[redacted]

Please scan as correspondence with Engineers

[redacted]

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.

[redacted]

My comments in green below;

Paul Cann
Principal Engineer (Drainage)

[redacted]

[redacted]

Hi Anita,

I am awaiting response from Paul Cann on this, I sent it through last week but as you know he still has a backlog.

Kind Regards

Sarah Burrow
Engineering Assistant

[redacted]

Hi Anita,

Further to our response last week to the drainage, we have not yet had any further feedback or a decision, please can you let me know where this currently resides?

Kind regards,

SAVISTA
DESIGN AND BUILD

SHIVANI BHARDWAJ
Technical Coordinator

[redacted].co.uk

3 Woodbrook Crescent, Radford Way
Billericay, Essex CM12 0EQ

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. Any other distribution, use or reproduction without the sender's prior consent is unauthorised and strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify your System Manager or Savista Developments Limited on +44 (0) 1277 655650. Any views expressed in this email message are those of the individual sending the message, except where the sender specifically states them to be the views of Savista Developments Limited. E-mail cannot be guaranteed against corruption and may contain 'viruses'. While Savista Developments Limited have taken every reasonable precaution to minimise risk, please conduct your own appropriate checks as we do not accept liability for errors, omissions or damage caused as a result of this email.

Savista Developments Limited, Registered Office: 2 Kingfisher House, Woodbrook Crescent, Radford Way, Billericay, Essex. CM12 0EQ. Company Registration Number 11677559

[redacted]

Dear Sarah,

As requested, please find attached a drawing register for all drawings forming the drainage submission and a copy of all drawings for completeness.

Yourselves wrote regarding point 11:

"3202 shows a junction – still needs 90 degrees option removed (bad practice to connect at 90 degrees, 45 degrees provides better flow arrangement). Junctions are far more robust than saddles. Sewers for adoption extract enclosed – shows junction. Water companies will allow saddle connections when the pipe being connected to is greater than 300mm diameter and the connecting pipe is less than or equal to 50% of the diameter of the pipe being connected to. Don't think we have this situation? Not a fan of saddles anyway – seen too many fail in the past. Hope this makes sense. SFA text extraction below;

The shown saddle connection for 300mm dia or larger would involve cutting the sewer and applying a saddle con

5. Where the connection is being made to a sewer with a nominal internal diameter of 300 mm

or less, connections should be made using 45o angle, or 90o angle, curved square junctions

(see Figure B.24).

Our response:

Sewers For Adoption shows figure B2.4, as per the attachment in your email), being for pipes of 300mm or less. All drainage within the surface and foul water networks are 225mm diameter or less (yes agree), therefore this detail applies which has been recreated exactly on our drainage detail drawings. The detail we would like to further point out is a single pipe with a preformed inlet (yes agree) and not of a pipe cut to suit with a saddle being fixed to the sewer/drain (yes agree). The discussion on saddles was for Sarah's benefit. As this detail is sufficient for Sewers For adoption, this detail is sufficient for our submission. Sewers for adoption is a design GUIDE for the water industry not for the planning authority. Oblique 45 degree junctions have a far better flow arrangement than a 90 degree curved entry junction. An easy bend is generally used immediately of the oblique junction. As far as I am aware you are not offering any of the system for adoption, so sewers for adoption shouldn't really be applicable in this case?

Just to mention that I am ex-water company (Southern Water) and 45 degree junctions were always the preference over the 90 degree versions for the reason given above.

Note 2 on the drainage plans and 1.2 on the drainage notes drawing state that the drainage is to be in accordance with Sewers for Adoption, meaning all supplementary notes that accompany this detail (and all other details) are to be applied.

Therefore as our detail is exactly as per SFA, the pipe diameters this detail is to be applied to are within the tolerances set out by SFA, our drawings state that the drainage is to be constructed to SFA standards / requirements covering any applicable notes that relate to this detail (and all other details) and the SFA document which the detail and notes have been taken from are used by all statutory sewerage authorities, we look forward to yourselves discharging the drainage conditions relating to this development.

