

Engineers Comments Regarding Surface Water Drainage

Application Reference:	R/20/24/DOC	Reviewer Reference:	ADC/EXT2/D2134/40
Planning Officer:	Kathryn Welch	Date of Review:	28.10.2024
Site Name:	Rustington Convalescent Home Sea Road Rustington BN16 2LZ		
Application Description:	Approval of details reserved by condition imposed under R/258/18/PL relating to condition 19-foul and surface water sewerage disposal.		
Assessment Number:	1 of 2		

Policy and Guidance Information

Arun District Council Surface Water Drainage Guidance - <https://www.arun.gov.uk/surfacewater>

WSCC Policy for the Management of Surface Water-

https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/media/12230/ws_llfa_policy_for_management_of_surface_water.pdf

Land Drainage Consent - <https://www.arun.gov.uk/land-drainage-consent/>

Arun District Council surface water pre-commencement conditions -

<https://www.arun.gov.uk/planning-pre-commencement-conditions>

Response

Condition 19: **Further information required**

Comments

Engineers Comments Regarding Surface Water Drainage

Application Reference:	R/20/24/DOC	Reviewer Reference:	ADC/EXT2/D2134/40
Planning Officer:	Kathryn Welch	Date of Review:	28.10.2024
Site Name:	Rustington Convalescent Home Sea Road Rustington BN16 2LZ		
Application Description:	Approval of details reserved by condition imposed under R/258/18/PL relating to condition 19-foul and surface water sewerage disposal.		
Assessment Number:	2 of 2		

Policy and Guidance Information

Arun District Council Surface Water Drainage Guidance - <https://www.arun.gov.uk/surfacewater>

Land Drainage Consent – <https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/fire-emergencies-and-crime/dealing-with-extreme-weather/flooding/flood-risk-management/ordinary-watercourse-land-drainage-consent/> and <https://www.arun.gov.uk/land-drainage-consent/>

Arun District Council surface water pre-commencement conditions - <https://www.arun.gov.uk/planning-pre-commencement-conditions>

The SuDs Manual [C753] by CIRIA

Sustainable drainage systems: non-statutory technical standards' <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a815646ed915d74e6231b43/sustainable-drainage-technical-standards.pdf>

Response

Condition 19: **Further information required**

Critical Items for Surface Water Drainage Design Conditions

The failure to adequately address the following items will result in an objection to an application to discharge a surface water drainage design condition.

If any of these items are inadequately addressed by the submission, then their correction may result in a redesign of the surface water drainage scheme. A redesign is likely to have site wide implications such as the potential for storage structures to increase in volume or plan area.

Items are further elaborated upon in the attached comment tracker where necessary.

Further comments which are unlikely to impact the design methodology will be provided in the comment tracker, these relate to the detailed design. Unless clearly stated, it is considered that these additional comments are unlikely to result in a redesign of the system. These can be addressed following a second consultation to prevent unnecessary refusals.

Critical Item	Reason	Status
Winter groundwater monitoring data.	Adequate winter groundwater monitoring data must be supplied to evidence that infiltration designs have sufficient freeboard from the base of structures and the peak groundwater level.	Insufficient Designer Summary required

	The same data is necessary to ensure that the potential for buoyancy has been adequately considered in attenuation designs.	
Winter infiltration testing data.	Adequate winter infiltration testing must be supplied to justify the proposed discharge method and design infiltration rates. Infiltration tests must be completed strictly in accordance with BRE DG 365, CIRIA R156 or a similar approved method. Testing depths must account for peak groundwater levels and correspond with the location and depth of proposed infiltration features. Designs must be based upon the <u>slowest</u> infiltration rate evidenced closest to a proposed infiltration feature. Average design rates will not be accepted. The results of incomplete tests should not be extrapolated to obtain design values for infiltration rates.	Insufficient Designer Summary required
The hierarchy for sustainable drainage.	The proposed discharge method must accord with the SuDS hierarchy as given below. Evidence must be supplied to justify the proposed discharge method. 1. Rainwater reuse where possible. 2. Complete discharge into the ground (infiltration). 3. Hybrid infiltration and restricted discharge to an appropriate water body or surface water sewer. 4. Restricted discharge to an appropriate water body. 5. Restricted discharge to a surface water sewer. 6. Restricted discharge to a combined sewer. A water body may be defined as a river, watercourse, ditch, culverted watercourse, reservoir, wetland or the sea. Engineers cannot support any proposed connection of surface water to the foul sewer.	Compliant

