

From:
Sent: 24 January 2023 11:41
To: DCAdmin
Cc: Nick Hirst
Subject: Planning Application 2020/93954 - Attenuation Tank Extras
Attachments: attenuation tank extras.pdf

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning,

Please find attached a personal comment concerning the revised housing development off Lingards Road.

I ask that my personal details are not made public.

Kind regards

As part of the proposal, the applicant would dig up green belt, in order to install an attenuation tank.

From looking at the various plans and submissions, I do not recall seeing any drawings or text making specific mention of what else is needed to facilitate this tank.

Looking at the Code, which provides developers with an understanding of what different water related plans involve/require, I'm seeing a much clearer picture.

It seems, the tank needs to have some form of entrance, for inspection/maintenance.

Are these the four circles shown on the plans?

In addition, the tank would need an air vent, to allow air pressure to be properly maintained.

What this means is the tank would not only see green belt dug up, and the profile of the land changed as a result: the land would look different and be higher than it is now.

It would also mean a vent and manhole(s) being evident too.

The type of tank being proposed will, I understand, also fill with sediment.

That sediment must be removed, which requires a pump.

I see no pump shown on the plans, or vehicular access for the sediment to be taken away.



Is the expectation to use a long hose, from the nearby, on site, turning head?

Or, is there an (as yet unseen) plan to site the pump on green belt too, and allow a vehicle to pull up alongside the tank?

All of what is understood to be required would change the look of the green belt.

All of which would look unnatural and out of place.

I cannot see any argument that ultimately supports these proposals.

There may be others, but I see only three possible over-arching reasons why this proposal has been put forward:

- Preserving the green belt is low on the list of priorities
e.g. it's just grass, who cares?
- It's a foot hold into trying to get the green belt designation removed, for future development plans
e.g. it's been changed already, why not do it again, but this time with houses?
- It achieves more profit than any alternative solutions
e.g. placing the tank on site would cost more, so stick it over there

Whatever the reason(s), I cannot believe they warrant the green belt being disturbed.

It must be preserved.

Just as the designation of green belt means.