Kind regards,

PAUL LAVERTY | **Civil Engineer**
HND

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

This e-mail and any attachments are strictly confidential and intended solely for the addressee. They may contain information, which is covered by legal, professional or other privilege. If you are not the intended addressee, you must not copy the e-mail or the attachments, or use them for any purpose or disclose their contents to any other person. To do so may be unlawful. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify us as soon as possible and delete the message and attachments from all places in your computer where they are stored. Please be aware that e-mail is not a secure form of communication. Messages sent via this medium may be subject to delays, non-delivery and unauthorised interference. Although we have scanned this e-mail and any attachments for viruses, it is your responsibility to ensure that they are actually virus free. Iesis Structures is a trading name of Iesis Special Structures Limited, a company registered in England and Wales, its registered office is 20 Ironmonger Lane, London, EC2V 8EP and its Company Registration Number is 07301412.

[redacted]

Paul,

Can you please issue me a drawing register for planning so they know what is the latest drawing they can refer to?

I fear this is a delaying tactic as they are pushing for an extension of time as their deadline is this Friday. If you can get this over to me ASAP it would be much appreciated.

Thank you for your continued hard work on resolving the drainage issues.

Kind regards,

SHIVANI BHARDWAJ
Technical Coordinator

[redacted]

3 Woodbrook Crescent, Radford Way
Billericay, Essex CM12 0EQ

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. Any other distribution, use or reproduction without the sender's prior consent is unauthorised and strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify your System Manager or Savista Developments Limited on +44 (0) 1277 655650. Any views expressed in this email message are those of the individual sending the message, except where the sender specifically states them to be the views of Savista Developments Limited. E-mail cannot be guaranteed against corruption and may contain 'viruses'. While Savista Developments Limited have taken every reasonable precaution to minimise risk, please conduct your own appropriate checks as we do not accept liability for errors, omissions or damage caused as a result of this email.

Savista Developments Limited, Registered Office: 2 Kingfisher House, Woodbrook Crescent, Radford Way, Billericay, Essex. CM12 0EQ. Company Registration Number 11677559

Our Privacy policy details how we process and manage your personal data. To view this, please go to :www.savista.co.uk

[redacted]

Hi Shivani

Please see the attached latest comments from our Drainage Engineer. Would you like me to add/substitute the previously submitted details as part of the application? If so can you let me have updated drawing issue sheet confirming the latest drawing numbers and those that have been substituted.

Thanks

Anita

[redacted]

Error! Filename not specified.

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk Save the environment - think before you print.

[redacted]

Hi Anita,

This is the only feedback from Paul (regarding point 11). The others are fine.

"3202 shows a junction – still needs 90 degrees option removed (bad practice to connect at 90 degrees, 45 degrees provides better flow arrangement). Junctions are far more robust than saddles. Sewers for adoption extract enclosed – shows junction. Water companies will allow saddle connections when the pipe being connected to is greater than 300mm diameter and the connecting pipe is less than or equal to 50% of the diameter of the pipe being connected to. Don't think we have this situation? Not a fan of saddles anyway – seen too many fail in the past. Hope this makes sense. SFA text extraction below;

4. The vertical angle between the connecting pipe and the horizontal should be greater than

0o and not more than 60o (see Figure B.24).

5. Where the connection is being made to a sewer with a nominal internal diameter of 300 mm

or less, connections should be made using 45o angle, or 90o angle, curved square junctions

(see Figure B.24).

6. Connections made with junction fittings should be made by cutting the existing pipe,

inserting the junction fitting and jointing with flexible repair couplings or slip couplers.

7. Where the connection is being made to a sewer with a nominal internal diameter greater

than 300 mm:

a) where the diameter of the connecting pipe is greater than half the diameter of the

sewer, the connection of an access point should be constructed; or

b) where the diameter of the connecting pipe is less than or equal to half the

diameter of the sewer, then the connection should be made using a preformed

saddle fitting.

8. Connections made with saddle fittings should be made by cutting and safely removing a

core from the pipe and jointing the saddle fitting to the pipe, in accordance with the

manufacturer's instructions, to ensure a watertight joint. The connecting pipe should not

protrude into the sewer."

Kind Regards

Sarah Burrow

Engineering Assistant

[redacted]

Hi Sarah,

Does this additional info now provide adequate info to allow discharge of the condition?

Thanks

Anita

[redacted]

Error! Filename not specified.

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk Save the environment - think before you print.

[redacted]

Subject: RE: FW: Found Place A/18/20/DOC

Dear Anita,

Please see below our responses to your comments in your email last week. I've attached the relevant drawings that been updated as per our responses which are 5 drawings in total.

