

Having reviewed the documentation provided we **do not recommend discharge of conditions at this time**. Points that are agreed are in green and have been included for completeness. The remaining 2 points are yet to be agreed.

To agree the outstanding points we request a copy of the letter (cited in the response), and confirmation regarding the installation of the membrane.

- 1) We would agree that Odyssey are independent and point 1 is therefore an issue for the planners to agree. *Notwithstanding this, any deviation from the approved condition would need to be approved with the planner (we would be happy for deviation in relation to point 1 only), as previously stated this change would not extend in any way to permitting contractors or the developer to verify any elements of the scheme or design.*
- 2) The letter is from the contractor, not Odyssey. As Odyssey have not verified the contents of the letter are consistent with the 'as constructed scheme', we would need to accept the contractor's word (detailed in the letter) for some elements of the scheme. We disagree that this would have required Odyssey to have been present at all stages of construction and included a non-exhaustive list of examples of how this could be achieved by Odyssey, now that construction has been completed.
- 3) The only evidence that this may have been completed correctly is the letter from the contractor. We require the construction of the tank to be verified before we are able to discharge the verification condition. This is particularly important as incorrect installation could have a significant impact on the stability and function of the drainage system. The photographs do suggest that (at one point in time) the liner was installed incorrectly, contrary to the contractor's letter.
- 4) *The letter submitted detailing all of the drawings refers to YAP-180-31 REV C4, however, the submitted planning drawing is Revision C5. The applicant will need to confirm which drawing the contractor was working off and confirm that the scheme was not constructed to an earlier design.*

Understood – an explanation for this discrepancy has been provided and this point is now agreed.

- 5) *We also acknowledge significant differences in the levels for the base of the permeable surfacing, and appreciate the revised calculations showing that this will only result in minor flooding in one area of the site. This is noted to occur, but is not significant enough to warrant remediation as the volumes are small and flooding only occurs infrequently (based on the model results).*