Calculations	Calculations for pre-development run off rates must be based upon the positively drained area only. Proposed discharge rates must not increase flood risk on site or elsewhere. Discharge rates must be restricted to QBAR or 2 l/s/ha, depending on whichever is higher.	Insufficient
	Designs must be based on the most recently available rainfall data at the time of conditions being applied. <u>FSR rainfall data will not be accepted.</u> FEH rainfall data is based upon more recent records and continues to be updated.	Compliant
	Designs must use the correct climate change allowances at the time of determination of the outline or full planning application. CV values for all events must be set to 1. This includes summer, winter, design, and simulation events. The correct allowance for urban creep must be applied. Additional storage must be set to zero unless it can be evidenced where this is provided. Infiltration half-drain times must be less than 24 hours. Infiltration design rates must be applied to the sides of soakaways, or to the base of infiltration blankets. Design rates must not be applied to both the base and sides of infiltration structures. A surcharged outfall must be modelled.	Insufficient
Natural catchments design.	The submission must define the natural drainage characteristics within, and hydraulically linked to, the site and demonstrate that the drainage proposals will integrate with and not compromise the function of the natural and existing drainage systems. The condition, performance (including capacity where appropriate) and ownership of any existing site surface water drainage infrastructure must be accurately reported.	Insufficient

	Appropriate easements to watercourses and other services must be shown on all plans. Where there are areas of flood risk from any source on the site, it must be shown how a sustainable surface water drainage design can be accommodated on the site without conflicting with those areas of flood risk. Designs must replicate the natural drainage catchments of the site. All surface water drainage designs must therefore drain via gravity to corresponding points of discharge. The use of pumps for surface water drainage is not sustainable and will not be supported.	
Plans	Plan areas, depths and levels of drainage infrastructure must accurately correspond with the supporting calculations.	Insufficient
Water quality benefits.	An assessment of water quality is necessary to evidence that the proposed design provides adequate treatment of surface water.	Complaint
Biodiversity and amenity benefits.	The surface water drainage design must provide biodiversity and amenity benefits.	Complaint
Trees and planting	There should be no conflict between surface water drainage infrastructure and existing or proposed trees or planting. The design must consider the potential growth of proposed trees and adequate mitigation must be provided to protect drainage infrastructure where conflict cannot be avoided.	Complaint

Additional comments to the planning officer

The NPPF states that when determining any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere (paragraph 173 and 180e). The PPG guides local planning authorities to refer to 'Sustainable drainage systems: non-statutory technical standards' and detailed industry guidance like The SuDS Manual [C753] by CIRIA to guide decisions about the design, maintenance, and operation of sustainable drainage systems for non-major development.

This consultation has been primarily informed by The SuDS Manual.

Application Reference: R/20/24/DOC	Initial Issue Date: 28.10.2024
Site Name: Rustington Convalescent Home Sea Road Rustington BN16 2LZ	Issue Date: 28.10.2024
	Reviewer Reference: ADC/EXT2/D2134/40

Summary and Recommendation:

Condition 19: **Further information required**

Please note: Any DOC application should only have a maximum of two consultation responses. If this is the second response for an open application and there are still comments outstanding, then please recommend that the application is refused.