11. It is widely considered best practice to design all drainage for a development to the same standard set for all sewerage authorities first, that being Sewers For Adoption (SFA), regardless if the drainage is to be adopted or remain private and any aspects of the design not covered by this standard designed to Document H. SFA states that blind connections are to use a saddle connection as shown by figure B.24 of SFA 7th Ed.. The submitted design follows this philosophy with the saddle connection shown on our drainage details drawing PP-ISS-XX-XX-DR-C-3202, detailed labelled as "Connections to Sewers".

As this connection method is used nationally by all sewer authorities, as outlined by the SFA document which is in affect a national policy, compiled by the Water Research Centre (WRC), please provide us with what overriding legislation or reasons why this method has become invalid.

12. The detail does not need to be site specific for the same reasons that only typical manholes, petrol interceptors, Hydrobrakes etc. are drawn with key information that varies between each unit or group of units provided in table form. The key information specific for each groups of cellular units / soakaway is provided in a summary table on the drainage plan adjacent each soakaway. The drawing has been amended to make these more clear.

The depth of water in the soakaway units for SCS1 -SCS4 in order for the 10yr event is 0.428, 1.036, 0.900, 0.492m. As the crates are 0.4m high with an inlet at its base and midpoint, units SCS1 & SCS4 have been adjusted so the inlet is 0.6m from the base and SCS2 & SCS3 set 1.2m from their base. The notes on the drainage plan listing their key information has been amended accordingly.

19. The diffuser detail has been amended to make this more clear.

23. SFA Type 3 manhole can be constructed using flexible material (SFA figure B.16) or rigid material (SFA figure B.19). To avoid confusion, between the two they are referred to as 3a and 3b respectively. While SFA type 4 manhole is a rectangular chamber, it is for manholes with a maximum depth from cover level to soffit being 1m whereas Type 3 is for a maximum depth of 3m. All manholes that are to be rectangular in shape for this site are more than 1m but not greater than 3m in depth, therefore they are classified as being Type 3 and their reference on the manhole schedule as 3b is correct.

29. A backdrop has been added as requested to flatten the gradient.

If you would like to discuss any of the points above, please feel free to contact myself.

PAUL LAVERTY | **Civil Engineer**
HND





This e-mail and any attachments are strictly confidential and intended solely for the addressee. They may contain information, which is covered by legal, professional or other privilege. If you are not the intended addressee, you must not copy the e-mail or the attachments, or use them for any purpose or disclose their contents to any other person. To do so may be unlawful. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify us as soon as possible and delete the message and attachments from all places in your computer where they are stored. Please be aware that e-mail is not a secure form of communication. Messages sent via this medium may be subject to delays, non-delivery and unauthorised interference. Although we have scanned this e-mail and any attachments for viruses, it is your responsibility to ensure that they are actually virus free. Tesis Structures is a trading name of Tesis Special Structures Limited, a company registered in England and Wales, its registered office is 20 Ironmonger Lane, London, EC2V 8EP and its Company Registration Number is 07301412.

On Thu, 26 Mar 2020 at 16:13, Shivani Bhardwaj <[redacted]ote:

Paul & Tom,

Please see the response from the planner below with regards to the discharge of the planning condition. There are still some items to address, please can you ensure this is done as a priority as we have also been given a timescale to ensure this is done and returned to them.

Kind regards,

SHIVANI BHARDWAJ

Technical Coordinator

[redacted]

3 Woodbrook Crescent, Radford Way
Billericay, Essex CM12 0EQ

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. Any other distribution, use or reproduction without the sender's prior consent is unauthorised and strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify your System Manager or Savista Developments Limited on +44 (0) 1277 655650. Any views expressed in this email message are those of the individual sending the message, except where the sender specifically states them to be the views of Savista Developments Limited. E-mail cannot be guaranteed against corruption and may contain 'viruses'. While Savista Developments Limited have taken every reasonable precaution to minimise risk, please conduct your own appropriate checks as we do not accept liability for errors, omissions or damage caused as a result of this email.

Savista Developments Limited, Registered Office: 2 Kingfisher House, Woodbrook Crescent, Radford Way, Billericay, Essex. CM12 0EQ. Company Registration Number 11677559

Our Privacy policy details how we process and manage your personal data. To view this, please go to :www.savista.co.uk

[redacted]

Hi Shivani,

Please see e-mail below from our Drainage Engineers. I await your comments in due course. The DOC expires next Friday. If we can't agree to discharge by that time then we will need to agree an EOT.

Regards

Anita

[redacted]

Error! Filename not specified.

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk Save the environment - think before you print.

