

From:

Simon Davis

Sent:

24 June 2026 14:43

To:

Planning Scanning

Subject:

FW: AL/20/26/PL - Land at West Barn, Norton

From: Kate Chapman

Sent: 24 June 2026 11:11

To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>

Cc: Nathan Turner

Madeleine Cozens

; Louis Weller

Subject: AL/20/26/PL - Land at West Barn, Norton

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Hi Simon

Further to our conversation yesterday, I have been liaising with our drainage consultant and we thought it would be helpful to specifically set out the issues which require further justification and explanation. As such our drainage consultant sets these out below;

*Firstly, the previous drainage comments instructed us to use a Factor of Safety (FoS) off 5.0. Therefore, we updated the hydraulic model accordingly applying a factor of safety of 5. They have now come back and asked for a FoS of 10.0. It would be useful to know why this late change was applied? The New SuDs guidance states that a FoS of 10 is only applied on a site greater than 1000.sq.m where 'Damage to buildings or structures, or major inconvenience (for example, flooding of roads)'. In this instance, any rainfall event exceeding the 1:100+45% Climate Change event will flood in the southernmost parking bays at the site's low end. **The hydraulic model confirms this.** If the flood level breaches the kerb height of the parking bays, any volume of water would flow above ground across soft landscaping towards the site boundary. In our opinion this would be deemed as minor inconvenience and therefore a FoS of 5 is rightly applied.*

Table S3.1 – Factors of safety for use in the hydraulic design of infiltration systems when using the RP 156 (CIRIA) method ^{footnote 13}			
Size of area to be drained	No damage or inconvenience from flooding	Minor inconvenience from flooding	Damage to buildings or structures, or major inconvenience (for example, flooding of roads)
Less than 100m ²	1.5	2	10
100m ² to 1000m ²	1.5	3	10
More than 1000m ²	1.5	5	10

Secondly, Soils Ltd carried out the soakage testing according to BRE 365. It is therefore unclear why the drainage officer assumes the testing does not meet the design standards? We believe it does and therefore a FoS of 5 is applied.

Thirdly, The drainage officer mentions that a coefficient at the base of the soakaway is not allowed. We cannot fathom why this is the case. Immediately upstream of the soakaway feature, we have a filter manhole that ensures sediment and oils are separated and will not enter the soakaway. Upstream of the filter manhole we have a catchpit manhole with a 500mm sump that captures any silt running off the hardstanding areas prior to connecting into the soakaway. The testing performed was at the designed base level and therefore coefficient at base should be applied as represented in our hydraulic calculations.

I would be grateful if these could be passed onto your consultant for comment.

Kind regards

Kate Chapman

Associate
Gillings Planning

