**Meeting with Taylor Wimpey 28.09.23**

Present: Kirsty McCluskey (TW), Simon Devine (TW), Liam Reeves (CWAC Flood Management and Project Officer), Brian Westcott (WPRA), Peter Cocker (WPRA), Jennifer Crew (WPRA)

* Preference of attendees was to have an in person meeting where possible with physical drawings. TW mentioned another meeting will be arranged in the future during the consultation period once the application has been submitted.
* Plans shown which demonstrated the extent of the proposed replan. The proposal is now to replan part of Phase 3 instead of its entirety. 38 plots will be built in this phase as per the planning approved due to build timescales. (Refused plan proposed a full replan of Phase 3)
* Letter drop to take place to inform residents
* Drainage is a big concern for residents. TW advised that calcs will be produced once the layout is fixed. Allowance will be made in revised drainage designs/calcs for the additional plots proposed
* TW have a provisional date from Welsh Water
* Concern raised in regard to levels at the buffer and if water will accumulate at the boundary / flood adjacent residents. TW to review and advise if additional drainage to gardens will be required. TW to look at a “french drain” system if review demonstrates requirement, however TW have highlighted that this would not be allowed to connect to the drainage system. This was confirmed by Liam. (Drain will act as a store)
* Query raised in relation to proposed levels and existing boundary levels. Proposed external levels for the scheme have not been produced yet.
* Previous flooding discussed, TW mentioned that once Phase 3 commences and drainage installed across the site this will allow drainage of Phase 3. Concern raised over permeability once residents move in and increase hard surfacing within gardens.
* Brian has requested that levels to the rear of his property are reviewed (Brian`s property backs onto Phase 2)
* Discussion had in regard to the existing resident / customer buffer options, demonstrated in the attached (this is a new document not raised at the meeting but requested). Summary of pros and cons discussed summarised in the attached.
* Mention of a potential hybrid option where the buffer is in customer ownership but ManCo maintain through access through resident`s gates. TW to look into current options and any other potential options. WPRA to also provide feedback and thoughts on this from residents. TW to speak to ManCo company RMG for their thoughts on this.
* Liam gave example of his property where they have taken an approach similar to Option 02 (Buffer in residents ownership with legal covenant). Liam advised that residents have not removed the buffer from their land. Their boundary to the buffer is a half height close board fence.
* Storey height plan shown which demonstrated that all 2.5 Storey plots have been moved away from the boundary in the replan area, however some still remain in the 38 plot area.
* Request made for the 2.5 storey properties to be removed from the boundary where TW intend to retain the 38 plots. TW advised that this area is to remain as per planning due to timescales not allowing for this to be made part of the replan.
* Jennifer asked if an NMA for just the 2.5 Storey plots in the 38 plot area could be done. TW advised that this would not be possible due to timescales for applications with LPA.
* If shrubs are to be planted as part of buffer, request made for low level native shrubs. Low / self maintaining.
* Density & boundary plans shown which demonstrate the replan at its boundaries to existing residential demonstrates similar DPH (dwelling per hectare) and numbers along boundary. All plots to boundary are detached, required semi (resulting in denser areas) are to the centre of site.
* Comparison of numbers provided, please see table below (Please note this is just for the replan area, which is no longer the entirety of Phase 3)



