**160 Malden Road – LLFA Comments & Designer (MS) Response**

1. The applicant has not fully justified the non-inclusion of rainwater harvesting or provided technical justification as to why blue/green roofs or water butts cannot be incorporated.

Green & brown roofs have already been included throughout the initial drainage strategy (BR1, GR1, GR2) on the proposed roofs of buildings across the site. Rainwater butts have also been added to the SuDS strategy. **SK01A – Appendix I.**

2. The applicant has not added the levels to the drainage drawing.

Actioned, levels added to drainage strategy drawing. **SK01A – Appendix I.**

3. The applicant has not provided the thickness of the substrate that will be used for the green/brown roofs.

Actioned. **Para 5.42.**

4. The applicant has not provided the greenfield or existing runoff rates for the 1 in 1 year rainfall event, 1 in 30 year rainfall event and 1 in 100 year rainfall event. The SuDS Proforma does not include all runoff rates.

Since the site is entirely brownfield, greenfield rates are not required but have been added to the report for transparency, existing brownfield runoff rates have also been included within the report. **Para 5.14 – 5.18.**

5. The applicant has not provided the greenfield or existing runoff volumes for a 6 hour 1 in 100 year event.

As above. **Para 5.14 – 5.18.**

6. The SuDS Proforma does not clearly state the proposed attenuation volumes for the proposed SuDS features.

Actioned, SuDS Proforma updated. **Appendix J.**

7. The applicant has not included any off-site overland exceedance flows to the drainage drawing.

Actioned, exceedance flows added to SuDS drawing. **SK01A – Appendix I.**

8. The calculations provided do not include the full site area.

Actioned, pre-development runoff rates use full site area details, site area details also on SuDS drawing. **Para 5.11 – 5.13, SK01A.**

9. Maintenance tasks and frequencies have not been provided for the geo [1] cellular tank.

Actioned. **Table 6.3.**

10.The name of the maintenance owner has not been provided.

Responsibility to fall to client for time being, scope to be changed to a maintenance company once development is completed, as noted within report. **Para 6.1 & 7.7.**

11.The applicant is yet to acquire consent from Thames Water to discharge into the combined sewer.

Capacity check application submitted to Thames Water, on basis of 2.7 l/s maximum outfall rate – awaiting confirmation but previous correspondence with TW on this site area indicated this should be approved. **Para 5.20.**

12.The applicant has not provided information detailing the management of Health and Safety risks related to the SuDS design.

Added. **Para 5.51.**

13.The applicant as not provided a Flood Risk Emergency Plan detailing any mitigation measures.

A flood risk emergency plan is not required given that the site is not at significant risk of flooding, with only minor surface water flooding in Malden Road. Explained in **para 4.16**.