

APPLICATION NO: F/YR18/0128/RM**UPDATE**

Consultations: The Town Council have confirmed that following withdrawal of the LLFA objection they are happy to approve the application.

Drainage: The agent has clarified in respect of Para 10.20 that the drainage strategy no longer includes soakaways in rear gardens, it is now proposed that roof drainage will be connected into the permeable carriageway pavement at least 5.0m away from any structures

Pollution Control: A further email to the case officer has been received from the Kings Dyke Nature Reserve highlighting:

'their continued concern over the potential for surface and ground water pollution to negatively impact the water quality within nature reserve's water bodies via impact pathways from the proposed development'. Although KDNR note that the LLFA have now withdrawn their objection, they 're-iterate their previous comments that the ground water is relatively shallow in the area. This can be confirmed by monitoring of the local water table undertaken by Forterra and the ground level of ponds within the nature reserve.'

'It is of great concern that the developer's consultant's latest report (EPS dated 6th July 2018) still does not make reference to the correct water regime within the nature reserve. It references the main lake as the nearest water body, when there are a large number of ponds much closer than this. I can confirm that at no time has anyone accessed the site to inspect these ponds. Accordingly, this latest EPS report still makes no reference to any potential impacts on the water regime within the nature reserve.' Furthermore, we note that the Local Highways Authority maintain their concerns as to the proposed methods of soakaway drainage (email from Rikki Parsons dated 31st July 2018) and as such will not adopt the proposed drainage.

Our major remaining concern is that there is no scheme in place for monitoring of any potential hydrological impacts on the nature reserve and no remedial strategy to address any identified impacts. You stated that there were no conditions attached to the outline planning permission that would allow you to require this under the detailed permission.

However, we note that Condition 6 of the outline permission requires the provision of a scheme to deal with the "contamination of land and/or groundwater" Of particular note, part d) requires "Provision of two full copies of a full completion report confirming the objectives, methods, results and conclusions of all remediation works, together with any requirements for longer-time monitoring and pollutions linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The purpose of the condition is "To control pollution or water in the interests of the environment and public safety in accordance with Policy LP16 of the fenland Local Plan 2014".

As the scheme to satisfy these conditions was withdrawn, this clearly still needs to be satisfied. As one of our concerns is that pollutants from the proposed soakaways will enter the groundwater and find their way into the water bodies within the nature reserve, any scheme submitted cannot be considered as satisfactory unless these potential impacts have been taken into account and a suitable monitoring scheme proposed.'

The comments received on behalf of the KDNR are noted. In response Members are advised that Officers have consistently advised that there is a condition appended to the outline planning application relating to pollution control and monitoring which will need to be satisfied. However officers have reservations as to whether the level of detail required to satisfy this condition will be sufficient from the perspective of KDNR in terms of ongoing monitoring of the pond areas.

The LPA will be guided by colleagues as and when the discharge of conditions submission is received; the original application to discharge conditions was based on the earlier scheme proposals - hence it was withdrawn with the view that a revised submission would be made which related to the alternative layout the developers are now pursuing.

The above matters have no implications in terms of the recommendation as made and accordingly the recommendation remains as one of approval.

Recommendation: APPROVE as per page 163