

Condition Number	Comments	Designers Response
1	The as-built information and QA checks provided, whilst well detailed, appears to be incomplete and not all the as-built drainage has been provided onto with this planning condition submission. Please review the information provided, specifically the split appendices etc... as it appears that several manholes, runs, and headwalls appear to be missing from the verification information and in some instances, information has been repeated. Eg, HW4, MH 202,-203, S204-205 etc...etc...	remaining datasheets have been provided and updated into the issue 3 report. Instances of repeated datasheets has been removed from the report.
2	The drainage verification report notes that a construction tolerance of 20mm has been deemed as acceptable, when where as-built deviated from the design by 20mm or less, these have not been reviewed further. Unfortunately, due to the very flat nature of the gradients of the proposed pipework, this tolerance becomes unacceptable since a few mm in the fall of the drainage runs can have a adverse impact on the already very "flat" gradient runs. As a result we would advise that the applicant reviews all the as-built drainage information against the design network and were the gradients differ, which occur in several instances S010a to S010, S105 to tank 1,, H10 invert higher than inlet HW09 etc....etc..., that the as-built level information is remodelled hydraulically and updated calculations are provided along with the Designers reviews and summary of actions or conclusions to demonstrate that the as-built elements which have been constructed at flatter grades that the design will not have a negative impact to the drainage proposals or increase the risk of unacceptable flooding.	There is no defined standard for private drainage construction tolerances, so the DCG was used to set a baseline. The use of 20mm was to highlight when deviation was above the 20mm tolerance and it's at this point a design review to the deviated feasibility was checked. This has been stated within the verification report, along with findings/conclusions on the deviation from the data available at the time to confirm the as-built data matches closely the construction pack information. Final information has been processed after receipt of the as-built information.
3	Whilst subject to the separate Ordinary Watercourse Consent it is evident from the as-built information and verification report that the installed headwalls and 1200mm diameter pipe between HW1 and HW2 which form part of the main culver works of the existing ditch appear to fall in the opposite directions to the design proposal. We would advise that this is check through further onsite levels surveys and the Designers review the outcomes of the survey to provide their summary and conclusion on the as-built as a backfall on the existing works.	This has been re-checked on site and a typographic error identified on the as built sheet. This has been updated and included into the issue 3 report.