



From: Kevin Brook [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 September 2017 10:55
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: Planning Consultation on: BE/102/17/OUT

Dear Mr Arun Planning Dept

Please see attached the response for the above Planning Consultation from the WSCC Flood Risk Management team.

Kind Regards

Kevin Brook
Flood Risk Management Engineer
Residents' Services – Highways and Transport
West Sussex County Council

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please reply to advise us but you should not read it, copy it, show it to anyone else nor make any other use of its content. West Sussex County Council takes steps to ensure emails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.

**WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT CONSULTATION**

DATE: 6th September 2017

FROM: Kevin Brook

TO: Arun District Council

FAO: Michael Eastham

PLANNING REFERENCE: BE/102/17/OUT

LOCATION: Salt Box Field Land Off Rowan Way Bersted PO22 9NW

RECOMMENDATION:

Advice	☒	Modification	☐	More Information	☐
Objection	☐	No Objection	☒	Refusal	☐

West Sussex County Council (WSSCC), in its capacity as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), has been consulted on the above proposed development in respect of surface water drainage.

The following is the comments of the LLFA relating to surface water drainage and flood risk for the proposed development and any associated observations and advice.

Flood Risk Summary

Modelled surface water flood risk	Low risk
Comments: Current uFMfSW mapping shows that the proposed site is at low risk from surface water flooding. This risk is based on modelled data only and should not be taken as meaning that the site will/will not definitely flood in these events. Any existing surface water flow paths across the site must be maintained or appropriate mitigation strategies proposed. Reason: NPPF paragraph 103 states – ‘When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere..’ Therefore, a wholesale site level rise via the spreading of excavated material should be avoided.	

Modelled ground water flood risk susceptibility	High risk
Comments: The majority of the proposed development is shown to be at ‘high risk’ from ground water flooding based on the current mapping. This risk is based on modelled data only and should not be taken as meaning that the site will/will not definitely flood in these events. Where the intention is to dispose of surface water via infiltration/soakaway, these should be shown to be suitable through an appropriate assessment carried out under the methodology set out in BRE Digest 365 or equivalent. Ground water contamination and Source Protection Zones.	

The potential for ground water contamination within a source protection zone has not been considered by the LLFA. The LPA should consult with the EA if this is considered as risk.

Records of any flooding of the site?

No

Comments:

We do not have any records of historic surface water flooding within the confines of the proposed site although we have records of locations within Shripney and Bersted having been affected by flooding. This should not be taken that this site has never suffered from flooding, only that it has never been reported to the LLFA.

Ordinary watercourses nearby?

Yes

Comments:

Current Ordnance Survey mapping shows ordinary watercourses within the boundary of the site.

Local or field boundary ditches, not shown on Ordnance Survey mapping, may exist around the site. If present these should be maintained and highlighted on future plans.

Works affecting the flow of an ordinary watercourse will require ordinary watercourse consent.

The EA should also be consulted due to the main river adjacent the site.

Future development - Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs)

The FRA for this application proposes that sustainable drainage techniques (permeable paving, swales and attenuation ponds) would be used to control the surface water from this development to Greenfield run-off rates. Infiltration methods should also be explored for the entire site. Should infiltration not be possible the proposed methods would, in principle, meet the requirements of the NPPF and associated guidance documents.

Development should not commence until finalised detailed surface water drainage designs and calculations for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles, for the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage designs should demonstrate that the surface water runoff generated up to and including the 1 in 100 year, plus climate change, critical storm will not exceed the run-off from the current site following the corresponding rainfall event.

Development shall not commence until full details of the maintenance and management of the SuDs system is set out in a site-specific maintenance manual and submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved designs.

Please note that Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 has not yet been implemented and WSCC does not currently expect to act as the SuDS Approval Body (SAB) in this matter.

Kevin Brook
Flood Risk Management Team