	ADC Drainage Comments	Designer Response	ADC Drainage Comments	Designer Response	ADC Drainage Comments
Date:	28.02.2024	25.06.2024	31.07.2024	18/08/2024	28.10.2024
Condition Number: 19					
Comment Number					
1.	Whilst we have no initial concerns in respect of the foul water strategy shown on drawing 202 (& subsequent GTA drawings 1901/1902), Southern Water shall be consulted in respect of the foul water disposal, prior to wholly discharging condition 19.	We note that Southern Water have provided their response in relation to this application, letter reference DSA000031166, dated 14 th February 2024 and have no objection to the application.	Noted. Comment closed.		
2.	A drainage strategy has been prepared by Ruby & Stagg Ltd dated June 2018. This advises a surface water strategy to utilise soakaways. Reference is made under application R/85/18/DOC to FRA which includes the	The proposes Surface Water drainage strategy combines infiltration and attenuation using the latest soakage test results.	The latest data set provided b LEAP contains a location plan, trial holes and infiltration testing results, no summary and/or recommendations. There is insufficient geotechnical/engineer summary to demonstrate the parts of the site (plan with approximate findings) that are	Please see LEAP Phase 3 report, ref LP3667/Ph3, which provides the data from the field tests with calculated infiltration rates. See Odyssey drawings 24-059-105, 106 and 107 which include the locations of the testing and results. Based on the results of percolation tests Odyssey	The latest data set provided b LEAP contains a location plan, trial holes and infiltration testing results. Simply adding the variable data to the drawings in not accepted as a summary and/or recommendations is

Surface Water Drainage Comment Tracker

	Soakage Test Letter by Geo-Environmental, ref JT01 180228. Dated 28th February 2018, however this has not been submitted under the application. Please ensure all applicable data is submitted.		suitable for infiltration and where a tanked approach is required. Comment outstanding.	have calculated the areas that are suitable for infiltration and areas which do not support infiltration. The Odyssey details also indicate which tanks and permeable paving sections are infiltrating, and which are non-infiltrating (and therefore providing conveyance/ storage function only).	required generally considering the worst case scenario. There is insufficient geotechnical/engineer summary to demonstrate the parts of the site (plan with approximate findings) that are suitable for infiltration and where a tanked approach is required so supporting geotech plan to highlight this is required. Comment outstanding.
3.	A subsequent drainage statement has been prepared by GTA, dated 16th February 2022 which is understood to be the current report.	Refer to drawings:- - Drawing 24-059-SK005 – Surface Water Drainage Strategy Sheet 1 of 3. - Drawing 24-059-SK006 – Surface Water Drainage Strategy Sheet 2 of 3. - Drawing 24-059-SK007 – Surface Water Drainage Strategy Sheet 3 of 3. Associated calculation also included.	These drawings are badged 'SK' inferring this is not a detailed design for construction purposes, as is required for a DOC discharge. These 'strategy' drawings cover high level and not detail, i.e. missing foul design, no FFL's, spots levels, gradients, low points, etc. Therefore we would expect supporting drawings for a full civils package including levels, drainage, surface finishes. Comment outstanding.	Please see the Odyssey drawings 24-059-105, 106 and 107 which indicate all drainage details requested.	These drawings are still not sufficient for construction purposes, as is required for a DOC discharge. It is noted that additional drawings 105,106,107,108 do provide a fuller civils package including road levels, drainage, however the full site design is still missing in terms of level design coverage.

