

Nicola Spencer

From: Tybie House [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 August 2026 15:41
To: Neil Crowther; Planning; Planning.Responses
Subject: A/44/26/PL BRE DG365 testing
Attachments: BRE_Email.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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.

Dear Mr Crowther,

I had hoped to be able to send this along with the independent engineer's review of the recorded testing process, but it was delayed. I therefore apologise for another email on the subject, but hope you agree that the provenance of the source makes this information particularly relevant.

Attached is an email from BRE Group, publisher of BRE Digest 365, which sets out the methodology for infiltration testing.

BRE's conclusion is that **"there shouldn't be a long gap between tests 2 and 3"**. This concurs with both the position we have previously set out and the independent engineering review already provided to ADC.

We therefore ask, again, how the Southern Testing report can properly be relied upon as evidence of infiltration testing undertaken in accordance with BRE 365, given that the recorded testing sequence included a 12-day gap between the second and third fills.

For the avoidance of doubt, I have never purported to write on behalf of anyone other than ourselves. We have expressed concerns about the potential impact upon present and future residents of the development. That is plainly not the same as claiming to represent those residents, and any suggestion that we have done so is expressly denied.

--

Kind regards

Dr Tym Huckin BSc(Hons) FIAP MBCS

Subject: RE: BRE 365

From: BRE Bookshop [REDACTED]

Date: 19/08/2026, 09:30

To: [REDACTED]

Hi Tym,

Your query was forwarded to BRE Bookshop.

I'm afraid that the author of DG365 left BRE some years ago and we have no staff familiar with the publication. Therefore, any answer comes from a reading of the document and is not based on expertise of taking such measurements on site and their use for the design of soakaways.

The key text relevant to your query comes from Section 3.2.2:

3.2.2 Soil infiltration

Site testing for soil infiltration rates should give representative results for the proposed site of the soakaway. This is achieved by the following:

- Excavating a soakage trial pit of sufficient size to represent a section of the soakaway.
- Filling the soakage trial pit several times in quick succession while monitoring the rate of seepage. This procedure will confirm soil moisture conditions typical of the site when the soakaway becomes operative.

And Section 3.2.3 *Rate test*:

Fill the soakage trial pit and allow it to drain three times to near empty. Each time record the water level and time from filling, at intervals sufficiently close to clearly define water level versus time (Figure 1). The filling of the soakage trial pit should be on the same or consecutive days.

I've highlighted the relevant text which indicates that there shouldn't be a long gap between tests 2 and 3.

BRE Bookshop



[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Follow us:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: BRE Group Enquiries [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 August 2026 09:33
To: BRE Bookshop [REDACTED] >
Subject: FW: BRE 365

Hi,

Please can you assist with the enquiry below? I tried Bet Ops first but they asked for it to be passed to you.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Customer Service Advisor
BRE



[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Tybie House [REDACTED] >
Sent: 12 August 2026 17:39
To: BRE Group Enquiries [REDACTED] >

Subject: BRE 365

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)
Hello

Please excuse a direct question, but I'm conducting some background research and wondered if you could clarify something please.

With the infiltration testing requirements of BRE365 stating three consecutive fills of a trial pit, if fills one and two were conducted on day one, would it be deemed compliant if fill three was then carried out after a gap of 12 days?

My understanding is that it would not, as the saturated ground has chance to recover in that time, but would appreciate your comments on this please.

Regards

Dr Tym Huckin BSc(Hons) FIAP MBCS

Privileged and confidential information and/or copyright material may be contained in this e-mail. If you are not the intended addressee you may not copy or deliver it to anyone else or use it in any unauthorised manner. To do so is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this e-mail by mistake, please advise the sender immediately by return e-mail and destroy all copies. Thank you.

Building Research Establishment Ltd, Registered under number 3319324 in England and Wales. VAT Registration No GB 689 9499 27 www.bregroup.com

BRE Global Limited, Registered under number 8961297 in England and Wales. www.breglobal.com

Building Research Establishment and BRE Global are subsidiaries of the BRE Trust.

BRE Trust is a company limited by guarantee, Registered under number 3282856 in England and Wales, and registered as a charity in England (no. 1092193) and in Scotland (no. SC039320). www.bretrust.org.uk

Registered Offices: Bucknalls Lane, Garston, Watford, Hertfordshire WD25 9XX - Travelling to BRE: see www.bregroup.com/contact/directions/
