



**PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
LAND NORTH OF SEFTER ROAD. BOGNOR REGIS**

**DRAINAGE STRATEGY
& SUDS STATEMENT-**

FEBRUARY 2020

Document Control Sheet

Project name: Land north of Sefter Road, Bognor Regis

Project ref: WSC/E47775

Report Title Drainage Strategy &
SuDS Statement

Doc. ref: TRS/E4775/17633

Date: 27th February 2020

	Name	Position	Signature	Date
Prepared by:	Terry Seymour	Director		February 2020
Reviewed by:	Tim Killingback	Principal Engineer		February 2020
Approved by:	Terry Seymour	Director		February 2020

Revision	Date	Description	Prepared	Approved

Contents

1.0	Introduction.....	2
2.0	Existing Site	3
	<i>Geotechnical</i>	4
	<i>Ground Conditions</i>	5
	<i>Hydrology</i>	5
	<i>Hydrogeology</i>	6
3.0	Flood Risk and Existing Surface Water Drainage	6
	<i>Existing Site Drainage</i>	7
4.0	Surface Water Management.....	7
	<i>Design Principles</i>	7
	<i>Sustainable Drainage Systems</i>	7
	<i>Surface Water Drainage Strategy</i>	8
	<i>Flow Control</i>	8
	<i>Water Quality</i>	9
	<i>Long Term Maintenance</i>	12
	<i>Exceedance</i>	12
5.0	Foul Drainage	12
6.0	Conclusion.....	13

Figures

Figure 1: Site Location.....	3
Figure 2: Site Topography.....	4
Figure 3: Extract of Flood Map from the EA's website.....	5

Appendices

Appendix A	Topographic Survey
Appendix B	Geotechnical Information (Extract)
Appendix C	Proposed Site Layout
Appendix D	Existing Drainage Regime
Appendix E	Proposed Surface Water Strategy
Appendix F	Micro Drainage Calculations
Appendix G	SuDS Maintenance Strategy

1.0 Introduction

Rogers Cory Partnership Limited have been instructed on behalf of Taylor Wimpey to prepare a Surface Water Drainage Strategy and SuDS Statement to support the Reserved Matters submission associated with the redevelopment of the site referred to as the Land north of Sefter Road, Bognor Regis, West Sussex per the current Outline Planning Notice (P/134/16/OUT).

This report outlines the development of the Surface Water Drainage and SuDS Strategy following on from the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) produced by C&A Consultants Ltd (Report dated December 2016) which formed part of the outline planning submission.

The purpose of this strategy is currently not to seek to discharge the current planning conditions relating to the surface water and SuDS of the Outline Planning Notice (P/134/16/OUT) but rather to support the Reserved Matters application and to demonstrate that a surface water drainage solution can feasibly be delivered to support the detailed layout.

Further details, including detailed hydraulic calculations, detailed drainage layouts and associated drainage construction details will be developed and submitted as part of a separate and future Discharge of Conditions application.

The drainage strategy outlined and presented in this report build on the principles of the following:

- Flood Risk Assessment by C&A Consulting Engineers Ltd (December 2016);
- Groundwater Report by RSK – Report reference 28756L01EH (18th October 2017;
- Geotechnical Ground Investigation Report by RSK, Report Reference 28756R01 (December 2016)
- Supplementary Hydrogeological Site Assessment by RSK, Report Reference 305035 L01 (March 2019)
- Existing Drainage and CCTV survey by Active Pump Services (September 2016)

2.0 Existing Site

The site is located north west of Bognor Regis, adjacent to Sefter Road (Refer to **Figure 1** below). The development is bounded to the north by an existing ditch and farmlands to the east and south by existing residential properties and existing commercial yard and to the west by farm lands




Figure 1: Site Location

The existing site proposed for development covers approximately 13.3ha of greenfield land comprising of open grassed field and farmland. The approximate centre of the site is at Ordnance Survey (OS) Grid Reference 490214; 99535.

The application site comprises of three catchment areas. The first catchment area in the south west falls in a northerly direction towards the existing “anti-tank” ditch, the second catchment located in the north west falls in a southerly direction and the third catchment in the east falls in a south easterly direction. An overview of the change in topography in this part of the wider site is presented as **Figure 2** overleaf. A copy of the topographical survey can be found in **Appendix A**.




Figure 2: Site Topography

Geotechnical

The current review of the geotechnical aspects of the site are based on the following documents:

- Groundwater Report by RSK – Report reference 28756L01EH (18th October 2017;
- Geotechnical Ground Investigation Report by RSK, Report Reference 28756R01 (December 2016)
- Supplementary Hydrogeological Site Assessment by RSK, Report Reference 305035 L01 (March 2019)

Ground Conditions

BGS geological maps indicate that the site is underlain by the London Clay Formation with River Terrace Deposits superficial deposits.

Intrusive investigations carried out by RSK indicate that the site consists of Topsoil or Made Ground over the River Terrace Deposits. below ground.

Winter groundwater monitoring was carried out over the Winter of 2018/2019 indicates the presence of shallow groundwater across the site varying from 0.00mbgl to 1.31mbgl. Winter infiltration testing to BRE 365 was carried out to investigate the potential feasibility for both shallow and deeper infiltration drainage techniques. The majority of the tests across the site failed with only two locations achieving very low permeability results at very shallow depths. As such it was concluded that infiltration drainage techniques (including shallow systems) would not be suitable for this site. ranging from 9.5×10^{-7} to 1.1×10^{-5} m/s.

A copy of the RSK Supplementary Hydrogeological Site Assessment is contained in **Appendix B**.

Hydrology

There is an existing ordinary watercourse which runs along the north western boundary of the site as well as along the south western side of the site.



Figure 3: Extract of Flood Map from the EA's website

Hydrogeology

Groundwater mapping published by the EA indicates that the site is located over a and Unproductive Stratum Bedrock and Secondary A Superficial Deposit designation respectively. The site does not lie within a groundwater source protection.

3.0 Flood Risk and Existing Surface Water Drainage

This report reviews the existing risk of flooding to the site and requirements for a compliant drainage strategy by interrogating the following information:

- Available topographic survey information;
- Arun District Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA);
- West Sussex LLFA Policy for the Management of Surface Water;
- Available mapping from the Environment Agency's website;
- Existing Southern Water sewer service records;
- Flood Risk Assessment by C&A Consulting Engineers Ltd (December 2016)

Based on a review of the EA's Flood Zone maps (see **Figure 3**), the development site appears to lie wholly within Flood Zone 1, considered to be at low risk from fluvial and tidal flooding.

The risk of flooding from pluvial sources has been assessed and based on the mapping information provided by the EA is deemed low to medium for the site. Based on the mapping as well as observations made during a site visit during Winter, there are areas of standing surface water in the south east part of the sit. This this is due to a localised low point in the site topography which would allow potential exceedance flows from site to accumulate. The risk to the future development as well as neighbouring properties will be mitigated through consideration of proposed finished levels of the development as well as seeking to locate the new SuDS basins in this part of the site. As the water ponding in this part of the site derives from overland flow from within the site, the redevelopment of the land will include for a new surface water drainage system with attenuation storage basins, this will ensure that the water is adequately captures, stored and conveyed back into the local watercourses at controlled predevelopment rates. Thus ensuring that the risk of flooding downstream is not increased.

Existing Site Drainage

A review of the existing topographic information, sewer records and drainage survey has been carried out to assess the existing surface water drainage regime of the site.

Details of the outcomes of the review as well as the recommendation for further investigations and remedial works as to existing headwalls on some of the ditches is provided in **Appendix D**.

4.0 Surface Water Management

The surface water management section should ensure that there is no adverse impact on flood risk elsewhere as a result of a change in the surface water runoff regime from the re-development.

Design Principles

Key design principles in the following guidance documents steer the approach to managing surface water runoff at sites:

- Building Regulations hierarchy of drainage (H3);
- Interim Code of Practice for SuDS; and
- CIRIA best practice guidance, including the use of the 'SuDS management train'.

Building Regulations hierarchy of drainage outlines the preferred methods for the disposal of surface water with infiltration methods being the preferred option. If this is not possible the next favoured option is to drain to an existing watercourse. If neither of these options are feasible, the regulations state that rainwater discharge should be directed to a sewer.

The Interim Code of Practice for SuDS provides guidance about the hydraulic design criteria for Sustainable drainage systems. This in general refers to both peak rate of runoff and the volume of runoff, post development. Prior to mitigation measures such as the use of SuDS attenuation features, both the volume and peak rate of runoff may increase post development.

The design principles for surface water management extend beyond simple hydraulic criteria. CIRIA guidance promotes the use of the SuDS management train, a concept where SuDS techniques are used to treat, convey and store surface water runoff. This approach is considered as part of the SuDS selection methodology.

Sustainable Drainage Systems

To drain the development in a sustainable manner whilst complying with the requirements of the NPPF, the scheme should seek to adopt an appropriate form(s) of sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS).

SuDS techniques comprise of implementation of attenuation basins, swales and below ground storage tanks provide temporary storage of surface water run-off.

Surface Water Drainage Strategy

In view of the requirements of the NPPF, PPG, WSCC and ADC along with the design parameters and constraints associated with redeveloping this site, a surface water drainage strategy design has been devised and hydraulically modelled to demonstrate that the scheme can be suitably implemented without increasing the level of flood risk, when the surface water drainage system experiences a 1:100 year rainfall event (including 40% climate change allowance) and 10% allowance for urban creep

The surface water drainage scheme has been designed to ensure:

- A reduction in the pre development site discharge for peak storm events.
- Sustainable Urban Drainage systems are wholly incorporated within the scheme.
- Consideration is given for the improvement of water quality within the design.
- The designed drainage scheme can satisfactorily retain a critical 1 in 100 Year storm event with climate change.

The proposed surface water drainage for the development is split into three separate catchments which seek to follow the falls of the existing topography.

Run-off from the access roads and plots will be conveyed to a new below ground surface water drainage network which will direct flows into the new onsite attenuation basins and swales per the respective catchments prior to discharging at the Annual Average Greenfield Run-off rate (Qbar) to existing anti-tank ditch culvert.