Surface Water Drainage Comment Tracker

					Comment outstanding.
4.	The aforementioned GTA report includes further infiltration testing undertaken by Ashdown Investigation Ltd dated Feb 2022. This concludes infiltration to be viable as summarised in table 2 (compliant to BRE365), with advisory to the standard 5m BRegs stand-off distance.	Refer to LEAP Environmental Soakage Testing results.	Noted. As above there is no summary or recommendations in respect of the design infiltration rate. Furthermore the calculations clearly show various inflation rates being used which is of concern. The worst case rates must be used and suitable engineers evidence shall be provided to qualify criteria. Comment outstanding.	Please see Odyssey drawings 24-059-105, 106 and 107 which indicate the location of percolation testing, their results and details. Odyssey have adopted infiltration rates for infiltrating structures that commensurate with the field findings appropriate for a given location.	Noted. As above there is no summary or recommendations in respect of the design infiltration rate. Furthermore the calculations clearly show various inflation rates being used which is of concern. The worst case rates must be used and suitable engineers evidence shall be provided to qualify criteria. Comment outstanding.
5.	Groundwater monitoring has been undertaken over the winter period. This appears to have some tidal influence with a seasonal peak of the order of 1.9m AOD. In light of the above compliance with the EA guidance in providing a 1.0m freeboard between the base of an infiltration feature and seasonal peak groundwater level it remains unclear if the	See included drawings and calculations.	No further evidence has been provided in respect of groundwater and the response to this comment is inadequate. Drainage strategy drawings 1,2,3 do not include any reference to groundwater and freeboard to all SUDS features. Comment outstanding.	Please see Odyssey drawings 24-059-105, 106 and 107 which indicate the location of groundwater (GW) monitoring locations and highest recorded level. Proposed infiltration features have their base level located above the highest recorded GW levels at the appropriate locations.	No further evidence has been provided in respect of groundwater and the response to this comment is inadequate. Whilst drainage layout drawings 105,106,107,108 annotate all geotechnical testing locations with groundwater levels, however numerous

	permeable pavement depth / formation level comply. Section 4.0 suggests a formation of 2.383m AOD (zone 9) which would inform a freeboard of 480mm; this does not comply with ADC standing advice. Furthermore it has been acknowledged there is a tidal impact here so it is considered a suitable freeboard is essential for the design life of the site when factoring in sea level rise.				permeable pavement depths appears to sit below the peak groundwater datum. It is evident there does not appear to be any freeboard between any SUDS feature 'base' and 'peak GW' and the permeable pavement depths are variable. It remains unclear if the designer has made allowances for saturated storage. Comment outstanding.
6.	Drawing 1005 illustrates 9 zones with numerous stated as 'infiltration nil' and a '150mm control', please clarify via a drawing the areas of the site where blanket infiltration will be utilised and remaining areas that are deemed unsuitable. Furthermore the designer must clarify the infiltration design rates used tally with the 3rd geotechnical test results and demonstrate worst case results have been adhered to.	Refer to drawings referred to above and associated calculations which note the infiltration rates.	As noted above the designer has not qualified the infiltration rates used. Comment outstanding.	As per above comment to point 4.	As noted above the designer has not qualified the infiltration rates used. Comment outstanding.

Surface Water Drainage Comment Tracker

7.	Please provide a site plan / topographic survey detailing the historic overland flow routing.		No information supplied. Comment outstanding.	Please refer to the topographical survey which indicates topography to be sloping from East to West towards the Mewsbrook Park.	A topographical survey in isolation does not highlight historic overland flow routes; this shall be applied by the designer. Comment outstanding.
8.	Please provide a site plan detailing the proposed overland flow routing.	See Drawings.	Drawing 24-059-130 'exceedance route layout' has been provided. Comment closed.		
	Drawings 1901/1902				
9.	Permeable pavement formation levels must be annotated.	Base levels are shown on the Drainage strategy.	Base level appears to be either 2.88 or 2.87; which is correct? It is noted that the permeable sub-base formation is intended to be flat, therefore depths are varied to form the final profile. In some areas depths are noted in excess of 1.44m however Sketch drawing 008 illustrating the stand detail does not qualify the greater depths and if geogrid will be required. Bespoke construction details must be provided for all SUDS features; for permeable pavements any check dams,	Please see Odyssey drawings 24-059-105, 106 and 107 which indicate sub-base levels for permeable paving at the start and end of respective sections. Please note that for permeable paving where infiltration is used the base is assumed as flat. For permeable paving sections where their main purpose is to convey water (to sections that infiltrate) the levels are provided for the sub-base at its upstream and downstream extent with the constant gradient in between. The thickness of sub-base is not	Base level appear to vary across the site hence this is a complex solution. It is noted that the permeable sub-base formations are mixed being flat and sloped and the depths are variable The permeable details on drawing 123 are too generic and do not reflect the greater depths and if geogrid/structural support will be required.

