

Thank you for the additional context and for forwarding the agent's response.

Having reviewed the position, including the extant permissions, I agree that the planning balance is altered by the existence of outline permission PL/2022/04974 and reserved matters approval PL/2024/07964, both of which remain capable of implementation until 28 March 2027 and were granted without drainage conditions or requirements for further drainage details.

In light of those fallback permissions, I do not consider there would be reasonable grounds to sustain an objection to the current application solely on the basis that additional drainage information has not been provided beyond that previously required. While current national policy expectations regarding flood risk and drainage have evolved since the outline permission was granted, the applicant retains the ability to implement a materially similar development under the extant consents.

In relation to the specific technical points raised:

1. Design Standard

I acknowledge the consultant's point that Wiltshire Council's published soakaway guidance for a soakaway serving a single dwelling requires design in accordance with BRE365 and sizing to accommodate the 1 in 10 year rainfall event. The guidance differentiates this from developments serving more than one dwelling, where 1 in 100 year standards are applied.

2. Infiltration Design Robustness

The submission includes BRE365 infiltration testing and the consultant has confirmed that a safety factor of 3 has been applied. Whilst there may remain some uncertainty regarding elements of the submitted calculations, I accept that the level of investigation undertaken is broadly proportionate for a single dwelling development.

3. Groundwater Considerations

From a purely technical perspective, I remain of the view that demonstrating adequate separation to maximum seasonal groundwater levels would normally provide greater confidence regarding the long-term performance of an infiltration device. Wiltshire's soakaway guidance also identifies the importance of considering seasonal groundwater variation and recommends a minimum 1m separation distance from maximum groundwater levels.

However, I accept that obtaining definitive confirmation of maximum seasonal groundwater levels is often difficult outside the winter groundwater season and that requiring such evidence in this specific case could be considered disproportionate, particularly when viewed against the fallback position represented by the extant planning permissions.

Given the above, I am content to withdraw the LLFA holding objection. I would recommend that any decision maker remains mindful of the residual uncertainty associated with groundwater levels and infiltration performance, but I do not consider those matters provide a sufficiently robust basis for maintaining an objection in this case when balanced against the existing implementable permissions.

Kind regards

Rohit Singh

Principal Technical Officer Drainage Planning

Weather and Drainage Team

Highways Asset Management and Commissioning