[redacted]

[redacted]

Hi Anita

Sarah and myself have looked at this now and whilst we are happy the applicant has cleared most of the points (and made it easier to assess by highlighting changes on the plans – thank you), the following still require addressing: (I have put my original point followed by their reply in blue and our response in red).

1: We are concerned that the calculations show flooding on every catchment in the 1 in 100 year +40% event. Given the excellent infiltration rates on the site we would be keen to see all surface water kept underground and infiltrating, particularly given that there is not a constraint on space. If the applicant is insistent about allowing flooding in the 1 in 100 year +40%, then they must show that the flood water can be contained on site without detriment to access and the building and show clearly at which points the system will flood. The Source Control output is misleading as the flooded volume is held in the upstream network as shown by the network modelling results with only Network 3 flooding by 0.027m3 during the 100yr event. The Source Control also is not as accurate as the network model results as this does not take into account that the storm water enters the network at different points and therefore does not converge at the infiltrating structure at the same time. For these reasons we have removed the source control results from the submission to avoid confusion and have included the graphs for the infiltration device showing the Volume vs Time and Depth vs Time relationship. The graphs for all infiltration devices are all less than the allowable limit. I note the source control output which as you say is misleading, as it appears to be only modelling the individual crate soakaways as opposed to the whole network and therefore not taking into account the true time of concentration and storage within pipework and manholes. I can confirm that the network simulations show the systems to store the 1 in 100 yr + 40% below ground level, which exception of network 3 where there is minimal above ground flooding, which is not an issue. Therefore, there are no further issues to address on this point.

11: Need a construction detail for an oblique junction. Saddle connection detail added to the construction details, now spread over 2 drawings. There has been some confusion here over what we were asking for, we just wanted a detail for an oblique junction, not a saddle. Oblique being 45 degrees and therefore any reference to 90 degrees to be removed. Saddle connections would not be permitted. Please adjust.

12: Soakaway detail shows pipes at the top of the soakaway, which we agree with. However on the plan the invert levels are the same as the base level, implying that they come in at the base. Please adjust. Infiltration detail is typical with exact levels, dimensions and pipe configuration shown on the

drainage plan. Due to the depth of the inlet(s), the lowest inlet is set to the base of the unit to reduce excavations. In addition to this, there are no negative impacts that will cause flooding or other issues for the site and surrounding area by having the inlets set to the base of the unit. Design has not been amended. The construction drawing should be site specific. Good practice is to make connections at as high a level as possible to allow for some siltation in the soakaway (will avoid causing issues to inflow due to any silt) and prevent most storm events impeding flow into the soakaway, BRE365 states that the 1 in 10 year storm must be stored below the lowest incoming pipe. Please therefore adjust to achieve as higher connections as possible.

19: Please show pipe diameters from diffuser units. Pipe diameter shown on detail. Can't see this on the diffuser detail or the plans.

23: Please make it clear what each of the manhole types are on the key. Manhole types are included in the manhole schedule now included in the submission. Fine, although the manhole schedule does not refer to Type 4, Type 3b instead? Please ensure that the naming is consistent.

29: Fall between S2.07 and pipe to S2.04 is too steep. Please insert a manhole with backdrop at the pipes' connection. Fall is not to steep, gradient left as is. Flow from a 1:5 could interfere/obstruct flow in the carrier drain. A manhole is required with a backdrop to reduce the gradient to something more acceptable.

Kind Regards

Sarah Burrow

Engineering Assistant

&

Paul Cann

Principal Engineer (Drainage)

[redacted]

Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Anita Gardner <Anita.Gardner@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 March 2020 09:35
To: Sarah Burrow <Sarah.Burrow@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: Pound Place A/18/20/DOC
Importance: High

Hi Sarah,

I think you have seen the attached details, just in case you haven't here they are. Can you let me have your comments when you are ready?

Thanks

Anita

[redacted]ad,

Error! Filename not specified.

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk Save the environment - think before you print.

[redacted]

Importance: High

Hi Anita,

Thank you for the response, Sarah Burrows did get this to us on Friday in your absence, please find attached amended drawings and information for her review.


Our Civil engineer did issue this to her last night, but should have sent this directly to yourself, apologies for that.

We have reviewed the comments and attached is:

- a response to each item in the attached letter
- the amended report with revised design including drawings and calculations
- the original email listing the LLFA comments on the submitted

If there are any issues with the PDFS, would like to discuss any of our response or anything else, please feel free to contact myself.