Surface Water Drainage Comment Tracker

			breaks, pipe links needs to be detailed. The drainage strategy plans illustrative numerous diffusers units with linking under drains, however there is insufficient information on both the plans and detailing to understand so how will the contractor build it. Comment outstanding.	constant and on standard detail drawing 24-059-123 it is noted that "sub-base thickness to be calculated based on the sub-base formation level and surface finished levels". Drawing 24-059-123 together with drawings 24-059-110 and 24-059-111 details appropriate construction for drainage and road make-ups.	Bespoke construction details (& site cross sections) must be provided for all SUDS features; for permeable pavements any check dams, breaks, pipe links needs to be detailed. The drainage strategy plans illustrative numerous diffusers units with linking under drains, however there is insufficient information on both the plans and detailing to understand so how will the contractor build it. Comment outstanding.
10.	Supporting construction details will be required. It is fundamental to detail all drainage related features including permeable pavements and pollution control features. Furthermore it is recommended that surface	See Drawing 012-050. See Hard Landscaping materials schedule.	Drawing not supplied (also not listed in the revised statement contents). Comment outstanding. Noted, no comments.	See Odyssey Drawings 24-059-123, 24-059-110 and 24-059-111 which detail the appropriate construction for the drainage and road make-up. Drawings 24-059-120 to 122 show various surface finishes across the site.	Noted, hover as commented in item 9, further information is required to cover all bespoke features. Comment outstanding.

Surface Water Drainage Comment Tracker

	finish information is also supplied.				
11.			Further construction details of TANK 3 are require to appropriately demonstrate how this will be installed underneath a permeable pavement.	Refer to Odyssey drawing 24-059-111 for details of the tank. The water would permeate through the permeable paving structure and then flow into the tank via the geotextile.	Generic details are not accepted. Further construction details of all SUDS features are require to appropriately demonstrate how this will be installed underneath variable finishes.
12.					Further construction details of all SUDS features are require to appropriately demonstrate how this will be installed underneath variable finishes.
13.					Cross sections are require where there are split permeable paving types and underdrains.
14.					What is the size and shape of geocellular tanks 5 & 6;this appears to be

Surface Water Drainage Comment Tracker

					amorphous hence unbuildable?
15.					Diffuser used for infiltration must be located at least 5m from any structure.
	Hydraulic Calculations:				
16.	The 1D model must include a supporting plan to denote all nodes/links or cascade approach.	See Drawings.	The drainage strategy plans and Infodrainage calculations do not tally. There are numerous catchment areas not identified on any plans. Comment outstanding.	Refer to Infodrainage calculations '24-059 - Rustington, Sea Road_SW system' including the catchment plan which provides the requested information.	The drainage strategy plans and Infodrainage calculations do not tally. There are numerous catchment areas not identified on any plans. Comment outstanding.
17.	The WSCC surface water policy requires a design criteria for FEH 2022 and a CV value of 1.0 for both Summer & Winter scenarios. The current modelling is not acceptable.	The system has been designed to FEH 2022.	The Infodrainage calculation outputs do not reveal all input criteria thus unable to qualify this is FEH22. Full print out are required. Comment outstanding.	Refer to Infodrainage calculations '24-059 - Rustington, Sea Road_SW system' which provides the requested information.	The Infodrainage calculations page 26 confirm FEH22, however the print outs lack of baseline criteria hence the CV values specified simulation cannot be seen. Comment outstanding.
18.	A factor of safety must be declared where infiltration is used.	See Calculations.	Noted, however the safety factor is only showing on certain elements of the design.	Refer to Infodrainage calculations '24-059 - Rustington, Sea Road_SW system' which specify FOS of infiltrating features and	Noted, however the safety factor is only showing on certain elements of the design.

