to have a fall towards an outlet at the south east of the site with a gradient no flatter than 1:150"*. - this does not state the limits of the grading so the boundary is not stated– if this is up to the boundary of the road then this requires altering land that the developer does not own or have permission to alter, so this cannot be achieved.
8. Page 11: *"A collector box, ...discharge rate to 1l/s"*. – the plans do not show where this will be positioned. What is known is that permission to alter or excavate Wickham Way, including foundation and verges has not been sought by the developer. At a minimum excavation to the road foundation will be required to achieve the connections presented (but not detailed where). So the plan presented is not buildable as no permissions exist. The road dates from circa 1935 and is exceptionally vulnerable to such alterations.
9. The drainage solution requires long term and continuous observation and maintenance; this measure is well beyond what one would expect for a private dwelling. Presumably it won't be long before the need for this special maintenance is lost to history, resulting in consequences for adjacent properties who have no influence over such work and cannot enforce it.
10. It has taken three attempts for the developer and applicant to get to the stage of addressing the problem of drainage. This could imply that they do not believe that drainage is a problem (at least not their problem) and therefore I suggest are unlikely to do the maintenance stated.


46 Wickham Way
RH16 1UQ
03-06-26