The new attenuation basins and swales will be lined and part filled with granular material to counter the effect of the shallow groundwater.

It must be noted that the strategy layout and calculations presented at this stage is to demonstrate that the detailed layout can feasibly be drained in terms of surface water. The full details of the drainage layouts including construction details for permeable paving, swales and attenuation basins will be provided as part of the separate Discharge of Conditions application of the Outline Consent.

Flow Control

The hydraulic models of the proposed surface water network, incorporating the SuDS attenuation basins and flow control devices can be found in **Appendix F**.

The hydraulic calculations have been simulated under various scenarios up to and including the critical 1 in 100 Year storm event with additional 40% allowance for climate change and 10% allowance for urban creep.

Discharge from the site from the overall proposed to be restricted to the Qbar rate all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus climate change.

The simulations confirm that the storm can be managed and contained within the curtailment of the site, with small volumes of surface flooding, during peak storm events contained at surface in areas of low risk to people or property.

Catchment	Impermeable Development Area (Ha)	Q1 Year (L/sec)	Q30 Year (L/Sec)	Q100 Year Plus Climate (L/Sec)	Discharge Volume (m3) (360min Winter)
1	4.071	8.6	9.8	10.7	14.986
2	0.85	3.5	3.5	3.6	144.884
3	0.554	5.0	5.0	5.7	223.200

Table 2: Summary of Post Development Run-off with mitigation measures

Water Quality

It is important to address issues with regards to quality when considering surface water management. As part of the surface water is proposed to be discharge to the existing downstream watercourses, treatment is proposed as part of a SuDS Management Train in accordance with the recommendations of the SuDS Manual (CIRIA 753) and as required by the LLFA.

This SuDS management train will be achieved through the use of permeable paving, swales and attenuation basins.

Chapter 26 of the CIRIA SuDS Manual (2015) provides guidance on methods that should be used to design SuDS to meet the water quality design criteria and good practice design standards. Diffuse urban pollution is a significant factor in compromising groundwater and receiving water standards that are required under the EA Water Framework Directive. Chapter 4 of the SuDs Manual summarises factors, which influence pollution levels in urban run-off. This summary is presented in **Table 1 overleaf**

Factors influencing pollution levels in urban run-off
The amount and type of pollution washed off a surface will depend on many things including: • Planning activities on, above and adjacent to the surface that affect the deposition of pollutants, their retention on the surface and the extent to which they are mixed with runoff (including pollution prevention strategies) • Unplanned activities (accidents and spillages) that can cause temporary unexpected high pollution concentrations • The surface location and type, affecting wash-off rates and contaminant movement mechanisms • The drainage path • The length of the dry weather period before the rainfall event • The intensity and the duration of the rainfall, and the associated flow velocities Any further pollutant transformations occurring during residence and conveyance within gullies, chambers, pipe or channel networks, gravels, soils and vegetation and quiescent bodies of water.

Table 1: Extract of Box 4.1 of the SuDS Manual (CIRIA 753)

Table 4.3 of the SuDS Manual classifies the pollution hazard level for residential sites, including residential car parks, low traffic roads as being “low” and thus only requiring a “Simple index approach” in terms of the requirements for the discharge to surface waters, including coasts and estuaries.

The SuDS Manual summarises the steps for the simple index approach:

Step 1 – *Allocate suitable pollution hazard indices for the proposed land use*

Step 2 – *Select SuDS with a total pollution mitigation index that equals or exceeds the pollution index*

Step 3 – *Where the discharge to a protected surface waters or groundwater, consider the need for a more precautionary approach*

The SuDS Manual describes “protected surface waters” as protected surface water resources, which include those designated for drinking water abstraction or for other environmental protection reasons

Table 26.2 of the SuDS manual notes the following pollution hazard indices for residential land use development:

Land Use	Pollution Hazard Level	Total suspended solids (TSS)	Metals	Hydrocarbons
Residential roofs	Very low	0.2	0.2	0.05
Individual property driveways, residential car parks, low traffic roads (eg. cul-de sacs, home zones and general access roads) and non-residential car parking with infrequent change (eg schools, offices) ie. Less than 300 vehicle movements/day	Low	0.5	0.4	0.4
Commercial yard and delivery areas, non-residential car parking with frequent change (eg hospital, retail), all roads except low traffic roads and trunk roads/ motorways	Medium	0.7	0.6	0.7

Table 2: Extract of Table 26.2 of SuDS Manual (2015)

Table 26.3 of the SuDS Manual provides details of the SuDS pollution mitigation indices for various types of SuDS components

Type of SuDS component	Mitigation indices		
	TSS	Metals	Hydrocarbons
Filter Strip	0.4	0.4	0.5
Filter Drain	0.4	0.4	0.4
Swale	0.5	0.6	0.6
Bioretention system	0.8	0.8	0.8
Permeable Paving	0.7	0.6	0.7
Detention Basin	0.5	0.5	0.6
Pond	0.7	0.7	0.5
Wetland	0.8	0.8	0.8

Table 3: Extract of Table 26.3 of SuDS Manual (2015)

As such the total SuDS mitigation index (figure 5) must be greater than the pollution hazard index (figure 4), furthermore when used in combination of two or more SuDS components, a factor of 0.5 is used to account for the reduced performance of the secondary or tertiary components associated with the already reduced inflow of concentration, therefore:

Total SuDS mitigation index = mitigation index₁ + 0.5 (mitigation index₂)

The use of the the combination of the attenuation basins and swales will provide the minimum required level of SuDS mitigation index to the run off from the development.

Long Term Maintenance

Consideration will need to be given to the long-term maintenance of the proposed drainage structures. Permeable paving, swales, attenuation basins and all associated external pipework, chambers and manholes within the demise of each plot ownership boundaries will be the responsibility of the future occupants. Elsewhere, the surface water networks below the access roads and open space will be the responsibility of the Management Company. Details of the Maintenance Plan will be provided as part of the separate Discharge of Conditions application of the Outline Consent.

Exceedance

Whilst the drainage system has been designed to a very high standard (1 in 100 Year storm event including climate change), it is possible that a more extreme event will occur and that the design standard for the system will be exceeded. It is best practice to design the drainage system to shed water, primarily into landscaped and other areas, therefore reducing the risk of flooding areas of built development during extreme events.

A strategy for directing overland flows for the site will be confirmed using overland flow modeling and provided as part of the separate Discharge of Conditions application.

5.0 Foul Drainage

The proposed foul water discharge generated by the site has been calculated at 12.9/s (based on 280 dwellings at 4000l/dwelling/day) in accordance with Sewers for Adoption 7th Edition.

In accordance with the approved Outline Consent, the foul water drainage will be conveyed via a new below ground foul sewer network through development and onto a new adoptable foul water pumping station to be located in the northern part of the site. A new rising main will convey the pumped discharge to the existing public foul water sewer located in Sefter Road..

All domestic foul drainage will be designed in accordance with Part H of the Building Regulations.

6.0 Conclusion


A surface water drainage strategy has been prepared and demonstrates that the development proposal can be successfully implemented and designed to withstand the impact of a 1:100-year rainfall event (including climate change), in accordance with the NPPF, PPG, WSCC and ADC requirements.

In view of this assessment, the report concludes that:


- i. The Development can be drained in a sustainable manner utilizing SuDS techniques;
- ii. The Development will satisfactorily manage and maintain a 1 in 100 Year storm event with an allowance for climate change;
- iii. The detailed drainage strategy generally follows the principles of the approved FRA and Surface Water Drainage Strategy and SuDS Statement;
- iv. The findings of this report identify the opportunity to promote the sustainable re-use of existing resources and potential to implement an appropriate SuDS strategy.

Appendix (A)

Topographic Survey



Scale:	Sheet Size:	Sheet Number:	Date:
1:200	A0	1	July 2018
Project Number:	Rev:	Surveyed By:	Approved By:
25634	-	JK / LW	-
			
THE ENGINEER REGISTERED IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK	THE ENGINEER REGISTERED IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK	THE ENGINEER REGISTERED IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK	THE ENGINEER REGISTERED IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK
SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP



DETECTION SURVEY REPORT

GENERAL

This survey was conducted in accordance with the 128R-128-014 (Publicly Available Specification from BSI). After a pre-survey consultation with the client it was agreed to carry out the detection survey using methodology M1 (see Table 2 of the 128R-128-014). The survey boundaries are shown on the drawing plate and the location sector of the site for reference.

DESKTOP UTILITY REPORT

The client's utility historical record information was reviewed. As per PAS 128:2011 the record information is classified as historical and must be referenced with extreme caution. There is no information on the drawing plate that would allow verification of the data.

OBTAINING UP-TO-DATE RECORDS BEFORE SITE WORK COMMENCES Site staff provided further local knowledge to the client.

DETECTION SURVEY

DRAINAGE

All drainage was checked with pipes and levels recorded. Wherever possible the location of drains were marked with pipe sockets and positioned on the drawing. All connections from gullies, external rainwater pipes and external toilet stacks have been proven wherever possible. All connections and sewer runs by radiotele location sonde (UTR) were proven. A service connection in present the position is assumed is useful proven otherwise. In instances where the location of drains was not proven, the location of drains was marked on the drawing as suggested to be straight and located by UTR. All drainage should be cross checked in critical areas. Records information was reviewed and the location of drains was marked on the drawing. Wherever possible the location of drains was proven by UTR. Due to high traffic levels and the covers being seized into the ground, records information was reviewed and the location of drains was marked on the drawing. It is recommended that further records are requested before any works in undertaken on site.

WATER

All waterlines within the survey area have been located using EMIL with electronically detected depths and GPR techniques with depths recorded to crown of pipe. Record information was reviewed and the location of waterlines was marked on the drawing. It is recommended that further records are requested before any works in undertaken on site. Successfully located: Sprinkler & Fire hydrants record location differ to on site location. Recommended table excavations to confirm depth and position in critical areas.

GAZ

Gas marks within the survey area have been located using GPR techniques with depths recorded to crown of pipe. Record information provided by Consulting Engineers Ltd match the survey results. Recommended table excavations to confirm depth and position in critical areas.

