

## Joseph Swift

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 March 2026 08:55  
**To:** Joseph Swift  
**Subject:** DM/26/0073 – Comments on Newly Submitted Drainage Information

**Dear Joseph,**

I hope you are well.

I appreciate that the public consultation period for DM/26/0073 has closed, and I am not seeking to reopen it. I am writing specifically in relation to the recent contractor responses and the new drainage technical note and section drawings submitted by the applicant on 16 March, which were not available during the consultation window.

Having reviewed the material, I wanted to highlight several points that may assist your ongoing assessment, particularly in light of the LLFA's holding objection:

- The applicant confirms that they are unable to provide construction-level drainage drawings, a Construction Method Statement, or full easements at this stage, stating that such information will only be available at later RIBA stages. This appears to leave several of the LLFA's core requirements unresolved.
- The technical note acknowledges that 3m easements are only provided on three sides of the SuDS features, despite the LLFA's request for clear easements around all relevant infrastructure.
- The cross-sections requested by the LLFA have been supplied only in an appendix rather than integrated into the final layout drawings, which makes it difficult to understand how the SuDS interact with finished levels, plot boundaries and the ancient woodland buffer.
- No infiltration testing, groundwater assessment, exceedance flow routing or catchment subdivision has been provided, despite these being fundamental to demonstrating the deliverability and safety of the proposed drainage strategy.
- The applicant's position that a Construction Method Statement cannot be provided until a contractor is appointed leaves unaddressed the LLFA's concerns regarding construction-phase risks to the adjacent watercourse and ancient woodland.

I also noted that the Air Quality Assessment screens out ecological receptors on the basis that none lie within 50m of the site. This appears inconsistent with the submitted drainage drawings, which show an Ancient Woodland Buffer immediately adjacent to the boundary. As dust deposition is a recognised risk to ancient woodland, this may warrant clarification.

Given the sensitivity of the site and the LLFA's outstanding objections, the newly submitted material appears to confirm that several fundamental requirements for a full planning submission remain unresolved. On that basis, it appears that the application does not demonstrate a safe deliverable or policy compliant drainage strategy.

**Kind regards,**

