

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 06 May 2021 10:53

Subject: Mow Cottage FP/80/21/DOC

Dear Wayne,

We have received these drainage comments which require your attention. Please note that we will not be able to extend the time past the 26th May expiry date so if this is not resolved by then, we will have to refuse to discharge the condition and you would need to resubmit.:

Engineers Comments Regarding Surface Water Drainage

The applicant is proposing that surface water is discharged to the watercourse on the site as infiltration has been found to be unviable. We agree that this is the most appropriate method of surface water disposal, however, the design requires some modification before I can recommend approval.

At present there is no effort made to restrict or slow the discharge rate of surface water to the ditch. It is difficult to discern an appropriate discharge rate due to the history of the site. Technically it is fair to consider the site a brownfield site as a house was formerly located there (before the fire in 2006) and it is assumed that there is existing hard standing on site as the design notes state that "redevelopment of this site will considerably reduce the impermeable areas and run off". However, we have no evidence to substantiate this claim, no historic floor plans, no photos, no previous impermeable area plan and no proposed impermeable area plan. If we consider the site as brownfield then policy indicates that we should expect 50% betterment on the existing discharge rates.

In order to better understand the existing system I would expect the pre-development runoff rate calculations to be provided, even if these are to show that the new design will require no restriction of flow due to the reduction in impermeable area.

In addition, even if no storage is required to attenuate flows before a restricted discharge (i.e. tanks or ponds/basins prior to an orifice or Hydrobrake) then we would still like to see effort made to slow the rate of discharge in other ways. It is suggested that the use of water butts with diverter kits could achieve this to an extent. It is unclear whether a driveway is being introduced for the development, but if so, diverting surface water through lined permeable paving would have the dual benefit of slowing flows and providing water treatment.

In addition to the above comments we would wish to see the following additional details:

1. A sumped manhole provided upstream of the headwall where the pipes connect.
2. If inspection chambers aren't provided on all pipe connections then please include a construction detail drawing for these junctions.
3. A note regarding pipe materials and cover types on inspection chambers/manholes on layout.
4. Please include hard bed, soft bed and top of bank levels on the headwall construction detail drawings.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer
Directorate of Place

T: 01903 737874



E: simon.davis@arun.gov.uk

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

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
www.arun.gov.uk/planning

Arun is a CIL Charging Authority, for more information go to www.arun.gov.uk/cil

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)