Kind regards,



SHIVANI BHARDWAJ
Techncial Coordinator

[redacted]

3 Woodbrook Crescent, Radford Way
Billericay, Essex CM12 0EQ

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. Any other distribution, use or reproduction without the sender's prior consent is unauthorised and strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify your System Manager or Savista Developments Limited on +44 (0) 1277 655650. Any views expressed in this email message are those of the individual sending the message, except where the sender specifically states them to be the views of Savista Developments Limited. E-mail cannot be guaranteed against corruption and may contain 'viruses'. While Savista Developments Limited have taken every reasonable precaution to minimise risk, please conduct your own appropriate checks as we do not accept liability for errors, omissions or damage caused as a result of this email.

Savista Developments Limited, Registered Office: 2 Kingfisher House, Woodbrook Crescent, Radford Way, Billericay, Essex. CM12 0EQ. Company Registration Number 11677559

Our Privacy policy details how we process and manage your personal data. To view this, please go to :www.savista.co.uk

[redacted]


Dear Shivani,

Please see the Drainage Engineer's comments below. Can you let me have receipt of the additional information as soon as possible ?

Regards

Anita Gardner

[redacted]



Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk Save the environment - think before you print.

[redacted]

Engineers Comments Regarding Surface Water Drainage

At present we are not able to recommend that condition 3 is discharged. Please address the following points, the majority of which will enable a contractor to be able to construct the scheme from the plans with confidence. Points 1 and 2 may influence the nature of the design and require immediate attention if work is due to or has already commenced on site (bearing in mind that this is a pre-commencement condition).

1. We are concerned that the calculations show flooding on every catchment in the 1 in 100 year +40% event. Given the excellent infiltration rates on the site we would be keen to see all surface water kept underground and infiltrating, particularly given that there is not a constraint on space. If the applicant is insistent about allowing flooding in the 1 in 100 year +40%, then they must show that the flood water can be contained on site without detriment to access and the building and show clearly at which points the system will flood.
2. We question why there is no permeable paving to the parking at the south of the site? We would be keen to see this for water treatment.
3. Please check that the impermeable areas correlate between the calculations and the plans.
4. On Drwg3000 the foul and surface water pipes are mis-labelled on the key.
5. Need construction detail drawings for permeable paving.
6. Need construction detail drawings for diffuser units.
7. The ACO Channel construction detail requires dimensions.

8.Need a silt trap detail drawing for the ACO Channel.
9.Need road gully details (these should be trapped).
10. All non-manhole junctions to be oblique.
11. Need a construction detail for an oblique junction.
12. Soakaway detail shows pipes at the top of the soakaway, which we agree with. However on the plan the invert levels are the same as the base level, implying that they come in at the base. Please adjust.
13. Manholes S2.04, S1.04 and S1.3 are assumed to be rectangular brick construction. A detail is shown for the backdrop but no the manhole itself. Please clarify and/or show a detail to illustrate this.
14. Please make it clear that the Catch Pit construction detail is a modification of "Type 2 Manhole" and increase the concrete thickness at the base to 225mm.
15. Remove Class B bedding.
16. Specify when Class Z or Class S should be used (depth of cover) on the detail drawing.
17. Please show cover levels and base levels of permeable paving on the plan.
18. Please show outlet invert level from the diffuser units.
19. Please show pipe diameters from diffuser units.
20. Please show cover levels for all soakaways.
21. Please make it clearer which dimension is the depth for the soakaway (eg "@0.8m depth").
22. Make it clear that all pipes are to connect soffit to soffit.
23. Please make it clear what each of the manhole types are on the key.
24. Amend invert level IL(x) for S4.03(CATCHPIT), this is currently the same as invert level of Soakaway CS4 (zero gradient) – shown on calcs as 11.970.
25. S1.07 IL(x) is 12.4 on drawing but 12.450 on calcs. Please correct.
26. Two manholes are identical (S1.23), it is assumed that one is in fact S1.15 with CL14.670 and IL13.1. Please correct.
27. Junction directly south of S3.12 is not appropriate (all should be oblique). Please insert manhole here.
28. Manhole S1.06 is incorrectly labelled, assumed to be S3.05, please correct.
29. Fall between S2.07 and pipe to S2.04 is too steep. Please insert a manhole with backdrop at the pipes' connection.

Kind Regards

Sarah Burrow

Engineering Assistant

and

Paul Cann

Principal Drainage Engineer

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.
****

http://www.arun.gov.uk
DX 57406 Littlehampton
You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.
****

http://www.arun.gov.uk
DX 57406 Littlehampton
You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.
****