ELECTRICITY

Electric cables within the survey area have been located using EMIL methods with electronically detected depths recorded. Unable to confirm the location of cables within the survey area. Recommended table excavations to confirm depth and position in critical areas.

ALTEKON

Altekon ducts have been traced with depths recorded. Due to laws protecting British Telecom records all ducts have been located using remote detection techniques only and cannot be confirmed. Chamber sizes have been recorded using GPR techniques wherever possible. For further information regarding BT apparatus please contact Openreach.

CATV

CATV ducts were not present on site during the survey works.

UNKNOWN

All other responses were located using either EMIL, or GPR techniques. Recommended table excavations to confirm identity, position and depths in critical areas.

SEE CAUTIONARY NOTES ON THE REVERSE KEY

Desktop Utility Records		
Utility Type	Provider Details	Date Acquired
Drainage	Southern Water	31/08/2016
Water	Portsmouth Water	28/01/2013
Gas	Scottia Gas Networks	24/01/2013
Electricity	Scottish and Southern Energy	23/01/2013
Telecom	Openreach	23/01/2013
NATV	Not a contract	30/09/0000



--




PAS 128:2014 Utility Survey			
Scale: 1:200	Sheet Size: A0	Sheet Number: 3	Date: July 2018
Project Number: 25634	Rev: -	Surveyed By: JK / LW	Approved By: -
			



- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Scale
1:200 | Sheet Size:
A0 | Sheet Number:
6 | Date:
July 2018 |
| Project Number:
25634 | Rev:
- | Surveyed By:
JK / LW | Approved By:
- |
|  |  |  |  |





PAS 128:2014 Utility Survey			
Scale 1:200	Sheet Size A0	Sheet Number 4	Date July 2018
Project Number 25634	Rev. -	Surveyed By JK / LW	Approved By -
			



Scale: 1:200	Sheet Size: A0	Sheet Number: 8	Date: July 2018
Project Number: 25634	Rev: -	Surveyed By: JK / LW	Approved By: -
			



Scale:	Sheet Size:	Sheet Number:	Date:
1:200	A0	9	July 2018
Project Number:	Rev:	Surveyed By:	Approved By:
25634	-	JK / LW	-






Appendix (B)

Geotechnical Information (Extract)



RSK Unit 28
Abbey Enterprise Centre
Princes Way
Barnley
SO51 8AQ
UK

Our Ref: 305035 L01 (00) DRAFT

1st March 2019

Taylor Wimpey (Southern Counties)

Colvedene Court

Wessex Business Park

Wessex Way

Colden Common

Winchester

SO21 1WP

For the attention of David Seer

Dear David,

**RE: SEFTER ROAD, BOGNOR REGIS, PO21 3EE
SUPPLEMENTARY HYDROGEOLOGICAL SITE ASSESSMENT**

1. BACKGROUND

RSK Environment Limited (RSK) was commissioned by Taylor Wimpey (Southern Counties) Ltd (the client) on 10th January 2019 to carry out a supplementary hydrogeological site assessment of land at Sefter Road, Bognor Regis, PO21 3EE (the site). The majority of the site currently comprises undeveloped fields, with a scout hut, associated car park and area of soft landscaped communal open space in the west of the site. A site location plan is given in **Figure 1**.

RSK has previously undertaken a geotechnical assessment of the site and groundwater monitoring regime. These are:

- RSK, 28756-R01 (01) 'Geotechnical Ground Investigation', Sefter Road, Bognor Regis, Dec 2016; and
- RSK, 28756-L01 (01) EH 'Review of Groundwater Conditions', Sefter Road, Bognor Regis, Nov 2017.

A summary of the November 2017 report is provided below, although it is recommended that this letter be read in conjunction with the previous two reports.

1.1 RSK, 28756-L01 (01) EH 'Review of Groundwater Conditions', Sefter Road, Bognor Regis, Nov 2017

12 groundwater monitoring visits were carried out monthly from September 2016 to August 2017. Generally, groundwater levels in the four wells varied throughout the monitoring period, with groundwater flow estimated towards the northwest (i.e. towards the land drain along the northern field boundary). Groundwater levels were deepest from September to November 2016, and shallowest from February to March 2017. The latter dates coincided with surface flooding in the southeast corner of the site. Across



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE

RSK Environment Ltd
Registered office
60 Sussex Street • Glasgow • Scotland • G41 1DX • UK
Registered in Scotland No. 115520

the monitoring wells BH1 to BH4, groundwater levels were found to be shallower than 1.00 mbgl on at least one occasion throughout the monitoring period.

Therefore, it was concluded that adopting soakaways or having run-off directed towards areas of landscaping may result in areas of localised to widespread flooding during periods of prolonged rainfall.

1.2 Concurrent groundwater monitoring works at the site

As per a request dated 1st October 2018, 7 additional monthly groundwater monitoring visits of BH1 to BH4 were proposed over the winter period from October 2018 to April 2019. Measurements from these visits have been amalgamated into this letter report. .

1.3 Rationale for supplementary hydrogeological site assessment

It is understood that Arun District Council (ADC) requested further information relating to the potential for infiltration drainage to be utilised as far as possible in the proposed development strategy. Rogers Cory Partnership Ltd (RCP) – on behalf of Taylor Wimpey – scoped an additional intrusive ground investigation comprising a further 23 trial pit soakaway tests and 11 groundwater monitoring well installations, followed by twice-monthly groundwater monitoring visits from completion of the site works until the end of April. Of the 23 trial pit soakaway tests, it was initially proposed that 15 locations were to be to c. 1.5 mbgl (or groundwater level if shallower) and 8 locations were to be to c. 0.5 mbgl, however due to shallow groundwater conditions, only 11 locations could be completed to c. 1.5 mbgl, with 12 locations completed to c. 0.5 mbgl, as detailed in **Section 2**. The positions of all new locations in addition to those from previous investigations are given in **Figure 2**. All new locations were surveyed to Ordnance Datum by GPS, with this data shown in **Appendix B**.

The site is planned for residential redevelopment comprising traditional low-rise residential properties with associated infrastructure and soft landscaping, a Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP), a Primary School, a Scout Hut and an Ambulance Station. The proposed redevelopment plan is given in **Figure 3**.

This letter report is subject to the service constraints laid out in **Appendix A**.

2. SITE INVESTIGATION METHODOLOGY

RSK carried out intrusive investigation work on 21st to 25th January 2019, excavating 23 trial pits and undertaking soakaway tests within, and completing 11 further boreholes with groundwater monitoring well installations. Prior to breaking ground, Technics Group Ltd completed a service clearance of every location, and also surveyed each location to Ordnance Datum. The rationale for the position of each exploratory location, as provided by RCP, is indicated in **Table 1** below:

Table 1: Exploratory location rationale

Location type	Location ID	Rationale
Trial pit soakaway test to 1.5 m bgl or resting groundwater, whichever was the shallower	TP201, TP202, TP204, TP205, TP207, TP209, TP211, TP212*, TP213*, TP215, TP216, TP218, TP219, TP221 and TP222	Testing infiltration properties across the site

Location type	Location ID	Rationale
Trial pit soakaway test to 0.5 m bgl	TP203, TP206, TP208, TP210, TP214, TP217, TP220, TP223	Testing infiltration properties in areas of proposed permeable paving
Groundwater monitoring wells	BH201 to BH211	Allowing groundwater levels to be measured twice monthly until end April 2019
Notes: Soakaway tests were completed in broad accordance with BRE 365, with the exception that due to slow infiltration rates, only one soakaway test was completed in most locations. *: TP212 and TP213 were proposed as trial pit soakaway tests to 1.5 m bgl. However due to substantial standing water in the vicinity of these locations which ran continuously into the pits, these were terminated at a shallower depth without a soakaway test undertaken. The rising level of water within these pits was measured over a period of 1 hour.		

3. GROUND CONDITIONS

A summary of ground conditions encountered during this phase of intrusive works is outlined in the following sections. Generally the site was underlain by Topsoil or Made Ground over River Terrace Deposits, with the London Clay Formation at depth. These exploratory logs are summarised in **Table 2**, and reported in detail in **Appendix B**. A selection of photographs taken during the investigation are included in **Appendix C**.

Table 2: General succession of strata

Strata	Exploratory holes encountered	Range of depths to top of stratum (mbgl)	Range of thickness (m)
Topsoil	TP202, TP204 to TP223, and BH201 to BH211	Ground level	0.15 to 0.40
Made Ground	TP201 and TP203	Ground level	0.40 to 0.45
River Terrace Deposits – cohesive	TP201 to TP223, and BH201 to BH211	0.15 to 0.45	0.20 to 2.80
River Terrace Deposits – granular	TP204, BH201 to BH205, BH206 to BH210	0.80 to 1.60	0.20 to 2.10
London Clay Formation	BH204, BH206 and BH210	2.30 to 2.77	0.33 to 0.90 [^]
Note: mbgl: metres below ground level; [^] : maximum proven thickness as base of this stratum was not encountered during this investigation			

3.1 Topsoil

Topsoil was identified across the site in TP202, TP204 to TP223 and BH201 to BH211 and comprised brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY, where sand is fine, gravel is subangular to subrounded fine to medium flint and with frequent rootlets. This stratum ranged from 0.15 to 0.40 m in thickness.

3.2 Made Ground

Made Ground was identified underlying the Scout Hut's car park, and the grassed area to the north of it, in TP202, TP204 to TP223 and BH201 to BH211. Beneath the car park, this stratum comprised ASPHALT underlain by flint gravel SUB-BASE followed by BRICK FILL, with dark grey CLAY containing rare brick and metal pieces followed by greyish brown CLAY under the grassed area. The Made Ground ranged from 0.30 to 0.45 m in thickness.

3.3 River Terrace Deposits

River Terrace Deposits were encountered underlying the Topsoil or Made Ground in each trial pit and borehole location, and consisted of both cohesive and granular material.

