

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 16 March 2021 11:20
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Planning Consultation on: Y/26/21/DOC

Essential maintenance is being carried out to the planning, building control and local land charges database during the week commencing 12 April 2021.

During this time there will be no public or staff access to any records held within this database, and it will not be possible to carry out any of the following tasks via the Arun website:

- Research planning and building control history
- View any planning applications, plans, agreements, tree preservation orders or competent persons data
- Submit building control applications
- Submit planning application comments
- Report any planning compliance issues

The publicity and consultation period for all planning applications that fall over this week will be extended by a further week to ensure no one is disadvantaged.

All other aspects of planning, building control and local land charges will be limited during this week and you are strongly advised to contact the individual departments before 12 April 2021 for specific restrictions during this time.

Amanda Scholes

T: 01903 737453

E: amanda.scholes@arun.gov.uk



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

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

Sign up to our newsletter **[here](#)**



From: Laura Gibbons <Laura.Gibbons@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 16 March 2021 09:44
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Michael Eastham <Michael.Eastham@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Planning Consultation on: Y/26/21/DOC

Dear Michael,

Thank you for consulting us on this discharge of conditions application. We have the following comments regarding condition 11.

Key

LG comments to Y/113/20/DOC 10/02/21

Odyssey response 22/02/21

LG comments to Y/26/21/DOC 16/03/21

1. Lots of calculations are missing.

a. Please provide calculations for permeable paving areas/ roads for each discrete area and each test pit area to accurately represent the design in areas which have different infiltration potential, and different areas draining to them. Additional calculations have been provided based on the criteria agreed with Ryan Saul

The calculations for road areas are not clearly defined, please label road 1, etc. on plan. Impermeable areas diagram does not clearly show which areas are draining to where, i.e. please break down the road area into the catchments modelled. Please clearly show road areas numbers on drainage layout drawing.

Road 4 has an unacceptable half drain time. Impermeable area modelled is greater than permeable paving area, please clarify why this is the case.

Road 5 has an unacceptable half drain time. Impermeable area modelled is greater than permeable paving area, please clarify why this is the case.

Road 5 plus plots 85-92- area is not clearly defined on the impermeable area plan, the modelled infiltration rate is not representative of the results from the nearest infiltration test. Diffusers are set too low in the sub-base (i.e. below 1 in 10 yr plus cc water level).

Road 8 has an unacceptable half drain time.

Plot 47-50pp has an unacceptable half drain time.

Calculations have not been supplied for permeable paving areas 63-70, 71-78,

b. Please provide calculations for rear garden soakaways for plots 25-33, 35 and 36. If one or more houses have the same area, have the same soakaway dimensions, and are located near to the same test pit then one calculation set for all will be sufficient, but this calculation set must reference all plots that it represents. Rear garden soakaway calculations for plots 25-36 and 79-82 have been provided for both the 10yr + CC and 100yr + CC return periods. *Tanks for plots 27-33 have an unacceptable half drain times.*

2. Please provide an impermeable areas plan in dwg format. Please also state areas on the impermeable areas plan (pdf and dwg). Impermeable areas have been added to catchment plan key. DWG also provided in link above. *Please see comments above, please better define your catchments so it is clear what areas are draining to what road areas.*

3. Please provide further detail regarding the unacceptably low factors of safety. As discussed if you are to use a FOS of 2 we wish to see evidence that your infiltration rates are representative of tests completed properly, i.e. you will need to do a couple of BRE365 tests with three repeat tests at each location in close proximity to the existing testing and compare rates. Some FoS calculations provided previously for separate review. Further FoS can be provided if requested, as agreed with Ryan Saul. *The factors of safety are low, a review of the information presented by Ryan shows that significant flood exceedance volumes were observed, and half drain times were exceedingly long. It is a real shame that compliant testing has not been completed, this leaves us in a very difficult position.*

