

Charlotte Burrows

From: Neil Crowther
Sent: 13 November 2014 16:18
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: BE/121/14 DOC
Attachments: 5626AFD1-E08A-4E34-B218D75FAF16E35D.PDF; Scan - 06-08-2014.pdf; 140134-ED-05a Oldlands Farm Water Vole Report.pdf.pdf; C14443-400 - T2 Attenuation pond - Levels.pdf; C14443-220 T1 Outfall details.pdf

Can you upload this as additional info for BE/121/14/DOC?

Thanks, Neil

[REDACTED]

Sent: 12 November 2014 11:40
To: Neil Crowther
Subject: C14443 RE: Oldlands Farm - Surface Water Drainage Conditions BE/121/14 DOC

Neil,

Hope you are well.

Please find below a response to consultation comments from Thomas Callaway (Coastal and Drainage Engineer).

I trust this now meets the necessary requirements to discharge the relevant conditions. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries.

Kind regards,

Adam





Try out our online tools...

Invaluable resources for planners and developers.

This e-mail message and any attached file is the property of the sender and is sent in confidence to the addressee only. Internet communications are not secure and Quod is not responsible for their abuse by third parties, any alteration or corruption in transmission or for any loss or damage caused by a virus or by any other means.

Quod Limited, company number: 07170163 (England).

Registered Office: Ingeni Building, 17 Broadwick Street, London W1F 0AX

From: Michael Endacott [REDACTED]

Sent: 12 November 2014 11:30
[REDACTED]

Cc: Angie Fenton; Adam Cornish; Sarah Burrows; Mark Graham; Neil Taylor; automate; Paul Graveney

Subject: C14443 RE: Oldlands Farm - Surface Water Drainage Conditions BE/121/14 DOC

Good afternoon Thomas,

Further to your points raised in your email 22 October 2014 (attached for your reference) we would like to offer the following response.

1. The condition report for this project identified the ground as cohesive with a high water table. As such there is no opportunity for direct infiltration. Tanked permeable paving provides only limited benefits in terms of source control, as it is only effective until it reaches the point of saturation, beyond which it becomes ineffective. As such it can sometimes be suitable for small drained areas, such as parking areas for housing developments, but is not generally considered a suitable solution for large areas of run-off as is the case here. The attenuation pond provided is a recognised SuDS component, and achieves the sustainability aim of limiting the impact of the development on the surrounding watercourses. Therefore it is considered to be the appropriate SuDS solution in this case.
2. While we don't believe there is any guidance to support the case for 300mm freeboard. Recent re-modelling of the pond is providing the level of freeboard you would like to see. I attach the latest pond layout for reference.
3. The current requirement is to provide drainage for the curtailed scheme. Any future development will include additional drainage commensurate to that element.
4. We have written confirmation that the central ditch is not required. While we have provided a single sized stone layer to the infill detail as a precaution, the attached letter gives permission from the land owner who has relinquished drainage rights to this ditch so no easement is necessary.
5. Outflow from pond to dry ditch has been angled further to direct flows into the channel.
6. The planning condition does not ask for construction drawings of the details you mention which will be submitted as part of the building control approval process. Drawing 220 attached gives outfall options for the contractor to price, it is likely that a precast outfall will be used. Given the nature of the ground, there will be no liner to the pond.

I trust the above is of assistance and alleviates any concerns you may have. Please feel free to contact me if you need to discuss anything.

Regards,

Michael.

Michael Endacott

BEng(Hons) CEng MStructE

Senior Structural Engineer