3.3.1 Cohesive

Cohesive River Terrace Deposits were identified underlying the Topsoil or Made Ground across the entire site from 0.15 to 0.45 mbgl, in each trial pit and borehole location. It generally comprised stiff orangish brown sandy CLAY, where sand is fine to medium. Occasionally it contained gravel generally of subangular to rounded fine to medium flint. The encountered thickness of this stratum ranged from 0.20 to 2.80 m, although this minimum value is the result of a shallow trial pit terminating within the cohesive River Terrace Deposits.

3.3.2 Granular

Granular Cohesive River Terrace Deposits were identified underlying the cohesive River Terrace Deposits across the western, northern and southern areas of the site, from 0.80 to 1.60 mbgl in TP202, TP204, TP205, TP211, and BH201 to BH210. It generally comprised light orangish brown and light brownish grey clayey fine to medium SAND, or dense orangish brown slightly gravelly silty fine to medium SAND, where gravels are angular to subrounded fine to coarse flint. This stratum ranged from 0.20 to 2.10 m in thickness.

3.4 London Clay Formation

The London Clay Formation was encountered underlying the River Terrace Deposits in the north, east, and centre of the site, from 2.30 to 2.77 mbgl, in BH204, BH206 and BH210. It generally comprised a firm to stiff bluish grey silty CLAY. The base of the London Clay Formation was not proven; however, from borehole records on the BGS website it is considered the London Clay Formation within this area is likely to be approximately 50 m in thickness.

4. GROUNDWATER

Groundwater strikes and seepages were recorded between 0.20 and 2.60 mbgl in BH201 to BH211, and between 0.60 and 1.60 mbgl in TP202, TP204, TP205, TP211, TP214, and TP222. A summary is provided in **Table 3**. Surface water strikes and seepages were encountered in TP212 and TP213 at 0.10 and 0.25 mbgl as shown in **Table 4**.

Table 3: Summary of groundwater strikes/seepages

Location	Groundwater strike/seepage	Depth (mbgl)	Comment
Borehole locations			
BH201	Groundwater strike	1.80	Rising to 1.20 m
BH202	Groundwater strike	1.86	Rising to 1.30 m
BH203	Groundwater strike	1.70	Rising to 1.10 m
BH204	Groundwater strike	1.50	Rising to 1.20 m
BH205	Groundwater seepage	2.50	-
BH206	Groundwater strike	0.20	-
BH207	Groundwater strike	1.80	-
BH208	Groundwater strike	0.90	-
BH209	Groundwater strike	2.60	-
BH210	Groundwater strike	1.80	Rising to 1.20
BH211	Groundwater strike	1.90	-
Trial pit locations			
TP202	Groundwater strike	1.60	At base of trial pit
TP204	Groundwater strike	1.50	At base of trial pit
TP205	Groundwater strike	1.45	-
TP211	Groundwater strike	1.50	-
TP214	Groundwater strike	0.60	-
TP222	Groundwater seepage	0.90	-
Notes: Groundwater was not encountered in TP201, TP203, TP206 to TP210, TP217 to TP221 or TP223			

Table 4: Summary of surface water strikes/seepages

Location	Surface water strike/seepage	Depth (mbgl)	Comment
Trial pit locations			
TP212	Surface water seepage	0.10	Standing water in area around trial pit
TP213	Surface water seepage	0.25	Standing water in area around trial pit

4.1 Soakaway tests

In-situ trial pit soakaway tests were undertaken in TP201 to TP211 and TP14 to TP223, the results of which are given in **Table 5**. Due to high resting groundwater levels in the vicinity of TP212 and TP213, soakaway tests were not undertaken; the natural rising water level was instead recorded over at least 1 hour. The raw data are given in **Table 6**.

Where the infiltration rate had not passed between 75 % to 25 % effective depth during the day, the pit was left open overnight – suitably secured using Heras fencing – to allow for at least a 24-hour test duration in accordance with BRE 365. The tests in TP201 and TP221 were terminated at 23 hours, however the final measured water levels measured immediately prior to test termination were not found to lie close to the 25 % effective depth, as such the decision was taken to backfill to ensure prompt continuation of site works. Over the course of the test, water levels in TP222 fell by only 5 cm. In consort with this, there were many other soakaway tests being undertaken simultaneously that had recorded greater drops in water level. As these locations were of greater importance, and also required secure fencing, the decision was made to terminate the soakaway test in TP22 following 6 hours of measurements. From the graph shown in **Appendix D**, it is RSK's opinion that this test would not have experienced sufficient infiltration over an additional 18 hours to reach the 75 % and 25 % effective depths, and as such did not warrant being left unsecured over this period.

The measured drop in water level in TP220 is within 0.10 m of the 25 % effective depth, however RSK have chosen not to extrapolate this result. Extrapolation can be completed if requested, although this result would not be in full accordance with BRE 365, and would be recorded as a non-standard test.

Table 5: Summary of soakaway test results

Trial pit (test no.)	Base depth (mbgl)	Effective depth (m)	Test duration (hours)	Time to pass between 75 % and 25 % effective depth (seconds)	Infiltration rate (m/s)
TP201	1.80	1.00	23	-	Test fail
TP202	1.48	0.88	24	-	Test fail
TP203	0.50	0.36	41	44000	2.08×10^{-6}
TP204	1.50	0.85	24	-	Test fail
TP205	1.50	0.97	26	-	Test fail
TP206	0.70	0.45	54	-	Test fail
TP207	1.60	0.66	26	-	Test fail
TP208	0.50	0.31	26	-	Test fail
TP209	1.50	0.95	26	-	Test fail
TP210	0.42	0.27	26	-	Test fail
TP211	1.50	1.00	24	-	Test fail
TP214	0.65	0.55	27	-	Test fail

Trial pit (test no.)	Base depth (mbgl)	Effective depth (m)	Test duration (hours)	Time to pass between 75 % and 25 % effective depth (seconds)	Infiltration rate (m/a)
TP215	1.60	0.99	25	-	Test fail
TP216	1.50	1.00	25	-	Test fail
TP217	0.55	0.39	29	-	Test fail
TP218	1.50	1.00	50	-	Test fail
TP219	1.50	1.00	30	-	Test fail
TP220	0.50	0.37	26	-	Test fail
TP221	0.60	0.50	23	-	Test fail
TP222	0.90	0.70	6	-	Test fail
TP223 (1)	0.50	0.42	6	15500	7.13×10^{-6}
TP223 (2)	0.50	0.40	18	38000	2.83×10^{-6}

As shown in **Table 5**, falling water levels the majority of the trial pits did not cross the 75 % / 25 % fill level thresholds as required by BRE 365. Only in TP203 in the west of the site and in TP223 in the centre of the main field did any reportable infiltration occur. It is considered that this is due to localised variations in geology allowing extremely limited capacity for small-scale infiltration. It is furthermore worth noting that both of these locations were shallow 0.50 m trial pit soakaway tests, and therefore would not be suitable locations for development-scale soakaway features.

Table 6: Rising surface water levels

Trial pit	Base depth (mbgl)	Initial water level (mbgl)	Final water level (mbgl)	Monitoring period (hours)
TP212	0.71	0.70	0.60	1
TP213	0.57	0.54	0.46	1.5

Rising surface water levels in TP212 and TP213 were recorded over at least 1 hour period in **Table 6**. These trial pits were positioned within an area of very saturated ground, and so were unsuitable for soakaway tests due to the rapidly incoming water.

4.2 Groundwater data loggers

Shallow groundwater monitoring wells were installed at all drive-in sampler borehole positions, with the response zone lying within the River Terrace Deposits, between 1.00 and 3.00 mbgl.

A total of 4 data loggers were installed in BH201, BH204, BH206 and BH209 to provide continuous measurements of groundwater levels. One BaroSCOUT was installed in BH201 to measure air pressure in the area of the site, and one LevelSCOUT was installed in each well to measure water pressure. The difference in the two values, when compared to a known datum, allows the calculation of water head, and therefore the groundwater level in the well. Readings will be taken at 30-minute intervals until the end of

April 2019. Simultaneously, twice-monthly groundwater monitoring visits will be completed to manually measure the groundwater levels in all monitoring wells, and download data recorded by the loggers.

4.3 Groundwater levels

8 groundwater monitoring visits have been completed to-date (including those completed for the groundwater monitoring regime instructed in October 2018). Groundwater levels recorded during these visits are summarised in **Table 7** below and presented in full in **Appendix D**. Groundwater depths (mbgl) and levels (mAOD) measured across the site have varied from 0.00 mbgl in BH3 and BH208 to 1.62 mbgl in BH1, and 4.167 mAOD in BH201 to 6.41 mAOD in BH2.

Table 7: Recorded groundwater levels

Location	Manual measurements			
	Depth (mbgl)		Level (mAOD)	
	Max	Min	Max	Min
BH1	1.62	1.330	5.22	4.928
BH2	0.88	0.505	6.41	6.031
BH3	0.88	0.000	6.11	5.232
BH4	1.30	0.730	5.54	4.966
BH201	1.60	0.995	4.77	4.167
BH202	1.29	0.895	5.06	4.669
BH203	1.08	0.697	5.05	4.669
BH204	1.15	0.140	5.65	4.643
BH205	1.08	0.915	5.90	5.739
BH206	0.35	0.125	6.25	6.025
BH207	0.25	0.010	6.19	5.945
BH208	0.29	0.000	6.08	5.790
BH209	1.08	0.575	5.86	5.356
BH210	1.20	0.610	5.49	4.896
BH211	0.88	0.360	6.35	5.830
Note: These readings detail the full range of groundwater levels recorded at the site as measured during the monitoring visits. The minimum and maximum values across the site are shown in grey.				

4.4 Discussion

It is considered that the granular River Terrace Deposits are a shallow, semi-unconfined aquifer underlain by the London Clay Formation. Locally within the cohesive River Terrace Deposits, there may be perched water where cohesive substrata impede downwards percolation of surface water.

As shown in **Table 5**, falling water levels in the majority of the soakaway locations did not cross the 75 % / 25 % fill level thresholds as required by BRE 365. Only in TP203 in the west of the site and in TP223 in the centre of the main field did any reportable infiltration occur. It is considered that this is due to localised variations in geology allowing extremely limited capacity for small-scale infiltration. It is furthermore worth noting that both of these locations were shallow 0.50 m trial pit soakaway tests, and therefore would not be suitable locations for development-scale soakaway features.