4. Tank 5 has a half drain time beyond 24 hours. Is there any potential to raise this crate up so that the better infiltration rate can be utilised? We are unable to raise the tank due the

road levels being drained to it. *The half drain time of tank 5 is unacceptably long and design does not meet requirements.*

5. The Road calculation also has a half drain time beyond 24 hours. It is also unclear where exactly these calculations are meant to represent. PP areas with slow drain times have been linked to adjacent systems via high level overflows (above 100+cc WL as agreed). Please refer to updated/latest drawings. *A linked system is appropriate if assurances upon this linked system functioning correctly are provided, i.e. it would be good to see calculations that evidence how this linked system will work in reality. Due to a lack of clarity on which road is which it has not been possible to review check dam overflow levels.*

6. The calculations for tank plot 34 have a tank area which is different to that on the layout plan, and the infiltration rate used does not seem to correlate. Tank reference amended and new calculation provided. *Okay.*

7. Why do some plots have diffuser blocks located in the drive, and some in the road? E.g. around plots 51-60 and 79-82? Surely they all need to go through to the road as you have not shown additional linkages with diffuser blocks through these service corridors. They are based on offsets, storage volume and catchment. Driveway was preference but if could not be met then linked to road. *Please better define impermeable areas draining to road/ drive areas.*

8. Please detail invert levels of all diffuser blocks, some of the blocks which are used to cross service corridors are missing. Invert levels have been added to all diffuser blocks. *Invert levels of diffuser blocks on driveways to plots 63-70, 79-82, etc. appear to be at the base of sub-bases, this does not meet policy requirements. Please review all diffuser invert levels to ensure they are all above the 1 in 10 year plus cc water level in the areas.*

9. Please provide additional SBILs closer to diffuser blocks. Diffuser blocks are located at the base of the PP. Further SBILs/ILs have been added for clarity. *Please review all diffuser invert levels to ensure they are all above the 1 in 10 year plus cc water level in the areas.*

10. It does not appear that all rwp's are connected. Please adjust, or add not to explain. A review has been carried and we can confirm that all RWP's are connected. *Okay.*

11. Some of the roads are missing SBILs. SBIL's have been added to roads in addition to the depth given for clarity. *Okay.*

12. Where connections are being made to pipelines rather than direct to manholes – add note 'all connections to be made using oblique 45 degree junctions' Note added to all Engineering Layouts. *Okay.*

13. Your layout plans show baffles are to be provided in some locations. The construction details are labelled as check dams, but from the construction detail it appears that these are to fully separate sub base areas- consider changing name as check dam or baffle implies water can spill over. Renamed as check dams. *Still implies that water can spill over in the sub-base, which is not shown on the construction detail. What you have in reality according to your drawings is areas of fully divided sub-base. Where an overflow pipe is not provided water would have to spill out of the surface to travel to adjacent permeable paving.*

14. I note from the layout that some baffles are to have 100mm diameter pipes through them to link sub-base areas. Please provide a construction detail drawing. Detail has been added to drawing 18-344/825. *Please make it clear if it is intended for these overflow pipes to be set level.*

15. Please state unit reference of hydrobrakes on plan. Detail has been added to new drawing 18-344/836 and hydrobrake unit references are specified in table. *Okay.*

16. Please provide site specific construction detail drawings of the hydrobrakes. Detail has been added to new drawing 18-344/836 and hydrobrake unit references are specified in

table. Cover levels, invert levels and pipe diameters should be provided. Depth of sump should also be stated.

17. Are all catchpits to have a permafilter? Why is this being specified? To protect the infiltration system/diffuser from debris. These could become blocked easily, frequency of maintenance and its importance must be clearly included within the maintenance document.

18. Please specify no/ reduces fines for sub-base materials. I would prefer to see the proposed type of material also specified. Note amended to specify no fines on detail drawing 18-344/821. Okay.

19. Please add sand bedding and permeable geotextile surround to the basin sections to clearly show that granular material will be kept out of the crates. Sections have been updated to show permeable geotextile and construction detail referenced. Please label the geotextile on the section drawing.

