

Amanda Scholes | Receptionist, Department, Arun District Council | Location: Ground Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37736 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737500 ext 37736 | E-mail: amanda.scholes@arun.gov.uk



Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk **Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**



Save the environment - think before you print.

Simon J Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council |

Location: Planning, First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37874 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737874 | E-mail: simon.davis@arun.gov.uk

Arun is a CIL Charging Authority, for more information go to www.arun.gov.uk/cil

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Sarah Burrow <Sarah.Burrow@arun.gov.uk>

Sent: 07 May 2020 09:20

To: Beverley Hunter

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

Subject: RE: SUB PLAN REQUEST - FW: Land North of Lees Yard (AL/21/20/OUT) - (6101275)

Good morning Beverley,

I have just re-run the calculations (I did not save them). I think I may have used the incorrect site area, it is 1.5ha, correct? My Qbar is now coming out at 2.96l/s which is closer to the rate in your report (with a SOIL type of 2). This is the value on the map for the site. If you wish to use a different SOIL value you will have to provide justification for this. I am happy for the discharge rate to be restricted to 2.4l/s as per the Qbar in your report, or if you provide

calculations (with justification) to revise the rate up to 3l/s we will consider that also. We will not consider allowing you to use variable discharge rates for the different storm events (as implied within your report – although this is unclear).

I offer my apologies for the mistake in my consultation and ask that Simon consider it as so:

Engineers Comments Regarding Surface Water Drainage

This department has been reconsulted on the revised drainage strategy. On the basis of my previous comments (below) it seems that the only point which has been addressed has been to increase the proposed rate of discharge to the watercourse. As previously stated, this department will not support a strategy that proposes to discharge surface water to a watercourse without proving that infiltration is not viable.

That said, if infiltration is not viable on the site and restricted discharge is agreed as the appropriate strategy, then we would expect the discharge rate to be no greater than Q_{bar} (or 2l/s if Q_{bar} is less than 2l/s).

All other comments are unchanged.

Please apply standard conditions PCENG2, PCENG3, PCENG4 and ENG1.

Infiltration must be investigated for surface water disposal. No evidence has been submitted to support the statement that the site is not suitable for infiltration. Winter groundwater monitoring and percolation test results will need to be submitted.

Infiltration rates for soakage structures are to be based on percolation tests undertaken in the winter period and at the location and depth of the proposed structures. The percolation tests must be carried out in strict accordance with BRE365, CIRIA R156 or a similar approved method and cater for the 1 in 10 year storm between the invert of the entry pipe to the soakaway and the base of the structure. It must also have provision to ensure there is capacity in the system to contain below ground level the 1 in 100 year event plus 40% on stored volumes, as an allowance for climate change. Adequate freeboard must be provided between the base of the soakaway structure and the highest recorded annual groundwater level identified in that location.

Any SuDS or soakaway design must include a full winter's groundwater monitoring data in order to determine the highest winter groundwater table in support of the design. This will still be required if infiltration is proven to be unviable as the applicant may need to consider the risk of floatation of attenuation features. Supplementary guidance notes are enclosed for information.

It should be noted that there is an area of surface water flood risk to the east of the site, any proposals to develop in this will need to be accompanied by evidence that development will not increase flood risk elsewhere and the risk to the proposed development is reduced, i.e.. Finished floor levels set to appropriate levels above flood levels.

There is a watercourse running to the east of the site, no development should occur within 3m of this. Any proposals to connect to a culverted watercourse will need land drainage consent, which can be sought through us.

~~It should also be noted that the current proposed discharge rate is unacceptable. The justification for a discharge rate of 4.9l/s based on the principles of blockage is insufficient, rates of 2l/s can be achieved.~~

Guidance notes available at: <https://www.arun.gov.uk/surfacewater/>

Drainage Checklist available at: <https://www.arun.gov.uk/download.cfm?doc=docm93jjm4n14646.pdf&ver=14996>
(Should be completed and submitted as part of a DOC application if the application is approved and the requested conditions are applied).

Kind Regards

Sarah Burrow
Engineering Assistant