Rising surface water levels in TP212 and TP213 were recorded over at least 1 hour period in **Table 6**. These trial pits were positioned within an area of very saturated ground, and so were unsuitable for soakaway tests due to the rapidly incoming water.


Based on the available data, it is not recommended that soakaways or run-off directed towards areas of landscaping are implemented at this site, as this may result in localised to widespread flooding during periods of prolonged rainfall. It is usually advised that at least 1.00 m of unsaturated zone is present beneath the soakaway feature. Given the shallow groundwater levels recorded at the site, this minimum unsaturated thickness is not achieved during periods of sustained heavy rainfall, with localised groundwater flooding in the southeast, and other areas of the site close to flooding.

This draft letter report will be updated upon completion of the final groundwater monitoring round.

We trust that the information provided above meets your requirements. Should you have any queries or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours sincerely,

For RSK Environment Limited



Geo-environmental Consultant



Kirsten Fairall

Principal Geo-environmental Consultant

Enc.

Figures:

Figure 1	Site Location Plan
Figure 2	Exploratory Hole Location Plan
Figure 3	Proposed Development Plan

Appendices:

Appendix A	Service Constraints
Appendix B	Exploratory Hole Logs
Appendix C	Photographic Log
Appendix D	Trial Pit Soakaway Test Data
Appendix E	Groundwater Monitoring Data



FIGURES



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2013



18 Frogmore Road
Hemel Hempstead
Hertfordshire
HP3 9PT
United Kingdom


Tel: +44 (0) 1442 437500
Fax: +44 (0) 1442 437550
Email: info@rsk.co.uk
Web: www.rsk.co.uk

Client
TAYLOR WIMPEY (SOUTHERN COUNTIES)

Project Title
SEFTER ROAD, BOGNOR REGIS

Drawing Title
SITE LOCATION PLAN

Drawn	Date	Checked	Date	Approved	Date	Project No.	Drawing File
ASC	29.01.19	EH	29.01.19	KF	29.01.19	305035 - L01	305035 - SLP
Scale	Orig Size	Dimensions	Drawing No.				Rev.
NTS	A4	m	FIGURE 1				A



- LEGEND
- Borehole Installation and Falling Head Test Location (RSK, 2016)
 - Trial Pit Soakage Test Location (RSK, 2016)
 - Borehole Location with Groundwater Monitoring Well Installation (RSK, 2019)
 - Trial Pit Soakage Test Location to ~1.50mbgl (RSK, 2019)
 - Trial Pit Soakage Test Location to ~0.50mbgl (RSK, 2019)

P1	29.01.19	FIRST ISSUE	ASC	EH	KF
Rev.	Date	Amendment	Drawn	Chkd.	Appd.

18 Frogmore Road
Hemel Hempstead
Hertfordshire
HP3 9PT
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0) 1442 437550
Fax: +44 (0) 1442 437559
Email: info@rsk.co.uk
Web: www.rsk.co.uk

Client

TAYLOR WIMPEY
(SOUTHERN COUNTIES)

Project Title

SEFTER ROAD,
BOGNOR REGIS

Drawing Title


EXPLORATORY
HOLE LOCATION
PLAN

Drawn	Date	Checked	Date	Approved	Date
ASC	29.01.19	EH	29.01.19	KF	29.01.19

Scale	Orig Size	Dimensions
1:2500	A3	m

Project No.	Drawing File
305035 - L01	305035 (L01) Fig 2.dwg

Drawing No.	Rev.
FIGURE 2	P1





LEGEND

----- Site Boundary

P1	29.01.19	FIRST ISSUE	ASC	EH	KF
Rev.	Date	Amendment	Drawn	Chkd.	Appd.



18 Frogmore Road
Hemel Hempstead
Hertfordshire
HP3 9PT
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0) 1442 437550
Fax: +44 (0) 1442 437559
Email: info@rsk.co.uk
Web: www.rsk.co.uk

Client

**TAYLOR WIMPEY
(SOUTHERN COUNTIES)**

Project Title

**SEFTER ROAD,
BOGNOR REGIS**

Drawing Title

**PROPOSED
DEVELOPMENT
PLAN**

Drawn	Date	Checked	Date	Approved	Date
ASC	29.01.19	EH	29.01.19	KF	29.01.19

Scale	Orig Size	Dimensions
1:2000	A3	m

Project No.	Drawing File
305035 - L01	305035 (L01) Fig 3.dwg

Drawing No.	Rev.
FIGURE 3	P1

Scale 1 : 2,000



APPENDIX A

SERVICE CONSTRAINTS

1. This report and the site investigation carried out in connection with the report (together the "Services") were compiled and carried out by RSK Environment Limited (RSK) for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (the "client") in accordance with the terms of a contract between RSK and the "client". The Services were performed by RSK with the skill and care ordinarily exercised by a reasonable environmental consultant at the time the Services were performed. Further, and in particular, the Services were performed by RSK taking into account the limits of the scope of works required by the client, the time scale involved and the resources, including financial and manpower resources, agreed between RSK and the client.
2. Other than that expressly contained in paragraph 1 above, RSK provides no other representation or warranty whether express or implied, in relation to the Services.
3. Unless otherwise agreed the Services were performed by RSK exclusively for the purposes of the client. RSK is not aware of any interest of or reliance by any party other than the client in or on the Services. Unless expressly provided in writing, RSK does not authorise, consent or condone any party other than the client relying upon the Services. Should this report or any part of this report, or otherwise details of the Services or any part of the Services be made known to any such party, and such party relies thereon that party does so wholly at its own and sole risk and RSK disclaims any liability to such parties. Any such party would be well advised to seek independent advice from a competent environmental consultant and/or lawyer.
4. It is RSK's understanding that this report is to be used for the purpose described in the introduction to the report. That purpose was a significant factor in determining the scope and level of the Services. Should the purpose for which the report is used, or the proposed use of the site change, this report may no longer be valid and any further use of or reliance upon the report in those circumstances by the client without RSK's review and advice shall be at the client's sole and own risk. Should RSK be requested to review the report after the date hereof, RSK shall be entitled to additional payment at the then existing rates or such other terms as agreed between RSK and the client.
5. The passage of time may result in changes in site conditions, regulatory or other legal provisions, technology or economic conditions which could render the report inaccurate or unreliable. The information and conclusions contained in this report should not be relied upon in the future without the written advice of RSK. In the absence of such written advice of RSK, reliance on the report in the future shall be at the client's own and sole risk. Should RSK be requested to review the report in the future, RSK shall be entitled to additional payment at the then existing rate or such other terms as may be agreed between RSK and the client.
6. The observations and conclusions described in this report are based solely upon the Services that were provided pursuant to the agreement between the client and RSK. RSK has not performed any observations, investigations, studies or testing not specifically set out or required by the contract between the client and RSK. RSK is not liable for the existence of any condition, the discovery of which would require performance of services not otherwise contained in the Services. For the avoidance of doubt, unless otherwise expressly referred to in the introduction to this report, RSK did not seek to evaluate the presence on or off the site of asbestos, electromagnetic fields, lead paint, heavy metals, radon gas or other radioactive or hazardous materials.
7. The Services are based upon RSK's observations of existing physical conditions at the Site gained from a walk-over survey of the site together with RSK's interpretation of information including documentation, obtained from third parties and from the client on the history and usage of the site. The Services are also based on information and/or analysis provided by independent testing and information services or laboratories upon which RSK was reasonably entitled to rely. The Services clearly are limited by the accuracy of the information, including documentation, reviewed by RSK and the observations possible at the time of the walkover survey. Further RSK was not authorised and did not attempt to independently verify the accuracy or completeness of information, documentation or materials received from the client or third parties, including laboratories and information services, during the performance of the Services. RSK is not liable for any inaccurate information or conclusions, the discovery of which inaccuracies required the doing of any act including the gathering of any information which was not reasonably available to RSK and including the doing of any independent investigation of the information provided to RSK save as otherwise provided in the terms of the contract between the client and RSK.
8. The phase II or intrusive environmental site investigation aspects of the Services is a limited sampling of the site at pre-determined borehole and soil vapour locations based on the operational configuration of the site. The conclusions given in this report are based on information gathered at the specific test locations and can only be extrapolated to an undefined limited area around those locations. The extent of the limited area depends on the soil and groundwater conditions, together with the position of any current structures and underground facilities and natural and other activities on site. In addition chemical analysis was carried out for a limited number of parameters [as stipulated in the contract between the client and RSK] [based on an understanding of the available operational and historical information,] and it should not be inferred that other chemical species are not present.
9. Any site drawing(s) provided in this report is (are) not meant to be an accurate base plan, but is (are) used to present the general relative locations of features on, and surrounding, the site.



APPENDIX B

EXPLORATORY HOLE LOGS



Drilling Progress and Water Observations						General Remarks
Date	Time	Borehole Depth (m)	Casing Depth (m)	Borehole Diameter (mm)	Water Depth (m)	
						1. Inspection pit hand dug to 1.2m depth. 2. Groundwater struck at 1.8m depth, rising to 1.2m depth. 3. 43mm diameter standpipe piezometer (complete with upstanding protective cover) installed to 3.2m depth on completion. Response zone 1.0m to 3.2m.
All dimensions in metres						Scale: 1:25
Method Used: Inspection pit + Cracked window	Plant Used: Dando Terrier		Drilled By: Phil Guinness	Logged By: CLewis	Checked By:	



Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Window Sample: BH202
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 24.01.18 End: 24.01.18	Ground Level (m AOD): 5.96	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:489846.8 N:099441.3	Sheet: 1 of 1

30BIT_LIBRARY_v8_06.GLB LibVersion: v8_06_018 PriVersion: v8_06 | Log WINDOW SAMPLE LOG - A4P | 305035 SEFTER ROAD, BOGNOR REGIS.GPJ - v8_06.