Surface Water Drainage Comment Tracker

	Permeable pavement feature must clarify the inverts, ground levels and 'cap' sub-base depths. It may be necessary to explain system water depths on the supporting 1D model plan.		Furthermore there is no explanation hence the response is inadequate. Comment outstanding.	provides full modelling details.	Furthermore there is no explanation hence the response is inadequate. Comment outstanding.
19.	Please summarise the half drain down time to 50% for each storage feature. This shall be illustrated for 10yr, 30yr, 100yr. Please note that our minimum compliance is required for at least the 10yr+CC (45%) storm.	See Calculations.		Whilst no comment has been made, the proposed design is supported by the Infodrainage calculations '24-059 - Rustington, Sea Road_SW system' which show water levels in the system for the 1 in 10 and 1 in 100 storm events – both allowing for climate change. Drainage plans 24-059-105, 106 and 107 specify then invert levels of connections and these were set to be not below the 1 in 10 water level (including climate change).	Revised calculations required. Comment outstanding.
20.	There is no drawings to demonstrate the existing and/or proposed impermeable area comparison and denote each catchment area to support the calculations areas.	See Drainage Strategy Drawings.		Whilst no comment has been made, the proposed design is supported by the Infodrainage calculations '24-059 - Rustington, Sea Road_SW system' including catchment plan that demonstrates connectivity of each sub-catchment into the respective part of the system.	The key plan on page 1 of the calculations is illegible and does not quantify the catchments.

Surface Water Drainage Comment Tracker

21.			The calculations stipulate a double barrel on some of the underdrains, yet this is not shown on any drawings or details.	Please see Odyssey Drawings 24-059-105, 106 and 107 which indicate the number and diameter of under-drains. The porous paving under drain construction detail is shown on drawing 24-059-111.	Noted. Comment closed.
22.			The calculations show orifice plate flow controls. Please provide further construction details and ensure all features are indicated on the plans. Any 1D features used in the model but not intended for install must be qualified by the engineer.	Refer to Infodrainage calculations '24-059 - Rustington, Sea Road_SW system' which now do not incorporate orifice flow controls.	Noted. Comment closed.
	Drainage & Maintenance Manual:				
23.	Whilst the schedule covers the main components, there is no supporting plan to denote the extents of maintenance requirements.	See Drawings.	A revised drainage maintenance manual was request but not supplied. Comment outstanding.	Please refer to the Drainage Maintenance and Management Plan.	The maintenance document dated August 2024 is received, however does not comply with ADC's requirements (see website checklist) where a supporting drawing 'plan' must also be included.
24.	Permeable paving diffusers need to be included.	See Drainage Strategy drawings.	Noted, these are shown on the drawings, however there	The drainage details indicate the locations of the	Noted.

Surface Water Drainage Comment Tracker

			are no details of the number and size of these to reflect the flow requirements. Comment outstanding.	diffusers with reference to the manufacturer to be determined. It is suggested that this is a reasonable arrangement (providing the performance is consistent) to ensure products which are available when they are required can be used. There presence is further supported in the calculations (Infodrainage calculations '24-059 - Rustington, Sea Road_SW system).	Noted. Comment closed.
25.	Section 1.3 mentions an existing ditch and watercourses?	N/A as infiltration.	A revised drainage maintenance manual was request but not supplied. Comment outstanding.	Please refer to the Drainage Maintenance and Management Plan.	Noted. Comment closed.
					The report must ensure there are clear details of who to contact if the surface water drainage system is not functioning correctly.
					There is no action plan for dealing with accidental spillages of pollutants.
					There is no advice provided as to what to do if alterations are to be made to the

					development or, works are to be carried out which may affect the surface water drainage system.
--	--	--	--	--	---

If a designer would like a .docx version of this document to aid administration of responses, please request this by email to land.drainage@arun.gov.uk.

