

Amanda Scholes | Receptionist, Department, [Arun District Council](#) | Location: Ground Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37736 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737500 ext 37736 | E-mail: amanda.scholes@arun.gov.uk



Visit Arun's web site at [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](#)



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Michael Eastham <Michael.Eastham@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 September 2020 17:22
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: BN/84/20/PL - Yapton Road, Barnham - Section 73 Layout

Please upload onto Ocella the email below which is a further consultation response from **ADC Drainage Engineers** to planning application **BN/84/20/PL** regarding Angels Nursery, Yapton Road, Barnham.

Thanks,

Michael

Michael Eastham
Principal Planning Officer,
Planning Department

T: 01903 737772
E: michael.eastham@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk



Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Laura Gibbons [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 September 2020 10:40

[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: BN/84/20/PL - Yapton Road, Barham - Section 73 Layout

Dear Stephen,

Thank you for providing revised details and responses to my comments. A number of my comments have now been closed. However, some require further work. Please see my further comments in *purple* below.

- ~~1. Only 2m is provided between the top of bank of the attenuation basin and the proposed building to the east. This is not acceptable, a minimum of 3m must be provided. Pond has been re-shaped to make it 3m away from the flats and the ditch. Okay.~~
- ~~2. The proposed attenuation tank is too close to the southern watercourse. It must be located 3m away from the top of bank of adjacent ditch. This is to ensure the stability of the ditch during construction of the tank and then maintenance of the tank and ditch. Please note that should you require to alter the ditch (temporary infilling, reprofiling or diversion) during construction of the tank then land drainage consent will be required. The Tank has been moved to be min 3m away from the ditch bank. Okay~~
3. The proposed attenuation tank is offline. This is not suitable due to the risk of siltation in such a structure. Please provide an upstream connection for flush flow. An upstream connection cannot be made due to Southern Water requirements. However, the tank is now designed to be an SDS system with rodding access so that the system can be jetted through. *Please provide construction detail drawing.*
4. Please provide details of the proposed manhole between the basin and tank. See detail on drawing 2113 enclosed. *See comment on calculations.*
- ~~5. The connection between the western and southern ditch appears to have been removed on the latest plan. Please include. The existing culvert has been noted to be removed and ditch reinstated as per the original design. The proposed culvert that was shown on the original design under the turning head is not needed on this layout. Okay.~~
6. The revised plans indicate that further ditch infilling is proposed in the south western corner. This is not acceptable. There also appears to be insufficient room for the land drain. Do you mean the south east corner ? The existing ditch is culverted due to the layout of the flats and the car park and link path. Without changing the parking and flats layout I can't see how we can maintain the existing ditch here. Paul Cann agreed to filling of this ditch as it doesn't serve anything to the east -- the only difference between the consented scheme is the filling in of the ditch is slightly longer -- about 15m longer. *Discussed with Paul Cann, okay to infill. However, new/ revised consent required.*
7. The land drain is shown to connect into the surface water network, prior to the flow control device. This is not acceptable, groundwater flows have not been accounted for in design. Please remove this and revise proposals to be as per the previously approved scheme, i.e. section of ditch in the south western corner to remain and land drain to feed into the head of this. Do you mean the South east corner ? The land drain isn't connected into the new surface water system. The land drain outfalls back into the open ditch as shown on the layout. *Apologies, south eastern corner. The land drain connects against the direction of flow, please correct. The headwall also does not appear to be at the correct location, i.e. it isn't within the ditch.*
- ~~8. Please provide a manhole at the connection from the drainage network to plots 66-68 to the main network. Similarly provide a manhole at the connection from plots 77 and 78. The system is designed in accordance with Sewers for adoption requirements, which allows 2 plots to be connected to the sewer via a Y-branch. Revised layout to ensure only two properties connected via y branch. Okay.~~
9. Please provide a revised impermeable areas plan to enable verification of calculations. Preferably provide this in dwg format to permit paperless review. See enclosed. *Has rain falling on the pond area been included within calcs?*
- ~~10. Why have drainage channels been introduced to lots of driveways? Do the revised plans change levels? To work with the latest site layout and levels. Some drives have a yard gully and some have a channel. Okay.~~
11. Please provide an mdx of the calculations to facilitate review. See enclosed. *Permeable paving area 2 is modelled with a very different invert level to that shown on plan. Please correct. Cellular storage crate has been modelled as 0.8m deep, yet now proposed to be 0.75m. Please revise. It is also unclear how you have modelled the weir arrangement between the two storage devices.*
12. The point of connection from the basin to the ditch appears to have changed. A new land drainage consent, or alterations to the existing will be required. *Noted. Awaited.*
13. It appears that you are proposing on forming a gravel filled trench between the rear of plots 80 and 72. It appears that it is proposed to connect this to the ditch. Land drainage consent will be required for this. Why

are these features being proposed? French drains at low points of back gardens are proposed to improve land drainage in gardens, to prevent saturated topsoil. These are not connected to the surface water system or ditch. *The drain to the rear of 72-80 appears to terminate at the ditch. Please revise the extent or submit land drainage consent.*

14. The maintenance manual will need to be updated once/ if changes to drainage design are agreed. Noted. *Awaited.*

15. ~~Please provide flotation calculations to support the tank design. See enclosed-Okay.~~

16. The trees indicated on the drainage plans do not tally with those shown on the landscaping plans. No trees should be located over/ within the pond or tank area. Proposed trees have been removed from the pond area. *There appears to be a tree proposed near the tank very close to SMH1, please remove. Please confirm if landscaping proposals have been adjusted.*

Kind regards,

On Thu, 17 Sep 2020 at 16:02, Stephen Lamprell [REDACTED] wrote:

Laura,

Thank you for your e-mail below on the latest scheme.