ARUN DISTRICT COURT used



DRAFT

BOREHOLE LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis			Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Window Sample: BH203
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 24.01.18 End: 24.01.18	Ground Level (m AOD): 5.75	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:489878.6 N:099614.2		Sheet: 1 of 1

Progress Window Run	Samples / Tests				Water Backfill & Instru- mentation	Description of Strata	Depth (Thick- ness)	Material Graphic Legend
	Depth	No	Type	Results				
1.20 - 2.00 (65mm dia) 90% rec 2.00 - 3.00 (55mm dia) 95% rec	1.20-1.65	1	SPT(c)	N=10		TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine. Gravel is subangular to subrounded fine to medium flint. Frequent rootlets. Soft orangish brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY with a low cobble content. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is angular to subrounded fine to coarse flint. Cobbles are subangular flint upto 75 mm in size. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	0.20 (0.90) 1.10	
						Wet dense light brown mottled grey gravelly silty fine to medium SAND. Gravels are fine to coarse and angular to subrounded flint and occasional chalk. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(1.20) 2.30	
	2.00-2.45	2	SPT(c)	N=12		Very wet dense orangish brown slightly gravelly silty fine to medium SAND. Gravels are fine to coarse and angular to subrounded flint. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(1.15) 3.45	
	3.00-3.45	3	SPT(c)	N=19		Borehole terminated at 3.45 m depth.		

Drilling Progress and Water Observations						General Remarks	
Date	Time	Borehole Depth (m)	Casing Depth (m)	Borehole Diameter (mm)	Water Depth (m)		
						1. Inspection pit hand dug to 1.2m depth. 2. Groundwater struck at 1.7m depth, rising to 1.1m depth. 3. 42 mm diameter standpipe piezometer (complete with upstanding protective cover) installed to 3.2m depth on completion. Response zone 1.0m to 3.2m.	
All dimensions in metres						Scale:	1:25
Method	Inspection pit + Tracked window		Plant Used:	Dando Terrier		Drilled By:	Phil Guinness
						Logged By:	CLewis
						Checked By:	



DRAFT

BOREHOLE LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis			Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Window Sample: BH204
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 24.01.18 End: 24.01.18	Ground Level (m AOD): 5.79	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490043.4 N:099702.3		Sheet: 1 of 1

Progress		Samples / Tests			Water	Backfill & Instrumentation	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Window Run	Depth	No	Type	Results					
1.20 - 2.00 (65mm dia) 60% rec 2.00 - 3.00 (55mm dia) 75% rec	1.20-1.65	1	SPT(c)	N=9			TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine. Gravel is subangular to subrounded fine to medium flint. Frequent rootlets. Soft orangish brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is angular to subrounded fine to coarse flint. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	0.20 (0.90)	
	2.00-2.45	2	SPT(c)	N=35			Wet dense brown sandy silty fine to coarse angular to subrounded GRAVEL of flint with a low cobble content. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	1.10 (1.20) 2.30	
	3.00-3.45	3	SPT(c)	N=19			Soft grey silty CLAY. (LONDON CLAY FORMATION)	(1.15) 3.45	
							Borehole terminated at 3.45 m depth.		






Drilling Progress and Water Observations						General Remarks	
Date	Time	Borehole Depth (m)	Casing Depth (m)	Borehole Diameter (mm)	Water Depth (m)		
						1. Inspection pit hand dug to 1.2m depth. 2. Groundwater struck at 1.5m depth, rising to 1.2m depth. 3. 42 mm diameter standpipe piezometer (complete with upstanding protective cover) installed to 3.2m depth on completion. Response zone 1.0m to 3.2m.	
Method Inspection pit + Tracked window						All dimensions in metres	Scale: 1:25
Plant Used: Dando Terrier			Drilled By: Phil Guinness		Logged By: CLewis	Checked By:	



DRAFT

BOREHOLE LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis			Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Window Sample: BH205
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 24.01.18 End: 24.01.18	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.82	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490184.5 N:099630.2		Sheet: 1 of 1

Progress Window Run	Samples / Tests				Water Backfill & Instru- mentation	Description of Strata	Depth (Thick- ness)	Material Graphic Legend
	Depth	No	Type	Results				
	1.20-1.65	1	SPT(c)	N=16		TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine. Gravel is subangular to subrounded fine to medium flint. Frequent rootlets. Soft orangish brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is angular to subrounded fine to coarse flint. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	0.20	
							(1.60)	
	2.00-2.45	2	SPT(c)	N=20		Soft orangish brown slightly sandy silty CLAY. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	1.80	
							(0.50)	
	3.00-3.45	3	SPT(c)	N=18		Soft orangish brown mottled grey sandy silty CLAY. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	2.30	
							(1.15)	
						Borehole terminated at 3.45 m depth.	3.45	

Drilling Progress and Water Observations						General Remarks	
Date	Time	Borehole Depth (m)	Casing Depth (m)	Borehole Diameter (mm)	Water Depth (m)		
						1. Inspection pit hand dug to 1.20 m depth. 2. Groundwater struck at 2.50 m depth. 3. 42 mm diameter gas/groundwater monitoring well complete with upstanding protective cover installed to 3.20 m depth on completion. Response zone 1.00 m to 3.20 m depth.	
All dimensions in metres						Scale:	1:25
Method Inspection pit + Tracked window	Plant Used: Dando Terrier		Drilled By: Phil Guinness	Logged By: CLewis	Checked By:		



DRAFT

BOREHOLE LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis			Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Window Sample: BH206
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 23.01.19 End: 23.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.38	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490315.7 N:099577.9		Sheet: 1 of 1

Progress		Samples / Tests			Water	Backfill & Instrumentation	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Window Run	Depth	No	Type	Results					
	1.20-1.65	1	SPT(c)	N=14			TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine. Gravel is subangular to subrounded fine to medium flint. Frequent rootlets.	0.20	
							Soft orangish brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is angular to subrounded fine to coarse flint.	(0.30)	
							Firm light brownish grey CLAY. With occasional red staining from relict rootlets.	(1.00)	
							Firm orangish brown CLAY.	(0.34)	
	2.00-2.45	2	SPT(c)	N=27			Light brown sandy gravelly CLAY. sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is subangular to subrounded fine to medium flint.	1.84	
							Orangish brown and greyish brown slightly silty fine to medium SAND.	(0.49)	
							(Beach sand) Orangish brown slightly gravelly medium to coarse SAND. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint. (BLOWN SAND)	(0.37)	
							R/W? Beach sand in ?weathered London Clay. As above, in firm brown CLAY. (LONDON CLAY FORMATION)	2.95	
	3.00-3.45	3	SPT(c)	N=21			Stiff brown CLAY. ?weathered London Clay? (LONDON CLAY FORMATION)	(0.50)	
							Borehole terminated at 3.45 m depth as additional 0.10 m recovery from London Clay Formation	3.45	

Drilling Progress and Water Observations						General Remarks	
Date	Time	Borehole Depth (m)	Casing Depth (m)	Borehole Diameter (mm)	Water Depth (m)		
						1. Inspection pit hand dug to 1.20 m depth. 2. Groundwater struck at 0.20 m depth. 3. 42 mm diameter gas/groundwater monitoring well complete with upstanding protective cover installed to 3.00 m depth on completion. Response zone 1.00 m to 3.00 m depth. 4. Groundwater level logger installed at 2.40 m depth.	
All dimensions in metres						Scale:	1:25
Method	Tracked window sampling		Plant Used:	Dando Terrier		Drilled By:	Phil Guinness
Used						Logged By:	EHughes
						Checked By:	



DRAFT

BOREHOLE LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis			Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Window Sample: BH207
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 25.01.19 End: 25.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.20	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490260.1 N:099476.3		Sheet: 1 of 1

Progress		Samples / Tests			Water	Backfill & Instrumentation	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Window Run	Depth	No	Type	Results					
 1.20 - 2.00 (65mm dia) 2.00 - 3.00 (55mm dia)	1.20-1.65	1	SPT(c)	N=16			TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine. Gravel is subangular to subrounded fine to medium flint. Frequent rootlets.	(0.30)	
							Firm orangish brown sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(1.30)	
							Reddish brown very sandy angular to rounded fine to coarse flint GRAVEL. Sand is fine to coarse. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	1.60	
	2.00-2.45	2	SPT(c)	N=29			Grey and orangish brown slightly silty fine to medium SAND. (BOGNOR SAND MEMBER)	1.80	
							2.56-3.00m : becoming greenish brown, occasional grey and orangish brown laminated slightly gravelly slightly silty fine to medium SAND. Gravel is subangular medium flint.	(1.65)	
	3.00-3.45	3	SPT(c)	N=20				3.45	
Borehole terminated at 3.45 m depth.									