20. A detailed plan showing a timetable for implementation of the drainage scheme has not been provided. Sequencing Plan provided by Redrow has been referenced and appended to MMP. This is not clear. It must be very clear how it will be ensured that the drainage elements serving each phase of development will be constructed and completed prior to occupation of these phases.

21. Details of how maintenance will be funded are not included. Statement has been added regarding costs being levied to residents. Okay.

22. The maintenance manual describes maintenance of cellular systems. Please make it clear that these are infiltrating cellular systems. Report amended to suit request. Okay,

23. Basin maintenance should remove reference to submerged and emergent aquatic plants. Remove all other irrelevant details relating to wet basins, the basin will not be wet. Report amended to suit request. Okay.

24. Please detail the requirement for opening and oiling of hydrobrake bypass doors. Detail has been added on the maintenance/inspection of the bypass operating rope. We have spoken with Hydro-International who have confirmed the door is made of stainless steel and therefore there is no requirement for oiling. Okay.

25. Design lifetimes and requirements for replacement are not detailed within the maintenance manual. Refer to corrective maintenance sections of the MMP for cellular systems, permeable paving and hydrobrakes. Cellular systems should include requirement for CCTV survey, and potential requirement for replacement of clogged geotextile. Ideas of lifespans of these features should be included, rather than just as required.

26. As per point 17 above your maintenance manual does not state that catchpits are fitted with a permafilter. The importance of maintenance of these must be detailed, along with the maintenance frequency.

27. Please provide construction detail drawings of headwalls.

Given the time the application has been open and the number of outstanding points we would support a refusal and would recommend that the following reasons are included within that refusal:

1. Insufficient information has been submitted to evidence that the site design meets the requirements of NPPF and the adopted WSCC Policy for the Management of Surface Water.
2. Of the information submitted it is clear that large areas of the proposed development fail to meet requirements of the adopted WSCC Policy for the Management of Surface Water.

3. We are unable to approve the maintenance of the scheme until a compliant design has been provided.
4. Design lifetimes of elements have not been clearly defined within the maintenance manual. This means that evidence has not been submitted to evidence the functioning of the drainage system throughout its lifetime.
5. Details on the timescales for implementation are very poor. The order of construction including drainage has not been clearly defined. It must be very clear how it will be ensured that the drainage elements serving each phase of development will be constructed and completed prior to occupation of these phases.

Kind regards,

Laura Gibbons

Drainage Engineer

Engineering Services

Please note that I work Tuesdays 08:00-16:00 for Arun only.



T: 01903 221374

E: laura.gibbons@arun.gov.uk or [REDACTED]

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF

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

Sent: 01 March 2021 11:49

To: Land Drainage <Land.Drainage@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: Planning Consultation on: Y/26/21/DOC

To: **Engineers (Drainage)**

NOTIFICATION FROM ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

Application No: Y/26/21/DOC

Registered: 26th February 2021

Site Address: Land to the south of Ford Lane East of North End Road Ford BN18 0DS

Description of Works: Approval of details reserved by condition imposed under ref APP/C3810/W/17/3170059 (Y/80/16/OUT) relating to Condition No 11 - maintenance & management of sustainable drainage scheme.

The Council have received the above application to discharge conditions. I shall be pleased to receive any observations you may wish to make in respect of those conditions relating to your field of expertise.

[Click here to view the Discharge of Condition application](#)

[Click here to view conditions on original application - click on decision tab](#)

Should you wish to make any comments click on the link www.arun.gov.uk/planning and click into ?Enter Comment? or if this is not possible email your response to planning.responses@arun.gov.uk by **15th March 2021**.

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.

In the absence of a reply within the period stated, I shall assume that you have no observations to make.

Yours sincerely

Michael Eastham

Planning Case Officer- Arun District Council

Telephone: 01903 737772

Email: michael.eastham@arun.gov.uk

PLCOND00 (ODS) 2020