

23 February 2021

55 Fitzroy Park

Comments on London borough of Camden LLFA Commentary of 27 November 2020

This is quite a useful and fairly comprehensive schedule, which was produced before the recent percolation test. It does pick up on the key points we have raised previously in relation to the drainage and more recently reiterated in our email to FPRA following the percolation test. It doesn't pick up on the impact of the drainage on the existing trees or tree roots which is not surprising as it is focused on the technical aspects of the drainage proposals. In summary, it has identified eight requirements which can be broadly summarised as follows:

- 1) The need for infiltration tests. Previously the LLFA referenced BRE 365 tests, so it will be interesting to see how they respond to what has now been provided.
- 2) Provide an updated drainage plan. The LFFA have identified that the infiltration trench is nearer than 5m from the road, so does not meet the Building Regulations (Part h). They have asked for a robust justification of this. They also ask that the developer demonstrates how cross contamination can be prevented.
- 3) The LLFA ask the applicant to demonstrate that there will be no more water entering the heath.
- 4) The LFFA ask the applicant to demonstrate that the theoretical storage won't be reduced if the groundwater rises (as the trench isn't above the ground water)
- 5) Provide confirmation from Thames Water (TW) that there is capacity in the combined sewer in Fitzroy Park for the proposed flows from site.
- 6) Clarify the proposed maintenance of the new pumped foul drainage.
- 7) Provide correspondence from TW regarding acceptance of the new pump chamber.
- 8) Provide details of management of flood risk during construction to avoid contamination.

It is clear from the schedule that the LLFA don't consider that the applicant has met their requirements and at the end of each section there are a set of actions for the applicant, largely the provision of more information, which we broadly agree with. However, at the end of the document, whilst it recommends that further information is required, it only asks for the site investigations and infiltration rate now. It says that all of the remaining information (10 items are separately listed) can be subject to 'an appropriately worded condition placed on the permission for the consideration of the surface water drainage strategy during detailed design'. They suggest this remaining information would be provided prior to construction.

We do not consider that this approach is appropriate for this application, on such a sensitive site. The issues that we have raised regarding the drainage proposals and in particular the quality of information provided, which the LLFA have also highlighted in the schedule, are absolutely fundamental to the overall scheme. Whilst it may be possible to defer some minor detail aspects and cover these under conditions, issues such as the location of the infiltration trench right on the boundary and whether this has adequate capacity (particularly given the level of the standing water in the recent borehole), whether Thames Water will accept any of the proposals for the foul as well as surface water drainage and the risk of contaminating the ponds should not be deferred. These are all matters which Camden should ask the applicant to properly resolve to the LFFA's satisfaction now.