Drilling Progress and Water Observations						General Remarks			
Date	Time	Borehole Depth (m)	Casing Depth (m)	Borehole Diameter (mm)	Water Depth (m)	1. Inspection pit hand dug to 1.20 m depth. 2. Groundwater struck at 1.80 m depth. 3. 42 mm diameter groundwater monitoring well complete with upstanding protective cover installed to 3.00 m depth on completion. Response zone 1.00 to 3.00 m.			
Method Inspection pit + Tracked window						All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25	
Plant Used: Dando Terrier			Drilled By: Phil Guinness		Logged By: EHughes		Checked By:		



DRAFT

BOREHOLE LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis			Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Window Sample: BH208
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 25.01.19 End: 25.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.08	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490290.5 N:099411.7		Sheet: 1 of 1

Progress Window Run	Samples / Tests				Water Backfill & Instru- mentation	Description of Strata	Depth (Thick- ness)	Material Graphic Legend
	Depth	No	Type	Results				
	1.20-1.65	1	SPT(c)	N=16		TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine. Gravel is subangular to subrounded fine to medium flint. Frequent rootlets. Firm orangish brown slightly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS) Firm orangish brown and brownish grey slightly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. Occasional dark brown lithified organic remains. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS) 1.10-1.20m : gravelly clay band	(0.30) 0.30 0.50 (1.20)	
	2.00-2.45	2	SPT(c)	N=23		Light brown gravelly CLAY. Gravel is angular to rounded fine to coarse flint. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS) Orangish brown and greyish brown slightly gravelly silty fine to medium SAND. Gravel is rounded medium to coarse flint. (BOGNOR SAND MEMBER)	1.70 1.84 (1.61)	
	3.00-3.45	3	SPT(c)	N=20		Borehole terminated at 3.45 m depth.	3.45	

Drilling Progress and Water Observations						General Remarks	
Date	Time	Borehole Depth (m)	Casing Depth (m)	Borehole Diameter (mm)	Water Depth (m)		
						1. Inspection pit hand dug to 1.20 m depth. 2. Groundwater struck at 0.50 m depth. 3. 42 mm diameter groundwater monitoring well complete with upstanding protective cover installed to 3.00 m depth on completion. Response zone 1.00 to 3.00 m.	
All dimensions in metres						Scale:	1:25
Method Inspection pit + Tracked window	Plant Used: Dando Terrier		Drilled By: Phil Guinness	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By:		



DRAFT

BOREHOLE LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis			Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Window Sample: BH209
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 25.01.19 End: 25.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.44	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490134.0 N:099477.8		Sheet: 1 of 1

Progress Window Run	Samples / Tests				Water Backfill & Instru- mentation	Description of Strata	Depth (Thick- ness)	Material Graphic Legend
	Depth	No	Type	Results				
1.20 - 2.00 (65mm dia) 100% rec 2.00 - 3.00 (55mm dia) 100% rec						TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine. Gravel is subangular to subrounded fine to medium flint. Frequent rootlets.	(0.30)	
						Firm orangish brown and light brownish grey slightly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. Occasional dark reddish brown lithified organic remains. Rare subangular fine to medium flint gravel. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	0.30	
							(1.30)	
	1.20-1.65	1	SPT(c)	N=20			1.60	
						Firm orangish brown slightly gravelly slightly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is subangular fine to coarse flint. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(0.38)	
							1.98	
	2.00-2.45	2	SPT(c)	N=29		Interbedded brownish grey and orangish brown silty fine to medium SAND and slightly gravelly CLAY, where gravel is subangular fine to medium flint. (BOGNOR SAND MEMBER)	(0.52)	
							2.50	
						Brownish grey and orangish brown silty fine to medium SAND. (BOGNOR SAND MEMBER)	(0.95)	
	3.00-3.45	3	SPT(c)	N=19			3.45	
						Borehole terminated at 3.45 m depth.		





Drilling Progress and Water Observations						General Remarks	
Date	Time	Borehole Depth (m)	Casing Depth (m)	Borehole Diameter (mm)	Water Depth (m)		
						1. Inspection pit hand dug to 1.20 m depth. 2. Groundwater struck at 2.60 m depth. 3. 42 mm diameter groundwater monitoring well complete with upstanding protective cover installed to 3.00 m depth on completion. Response zone 1.00 to 3.00 m.	
All dimensions in metres						Scale:	1:25
Method Inspection pit + Tracked window	Plant Used: Dando Terrier		Drilled By: Phil Guinness	Logged By: ECraggs	Checked By:		



DRAFT

BOREHOLE LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis			Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Window Sample: BH210
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 24.01.18 End: 24.01.18	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.10	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490076.5 N:099583.0		Sheet: 1 of 1

Progress		Samples / Tests			Water	Backfill & Instrumentation	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Window Run	Depth	No	Type	Results					
							TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine. Gravel is subangular to subrounded fine to medium flint. Frequent rootlets.	0.20	
							Soft orangish brown slightly gravelly silty CLAY. Gravels are fine to coarse angular to subrounded flint. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(0.90)	
								1.10	
	1.20-1.65	1	SPT(c)	N=12			Soft brownish orange mottled dark brown slightly gravelly silty CLAY. Gravels are fine to coarse angular to subrounded flint. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(1.10)	
	2.00-2.45	2	SPT(c)	N=23				2.20	
							Wet dense brown sandy silty fine to coarse angular to subrounded GRAVEL of flint with a low cobble content. Sand is fine to coarse. Cobbles are subrounded flint upto 100 mm in size. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(0.30)	
							Soft orangish brown mottled grey sandy silty CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (LONDON CLAY FORMATION)	2.50	
								(0.95)	
	3.00-3.45	3	SPT(c)	N=20				3.45	
							Borehole terminated at 3.45 m depth.		

Drilling Progress and Water Observations						General Remarks			
Date	Time	Borehole Depth (m)	Casing Depth (m)	Borehole Diameter (mm)	Water Depth (m)	1. Inspection pit hand dug to 1.2m depth. 2. Groundwater struck at 1.8m depth, rising to 1.2m depth. 3. 43 mm diameter standpipe piezometer (complete with upstanding protective cover) installed to 3.20 m depth on completion. Response zone 1.00 m to 3.20 m.			
Method Inspection pit + Tracked window						All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25	
Plant Used: Dando Terrier			Drilled By: Phil Guinness		Logged By: CLewis		Checked By:		



DRAFT

BOREHOLE LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis			Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Window Sample: BH211
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 24.01.19 End: 24.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.71	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490193.7 N:099554.2		Sheet: 1 of 1

Progress		Samples / Tests			Water	Backfill & Instrumentation	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Window Run	Depth	No	Type	Results					
							TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine. Gravel is subangular to subrounded fine to medium flint. Frequent rootlets.	0.20	
							Firm orangish brown sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(1.60)	
	1.20-1.65	1	SPT(c)	N=11				1.80	
							Orangish brown slightly sandy silty CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(0.60)	
	2.00-2.45	2	SPT(c)	N=17				2.40	
							Soft orangish brown mottled grey sandy silty CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	2.60	
							Brownish orange occasionally mottled grey slightly sandy silty CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(0.85)	
	3.00-3.45	3	SPT(c)	N=10				3.45	
							Borehole terminated at 3.45 m depth.		


Drilling Progress and Water Observations						General Remarks	
Date	Time	Borehole Depth (m)	Casing Depth (m)	Borehole Diameter (mm)	Water Depth (m)		
						1. Inspection pit hand dug to 1.2m depth. 2. Groundwater struck at 1.90 m depth. 3. 43 mm diameter standpipe piezometer (complete with upstanding protective cover) installed to 3.20 m depth on completion. Response zone 1.00 m to 3.20 m.	
All dimensions in metres						Scale:	1:25
Method Used: Tracked window sampling	Plant Used: Dando Terrier		Drilled By: Phil Guinness	Logged By: CLewis	Checked By:		




DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP201	
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 21.01.19 End: 21.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.10	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:489826.4 N:099428.5	Sheet: 1 of 1	

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						ASPHALT.	0.15	
						SUB-BASE: Angular to rounded fine to coarse concrete and flint GRAVEL.	0.30	
						MADE GROUND: Brick fill	0.45	
						Orangish brown sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(1.35)	
						1.50-1.80m : becomes orangish brown, brownish grey and occasionally mottled dark reddish brown.	1.80	
						Trial pit terminated at 1.80 m depth.		

Plan (Not to Scale) 		General Remarks	
		1. Trial pit remained dry and stable during excavation. 2. Soakage test carried out. 3. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.	
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25	
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By: 

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
G:\IT_LIBRARY\06_06_GLB LibVersion: v8_06 - Core+Logs - 001 | Log TRIAL PIT LOG - A4P | 305035 SEFTER ROAD, BOGNOR REGIS.GPJ - v8_06
19/02/19 - 20:59 | EHI |



DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP202	
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 23.01.19 End: 23.11.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 5.73	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:489783.2 N:099462.4	Sheet: 1 of 1	

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint. Frequent rootlets.	(0.30) 0.30	
						Orangish brown slightly gravelly slightly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(0.70) 1.00	
						Yellowish brown, alternately light orangish brown and light brownish grey fine to medium SAND. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(0.60) 1.60	
						Trial pit terminated at 1.60 m depth.		

Plan (Not to Scale)		General Remarks			
		1. Trial pit remained stable during excavation. 2. Water seepage at base of trial pit; 1.60 m depth. 3. Soakage test carried out. 4. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.			
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25			
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By:		




DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP203	
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 21.01.19 End: 21.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 5.75	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:489852.4 N:099488.0	Sheet: 1 of 1	

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						MADE GROUND: Dark grey CLAY with rare brick and metal pieces.	0.10	
						MADE GROUND: Greyish brown CLAY.	0.30	
						Orangish brown slightly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	0.55	
						Trial pit terminated at 0.55 m depth.		

Plan (Not to Scale) 		General Remarks	
		1. Trial pit remained dry and stable during excavation. 2. Soakage test carried out. 3. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.	
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25	
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By: 

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
G:\IT_LIBRARY_V8_06.GLB LibVersion: v8_06_018 ProjVersion: v8_06 - Core+Logs - 001 | Log TRIAL PIT LOG - A4P | 305035 SEFTER ROAD, BOGNOR REGIS.GPJ - v8_06_01
19/02/19 - 20:59 | EHI |



DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP204
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 23.01.19 End: 23.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 5.47	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:489879.0 N:099566.1	Sheet: 1 of 1

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						TOPSOIL: Brown and dark brownish grey slightly gravelly slightly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint. Frequent rootlets.	(0.30) 0.30	
						Orangish brown, light brownish grey and occasionally dark brown slightly gravelly slightly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(0.50) 0.80	
						Light orangish brown and light brownish grey clayey fine to medium SAND. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(0.70) 1.50	
						Trial pit terminated at 1.50 m depth.		