I have responded in red on the attached word doc, and attached relevant drawings and calcs for your approval.

If you feel it is a good idea then we can arrange a meeting on Teams/ Zoom sometime to discuss these points.

Let me know if you have any problems opening any of the files.

Regards,

Stephen Lamprell

Civil Engineer

on behalf of

Gyoury Self

Consulting Engineers

16/17 Boundary Road,

Hove, Sussex.

BN3 4EF.

www.gyouryself.com

[Click here for online email disclaimer](#)

Please consider the environment before printing this e mail

From: Laura Gibbons [REDACTED]

Sent: 15 September 2020 11:35

To: Stephen Lamprell [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: BN/84/20/PL - Yapton Road, Barham - Section 73 Layout

Stephen,

Thank you for your email.

It is my understanding that Redrow have commenced on site. Therefore, we must agree details at this stage prior to determination and my objection will remain until we do. Not doing so would risk drainage being implemented which has not been approved.

I have reviewed the information you have provided and have the following initial comments:

1. Only 2m is provided between the top of bank of the attenuation basin and the proposed building to the east. This is not acceptable, a minimum of 3m must be provided.
2. The proposed attenuation tank is too close to the southern watercourse. It must be located 3m away from the top of bank of adjacent ditch. This is to ensure the stability of the ditch during construction of the tank and then maintenance of the tank and ditch. Please note that should you require to alter the ditch

(temporary infilling, reprofiling or diversion) during construction of the tank then land drainage consent will be required.

3. The proposed attenuation tank is offline. This is not suitable due to the risk of siltation in such a structure. Please provide an upstream connection for flush flow.
4. Please provide details of the proposed manhole between the basin and tank.
5. The connection between the western and southern ditch appears to have been removed on the latest plan. Please include.
6. The revised plans indicate that further ditch infilling is proposed in the south western corner. This is not acceptable. There also appears to be insufficient room for the land drain.
7. The land drain is shown to connect into the surface water network, prior to the flow control device. This is not acceptable, groundwater flows have not been accounted for in design. Please remove this and revise proposals to be as per the previously approved scheme, i.e. section of ditch in the south western corner to remain and land drain to feed into the head of this.
8. Please provide a manole at the connection from the drainage network to plots 66-68 to the main network. Similarly provide a manhole at the connection from plots 77 and 78.
9. Please provide a revised impermeable areas plan to enable verification of calculations. Preferably provide this in dwg format to permit paperless review.
10. Why have drainage channels been introduced to lots of driveways? Do the revised plans change levels?
11. Please provide an mdx of the calculations to facilitate review.
12. The point of connection from the basin to the ditch appears to have changed. A new land drainage consent, or alterations to the existing will be required.
13. It appears that you are proposing on forming a gravel filled trench between the rear of plots 80 and 72. It appears that it is proposed to connect this to the ditch. Land drainage consent will be required for this. Why are these features being proposed?
14. The maintenance manual will need to be updated once/ if changes to drainage design are agreed.
15. Please provide flotation calculations to support the tank design.
16. The trees indicated on the drainage plans do not tally with those shown on the landscaping plans. No trees should be located over/ within the pond or tank area.

Kind regards,

On Mon, 14 Sep 2020 at 10:26, Stephen Lamprell [REDACTED] wrote:

Laura,

In response to the e-mail to the planners that you have sent regarding the drainage for the Section 73 amended layout on this site, we have fully considered the drainage design with the latest layout and still made it work.

I have attached the latest drainage plans, details and calcs, which you can see still complies with the same standards as the approved scheme.

We have maintained the same philosophy as the original but the layout has meant that there are some differences.

Permeable paving is still utilised for shared access roads and parking courts in non-adoptable areas. The only exception to this is the access to plots 1-4 which has to be non-permeable since this is over an existing foul sewer and therefore cannot be a lined permeable paved road since Southern Water would raise an objection.

We now have more storage in the pond and an additional offline attenuation tank. All surface water will still pass through the pond with planting to achieve the SUDS requirements for water quality set out in Ciria 753. As you can see from the microdrainage results we maintain the same flood risk as the original approved scheme.

All dwellings are set back a min 3m from the watercourse, where the watercourse is maintained as an open channel.

In order to progress the planning, I would be grateful if you can remove the objections and condition the detailed design of the drainage, which we can hopefully resolve between us in due course.

Let me know if you require any further information at this stage.

Regards,

Stephen Lamprell

Civil Engineer

on behalf of

Gyoury Self

Consulting Engineers

16/17 Boundary Road,

Hove, Sussex.

BN3 4EF.

www.gyouryself.com

[Click here for online email disclaimer](#)

Please consider the environment before printing this e mail

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by Mimecast Ltd, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).

--

Laura Gibbons

Engineer, Adur & Worthing Councils



Address: Facilities & Technical Services, Worthing Town Hall, Chapel Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN11 1HA



This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please send it back to us, and immediately and permanently delete it. Do not use, copy or disclose the information contained in this message or in any attachment. Whilst every care has been taken to check this e-mail for viruses, it is your responsibility to carry out checks upon receipt.

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by Mimecast Ltd, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).

Laura Gibbons

Engineer, Adur & Worthing Councils



Website: www.adur-worthing.gov.uk

Address: Facilities & Technical Services, Worthing Town Hall, Chapel Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN11 1HA



This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please send it back to us, and immediately and permanently delete it. Do not use, copy or disclose the information contained in this message or in any attachment. Whilst every care has been taken to check this e-mail for viruses, it is your responsibility to carry out checks upon receipt.