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

To register to receive notifications of planning applications in your area please go to
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>



From: Paul Cann [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 November 2024 12:45
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>

[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Planning Re-Consultation on: R/20/24/DOC

Latest response from our consultant enclosed.

Regards

Paul Cann

Principal Drainage Engineer, Coastal Engineers and Flood Prevention

[REDACTED]

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



From: Daniel Vick [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 October 2024 12:26
To: Kathryn Welch <Kathryn.Welch@arun.gov.uk>

[REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Planning Re-Consultation on: R/20/24/DOC

Kathryn,

It is possible that an updated tracker was not sent. I understand it has been requested.

Daniel Vick

Team Leader (Development Management), Planning

[REDACTED]

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





From: Daniel Vick
Sent: 25 October 2024 17:20
To: Kathryn Welch <Kathryn.Welch@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Planning Re-Consultation on: R/20/24/DOC

Apparently they are not the most up-to-date – Sarah will re-send on Monday.

Daniel Vick
Team Leader (Development Management), Planning



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



From: Daniel Vick
Sent: 25 October 2024 17:09
To: Kathryn Welch <Kathryn.Welch@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Planning Re-Consultation on: R/20/24/DOC

Thanks – which is the most up-to-date?

Daniel Vick
Team Leader (Development Management), Planning

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



From: Kathryn Welch <Kathryn.Welch@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 October 2024 16:58
To: Daniel Vick [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Planning Re-Consultation on: R/20/24/DOC

FYI

Kathryn Welch
Senior Planning Officer, Planning Department

T: 01903 737789
E: kathryn.welch@arun.gov.uk

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



From: Sarah Burrow [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 October 2024 09:17
To: Kathryn Welch <Kathryn.Welch@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Planning Re-Consultation on: R/20/24/DOC

FYI

Sarah Burrow
Flood Risk and Drainage Engineer, Coastal Engineers and Flood Prevention



Usual working pattern:
Monday – Flexible between 8am and 6pm
Tuesday and Wednesday – 9:15am to 2:45pm
Thursday – 9am to 6pm
Friday – Flexible between 8am and 6pm

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



From: Paul Cann [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 October 2024 09:09
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Planning Re-Consultation on: R/20/24/DOC

Please find enclosed our consultants response

Regards

Paul Cann
Principal Drainage Engineer, Coastal Engineers and Flood Prevention

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



From: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2024 4:20:32 PM (UTC+00:00) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Land Drainage <Land.Drainage@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Re-Consultation on: R/20/24/DOC

To: **Engineers (Drainage)**

NOTIFICATION FROM ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

Application No: R/20/24/DOC
Registered: 30th January 2024
Site Address: Rustington Convalescent Home Sea Road Rustington BN16 2LZ
Grid Reference: 504324 101454
Category: Discharge of Condi
Description of Works: Approval of details reserved by condition imposed under R/258/18/PL relating to condition 19-foul and surface water sewerage disposal.

I am able to inform you that I have received an amendment to the above application dated 21st August 2024 relating to: Additional drainage plans and documents.

[Click here to view the plans and documents](#)

If you should wish to make further representations as a result of this amendment you should click the link below and then click on 'Enter comment'.

[Click here to make further comments](#)

Please make any further comment by **5th September 2024**.

Please be aware that any comments you may make will be available on our website so please do not insert personal details or signatures on your reply.

Yours sincerely

Kathryn Welch

Planning Case Officer-Arun District Council

Telephone: 01903 737789

Email: kathryn.welch@arun.gov.uk

PURECON_DOC (055) 2620