Plan (Not to Scale)		General Remarks		
		1. Trial pit remained stable during excavation. 2. Concrete obstruction noted along south edge of pit at 0.4 m depth, so excavation continued approximately 0.3 m away from obstruction. 3. Water seepage at base of trial pit; 1.50 m depth. 4. Soakage test carried out. 5. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.		
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25		
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By:	



DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP205
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 23.01.19 End: 23.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 5.75	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:489911.4 N:099641.5	Sheet: 1 of 1

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint. Frequent rootlets.	0.25	
						Orangish brown sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	0.50	
						Light orangish brown and light brownish grey very sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(0.95)	
						Orangish brown fine to medium SAND. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	1.45	
						Trial pit terminated at 1.50 m depth.	1.50	

Plan (Not to Scale)		General Remarks		
		1. Trial pit remained stable during excavation. 2. Water seepage at 1.45 m depth. 3. Soakage test carried out. 4. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.		
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25		
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By:	




DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP206	
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 21.01.19 End: 21.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.04	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:489961.2 N:099673.1	Sheet: 1 of 1	

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						TOPSOIL: Brownish grey and brown slightly gravelly CLAY. Gravel is angular to rounded fine to coarse flint.	(0.30)	
						Orangish brown and light brownish grey CLAY. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(0.40)	
						Trial pit terminated at 0.70 m depth.	0.70	

Plan (Not to Scale) 		General Remarks	
		1. Trial pit remained dry and stable during excavation. 2. Soakage test carried out. 3. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.	
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25	
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By: 



DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP207	
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 22.01.19 End: 22.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.44	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490156.7 N:099663.5	Sheet: 1 of 1	

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly CLAY. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint.	(0.40)	
						Orangish brown sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	0.40	
						1.00-1.40m : becoming slightly gravelly CLAY, gravels of flint	(1.20)	
						1.40-1.60m : becoming orangish brown and light brownish grey slightly sandy slightly gravelly CLAY, sand is fine to medium, gravels of flint	1.60	
						Trial pit terminated at 1.60 m depth.		

Plan (Not to Scale)		General Remarks	
		1. Trial pit remained dry and stable during excavation. 2. Soakge test carried out. 3. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.	
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25	
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By:



Contract:		Client:		Trial Pit:	
Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		TP208	
Contract Ref:	Start: 22.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD):	National Grid Co-ordinate:	Sheet:	
305035	End: 22.01.19	6.96	E:490218.7 N:099664.6	1 of 1	

Plan (Not to Scale)		General Remarks 1. Trial pit remained dry and stable during excavation. 2. Soakge test carried out. 3. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.	
Method Used: Machine dug		Plant Used: JCB-3CX	
Logged By: EHughes		Checked By: 1:25	



DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP209	
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 22.01.19 End: 22.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.87	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490284.1 N:099672.3	Sheet: 1 of 1	

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly CLAY. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint.	(0.30)	
						Orangish brown sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(1.20)	
						1.20-1.50m : becomes slightly gravelly CLAY with a low cobble content, gravels and cobbles are flint	1.50	
						Trial pit terminated at 1.50 m depth.		

Plan (Not to Scale)		General Remarks			
		1. Trial pit remained dry and stable during excavation. 2. Soakage test carried out. 3. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.			
		All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25	
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By:		



Contract:		Client:		Trial Pit:	
Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		TP210	
Contract Ref:	Start: 22.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD):	National Grid Co-ordinate:	Sheet:	
305035	End: 22.01.19	6.59	E:490300.2 N:099620.3	1 of 1	

Plan (Not to Scale)		General Remarks 1. Trial pit remained dry and stable during excavation. 2. Soakage test carried out. 3. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.	
		All dimensions in metres Scale: 1:25	
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By:



DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP211	
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 21.01.19 End: 21.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.36	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490300.5 N:099536.4	Sheet: 1 of 1	

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
1.50	1	B				TOPSOIL: Brown occasionally orangish brown	(0.30)	
						Orangish brown CLAY. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	0.30	
						Yellowish brown slightly clayey fine to medium SAND. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	1.40	
						Trial pit terminated at 1.50 m depth.	1.50	

Plan (Not to Scale)		General Remarks	
		1. Trial pit remained stable to 1.40 m during excavation, but was unstable below 1.40 m due to running sand. 2. Groundwater struck at 1.50 m depth. 3. Soakage test undertaken. 4. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.	
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25	
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By:



DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP212	
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 23.01.19 End: 23.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.08	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490326.8 N:099449.0	Sheet: 1 of 1	

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly CLAY. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint.	(0.30)	
						Orangish brown slightly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	0.30	
							(0.41)	
						Trial pit terminated at 0.71 m depth.	0.71	

Plan (Not to Scale) 		General Remarks	
		1. Trial pit was unstable throughout owing to high resting water level (standing water around trial pit). 2. Surface water seepage at 0.10 m depth. 3. Soakage test not undertaken owing to high resting groundwater level, however rising groundwater level recorded over 1 hour. 4. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.	
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25	
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By:



Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP213
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 23.01.19 End: 23.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.19	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490273.2 N:099402.3	Sheet: 1 of 1

Plan (Not to Scale)		General Remarks 1. Trial pit was unstable throughout owing to high resting water level (standing water around trial pit). 2. Surface water seepage at 0.25 m depth. 3. Soakage test not undertaken owing to high resting groundwater level, however rising groundwater level recorded over 1.5 hours. 4. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.	
		All dimensions in metres	Scale: 1:25
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By: AGS



DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP214	
Contract Ref: 305035		Start: 22.01.19 End: 22.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.40	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490205.8 N:099444.7	Sheet: 1 of 1

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly CLAY. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint.	(0.35)	
						Orangish brown sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	0.35	
							(0.30)	
						Trial pit terminated at 0.65 m depth.	0.65	

Plan (Not to Scale) 		General Remarks	
		1. Groundwater struck at 0.6m depth within the light greyish brown sandy clay. 2. Topsoil stratum unstable. 3. Soakage test carried out. 4. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.	
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25	
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By:



DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP215	
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 22.01.19 End: 22.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.12	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490111.4 N:099429.5	Sheet: 1 of 1	

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly CLAY. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint.	(0.30) 0.30	
						Orangish brown and light brownish grey sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(1.30)	
						1.30-1.50m : becomes slightly gravelly CLAY with a low cobble content cobble subangular flint to 100 mm in size	1.60	
						Trial pit terminated at 1.60 m depth.		

Plan (Not to Scale) 		General Remarks	
		1. Trial pit remained dry and stable during excavation. 2. Soakage test carried out. 3. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.	
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25	
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By:




DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP217	
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 22.01.19 End: 22.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.16	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490058.1 N:099490.6	Sheet: 1 of 1	

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly CLAY. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint.	(0.30)	
						Brownish grey, orangish brown and dark brown slightly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. Brick fragment at 0.4 m depth. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	0.30	
						Trial pit terminated at 0.55 m depth.	0.55	

Plan (Not to Scale) 		General Remarks	
		1. Trial pit remained dry and stable during excavation. 2. Soakage test carried out. 3. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.	
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25	
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By: 



DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP218	
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 22.01.19 End: 22.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.28	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490085.3 N:099550.0	Sheet: 1 of 1	

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly CLAY. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint.	0.25	
						Orangish brown, light greyish brown and dark brown mottled sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(1.25)	
							1.50	
						Trial pit terminated at 1.50 m depth.		

Plan (Not to Scale) 		General Remarks	
		1. Trial pit remained dry and stable during excavation. 2. Soakage test carried out. 3. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.	
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25	
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By:



DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP219	
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 22.01.19 End: 22.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.19	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490103.2 N:099616.6	Sheet: 1 of 1	

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly CLAY. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint.	0.25	
						Orangish brown sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	(1.05)	
						Orangish brown and light brownish grey slightly gravelly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. Gravel is subangular coarse flint. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	1.30	
						Trial pit terminated at 1.50 m depth.	1.50	

Plan (Not to Scale) 		General Remarks	
		1. Trial pit remained dry and stable during excavation. 2. Soakage test carried out. 3. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.	
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25	
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By:



DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP220
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 22.01.19 End: 22.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.72	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490168.9 N:099591.1	Sheet: 1 of 1

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly CLAY. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint.	0.25	
						Orangish brown sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	0.50	
						Trial pit terminated at 0.50 m depth.		

Plan (Not to Scale)		General Remarks		
		1. Trial pit remained dry and stable during excavation. 2. Soakage test carried out. 3. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.		
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25		
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By:	



DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP221	
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 23.01.19 End: 23.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.51	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490238.0 N:099574.6	Sheet: 1 of 1	

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						TOPSOIL: Brown	(0.35)	
						Orangish brown slightly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	0.35	
						Trial pit terminated at 0.60 m depth.	0.60	

Plan (Not to Scale)		General Remarks			
		1. Trial pit remained dry during excavation. 2. Some collapse of topsoil stratum 0.00 to 0.35 m depth. 3. Soakage test carried out. 4. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.			
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25			
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By:		



DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis			Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP222
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 23.01.19 End: 23.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.48	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490212.0 N:099511.6		Sheet: 1 of 1

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly CLAY. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint.	(0.30)	
						Orangish brown, light brown and occasional dark brown slightly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	0.30	
							(0.60)	
						Trial pit terminated at 0.90 m depth due to incoming groundwater.	0.90	

Plan (Not to Scale)		General Remarks			
		1. Water seepage at base 0.90 m depth. 2. Partial collapse of topsoil stratum 0.00 to 0.30 m depth. 3. Soakage test carried out. 4. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.			
		All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25	
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By:		



DRAFT

TRIAL PIT LOG

Contract: Sefter Road, Bognor Regis		Client: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Trial Pit: TP223	
Contract Ref: 305035	Start: 23.01.19 End: 23.01.19	Ground Level (m AOD): 6.68	National Grid Co-ordinate: E:490156.4 N:099532.2	Sheet: 1 of 1	

Samples and In-situ Tests				Water	Backfill	Description of Strata	Depth (Thickness)	Material Graphic Legend
Depth	No	Type	Results					
						TOPSOIL: Brown slightly gravelly CLAY. Gravel is subangular to rounded fine to coarse flint.	0.25	
						Orangish brown sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to medium. (RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS)	0.50	
						Trial pit terminated at 0.50 m depth.		

Plan (Not to Scale) 		General Remarks	
		1. Trial pit remained dry during excavation. 2. Soakage test carried out. 3. Partial collapse of topsoil stratum 0.00 to 0.25 m depth during soakage test. 4. On completion, trial pit backfilled with arisings.	
All dimensions in metres		Scale: 1:25	
Method Used: Machine dug	Plant Used: JCB-3CX	Logged By: EHughes	Checked By: