

From: Paul Cann <Paul.Cann@arun.gov.uk>

Sent: 21 June 2022 09:02

To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>

Cc: Anita Gardner <Anita.Gardner@arun.gov.uk>; Sarah Burrow <Sarah.Burrow@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: M/39/22/DOC Briarfield

Please find enclosed a further response from our consultant in respect to surface water drainage.

Hopefully, the applicant can resolve the outstanding points shortly.

Regards

Paul Cann
Principal Drainage Engineer
Engineering Services

T: 01903 737819

E: paul.cann@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](#)



Item 1 –

For a single house soakaway, we are happy to accept that this could be inspected by a camera from the proposed silt trap manhole, and as such, do not require a dedicated inspection manhole or cover.

Access for inspection is recommended in Section 13.12.1 of C753, (P286), this is not something we would expect on designs for relatively small developments (i.e. single dwellings or small extensions) providing upstream sediment traps are included to reduce the chance of the soakaway silting up, and access for inspection with a camera is possible.

Item 2 –

We are willing to accept that the proposed soakaway forms an infiltration blanket structure, and as a result, base infiltration is permitted on this occasion.

We are currently discussing a formal definition of infiltration blankets in order to avoid any current ambiguity regarding the difference between infiltration blankets and soakaways.

Item 3 and 6 –

Both of these items are points we require on occasion where; obvious trees are present in aerial imagery, but not discussed in the application, and, where possible ground instability issues could occur.

Regarding the trees: we will request this where we identify trees close to SuDS for which the root protection areas are not included on the drawings.

In this case, this request was identified due to the large canopy of the tree located in what appears to be the adjacent garden.



Having discussed this further no statement is required on this site.

In future this information will be requested if further investigations are a recommendation of geotechnical reports included with the application. In addition, there may be some locations where we request this information based on local knowledge, possible issues, and historic mapping.

Please note you will still need to meet any building regulations requirements, including those pertaining to the stability of the building and the drainage systems.

Item 8 –

This is something we do require on this occasion and is needed because we sometimes spot check calculations to ensure rates have been calculated correctly.

As you have stated a simple table containing this information would be acceptable.

In this specific case if this data has not been recorded and cannot be provided, we are willing to accept the results based on your drawing. This decision is informed by the fact the rates closely match with other results in the area, you are making a betterment, and your statement.

Item 1) There is the manufacturer specification for the geocell included within the 'Key Detail' in the Layout Drawing including the unit size. How much more detail is required?

We would prefer if this can be included on the section drawing (to reduce the risk of a contractor purchasing the wrong crates), however, we are willing to accept this as the details is provided.

Item 3) The existing garage is of pre-fabricated construction with only a minimal foundation depth of 250mm, as per investigation, as detailed within the Drainage Design Notes. It was considered that a distance of 3.6 meters from these shallow foundations to a soffit depth of 500mm for the geocellular installation was acceptable. Note that the 'Best Practice' distance to boundaries has been observed, though this may have to be reduced in light of comments above.

Thank you for confirming the garage details. On this basis, providing you are happy that the soakaway is a sufficient distance away, we are happy to accept this approach.

Item 5) This design, in common with many designs, has the invert level of the incoming pipe not marrying up with the molded socket on the geocell. In these instances, the builder generally cuts an access hole in the geocell and pokes the pipe through, taking due consideration of the sealing of the geotextile membrane. The Constructional Drawing will be changed to reflect this and reference to an adaptor will be removed.

No additional comments, thank you for confirming how the system will be sealed and for removing the adaptor.

Item 7) the current Finished Floor Level will be included on the Layout Drawing typically here 180mm above outside ground levels and 110mm above the ground level at the location of the soakaway structure.

Thank you for confirming.

Additional Information

There was reference to recent changes being made to Climate Change Allowances -- currently for this Planning Application at +40%. As this proposal was submitted prior to these changes being made. Please advise me of what the Climate Change Allowance was updated (presumably increased) to.

To confirm, your submission was made prior to the changeover date and as such, we do not expect the new allowance to be used in your revised calculations as part of this DOC, which can continue to use 40%.

The latest climate change allowances for increases in peak rainfall intensity are published at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances> and displayed on the following mapping: <https://environment.data.gov.uk/hydrology/climate-change-allowances/rainfall>

These values differ depending on which catchment you are in so are different across various parts of England. Within Arun DC, the new upper end allowance which is to be applied (45%), instead of the 40% allowance previously accepted,

If additional advice regarding the use of the central or upper end allowances is published by the EA or the team who undertook the study this will supersede the above.

For the record, and I do understand the current workload pressures experienced by Arun DC Engineers, this DoC was validated on 11th April 2022 with a standard 56 day decision period due by 6th June. It sat within Arun DC for these 56 days before a response from consultation was available within the Arun Planning Portal on the 7th June. There was an extension of 14 days requested expiring on the 20th June giving only 14 days for changes and re-consultation. There is currently only 11 days before this expiry date to resolve some issues which are not just drawing errors on our part but some are fundamental changes to current (as I understand them) acceptance standards. If the DoC submission is not approved by the due date of the 20th June then, again, as I understand it the default fallback position of Arun DC planning Department is to refuse the Doc Application. This is surely an undesirable situation for the Applicant.

Please can you discuss this directly with the Planning Case Officer.

Please note that we will not be recommending the discharge of the condition until the revised drawings and calculations have been approved.