



Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex BN17 5LF
Planning General Enquiries
Tel: (01903) 737756 Fax: (01903) 730442
Dx: 57406 Littlehampton
Minicom: 01903 732765
e-mail: planning@arun.gov.uk
website: www.arun.gov.uk/planning

Mr Jeremy Napthine
Salt Earth Ltd
1-4 Holm Oaks
Land Adjacent to Northwood Hc
Burndell Road
BN18 0HR

Your Ref: F/26/17/DOC

Please ask for:

Mrs A Gardner

20 December 2017

Dear Mr Jeremy Napthine

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015
Application for approval of details reserved by condition imposed under planning permission
F/15/16/PL relating to condition No. 3 (SuDS System and No. 4 (Landscaping scheme)
1 - 4 Holm Oaks Land Adj to Northwood House, Burndell Road, Ford

Notification regarding the above application:

Condition Number 3

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 manual is to include (a) details of financial management of the site including arrangements made in the event that the management company (or any subsequent management company) is no longer able to fulfil its duties; and (b) arrangements for the replacement of major components at the end of the manufacturers recommended design life.

Reason: To ensure the efficient maintenance and on-going operation of the SuDS system and to ensure the best practice in line with guidance set out in 'The SuDS Manual' CIRIA publication ref: C753 Chapter 32.

Decision:

Arun District Council have decided to **REFUSE details reserved by condition for the following reasons:**

This condition is refused for the following reasons:

1. Please note that since the properties have been constructed, the comments below are likely to mean that additional construction works are required on site, in order to comply with our requirements. As part of this assessment, I undertook a walkover of the site.
2. It appears that the current surface water drainage design deviates from the originally approved scheme. Also, what exists on site does not correspond to what is shown on the current drawings.
3. The three soakaways shown at the front of the site are not visible. The two at the rear in the rear gardens also do not exist in the positions shown, although there are two manhole covers visible in the rear of plots 1 and 3, which may suggest that their positions have been moved. A channel drain exists where the driveway meets the public highway. The applicant needs to clarify what has been built on site and update the drawings accordingly.
4. Show how the channel drain is connected into the system.
5. The scheme has a fundamental problem in that the proposals/calculations are partly utilising deep soakage and storage. The basis of the original scheme was to rely on shallow

docdeci

soakage/storage due to the high water table (650mm below ground level) and with also the better percolation rates being achieved at shallow depth. Therefore, a large proportion of the storage in the ring soakaways is not unusable in high groundwater conditions and cannot be taken account of in the calculations. If ring soakaways are to be used as a means of providing pipe connectivity/water distribution, then they need to be physically connected to shallow storage, where suitable capacity can be provided, and favourable percolation rates made use of. It should be noted that the potential ring soakaways in the rear of the properties may not have any connection to shallow storage features and are therefore probably unable to accommodate the design storm. The hydraulic calculations will need to reflect the above (they currently do not).

6. An outflow/overflow is shown from the permeable paving. Why is this needed? Has it been built? The original scheme was to solely rely on shallow soakage/storage and therefore this type of connection would not be permitted. If the connection has been made, then it would have been made to the highway drain in Burndell Road. Did WSCC approve this? The notes on the drawing mention it discharging to a channel drain?, whilst item 1.9 of the Ambiantal report refers to a discharge to a ditch? Has the permeable paving been tanked as a result?

7. The percolation rate used in the calculations was the best rate achieved in testing and should not have been used. Either the worst rate or an average would only be permitted. Please note that percolation through the base of ring soakaways should not be taken account of in the hydraulic calculations, not to mention anything deeper than 650mm below ground level. Due to the likely construction of the ring soakaways, this likely rules out the entire ring soakaways soakage potential and needs to be reflected in the calculations .

8. The drawing should clearly indicate the perimeter of the permeable paving (assumed green shaded area) - add key.

9. Indicate finished surface levels for the permeable paving on the drawing, including levels on the channel drain. Has the permeable paving been laid with a flat formation level? - indicate levels on drawing

10. Pipe diameters/invert levels and gradients need to be specified for all pipes.

11. Catchpits required immediately upstream of all soakaway structures.

12. Full construction detail drawings will be required for catchpits/permeable paving/soakaways, including how the soakaways interact with the permeable paving.

13. The hydraulic calculations will need to be resubmitted once the principles of the drainage scheme have been agreed.

14. The management and maintenance manual will need to be finalised once the design has been agreed.

Please do not hesitate to contact the above officer if you require any further assistance.

Yours sincerely



Neil Crowther