

[REDACTED]

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 07 January 2019 10:08
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Y/92/18/DOC

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 07 January 2019 09:53
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Y/92/18/DOC

Further Drainage advice, please upload in colour.

From: Laura Gibbons
Sent: 04 January 2019 14:52
To: Simon Davis [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Y/92/18/DOC

Hi Simon,

Comments below in red. Very frustrating, seems we are just repeating the same arguments.

Kind Regards,

Laura Gibbons, MEng, GMICE
Engineer (Drainage & Coastal)

Laura Gibbons | Engineer (Drainage & Coastal), Engineering Services, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre,
Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

[REDACTED]

Arun is Working in Partnership with Chichester District Council

Visit Arun's web site at <http://www.arun.gov.uk/> and www.chichester.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 04 January 2019 11:24
To: 'Rosie Foreman'
Cc: Pierre Dowsett; James Dodds; Lee Clarke
Subject: RE: Y/92/18/DOC

Dear Rosie,

I have forwarded your concerns direct to Southern Water and asked them to respond. I will also ensure that Laura is made aware of your additional comments in respect of the drainage matters.

You have again suggested that one way to deal with the issues is to discharge the conditions in such a manner as to require the further submission of a verification report to be checked and agreed by us. This is not an approach that I

or my Team Leader have come across. We do word condition discharge notices to say that the approved details must be implemented in accordance but we do not require the further approval of details through a condition decision notice other than where this is explicit within the original condition (e.g. our contamination verification report requirements are stated within the actual condition).

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council |
Location: Planning, First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Please note that I typically work from home on Thursdays when I am unreachable on my work phone

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Rosie Foreman

Sent: 21 December 2018 13:38

To: Simon Davis

Cc: Pierre Dowsett

Lee Clarke

Subject: Re: Y/92/18/DOC

Hi Simon

Further to the voicemail I left for you earlier, I think perhaps Southern Water are not aware of the practically of connecting to an existing sewer. The hierarchy in H1 of the building regs requires public and private sewers to be considered first, before moving on to septic tank/cesspit if the sewer option is 'not reasonably practicable'. In this instance, the nearest sewer is over 300m from the staff facilities, which will be used only by around 10 staff. The scale and cost of works to connect to a sewer over 300m away from the staff facilities building are disproportionate to the amount of foul water generated by a facility for a small number of mainly seasonal staff. I would appreciate it if you would return to Southern Water with the additional background to the foul drainage scheme.

In addition, our Drainage Consultant has been continuing their discussions with Laura in the Drainage Team and, subject to receipt of satisfactory infiltration testing reports, I understand that her main concern is now the level of detail provided on the reservoir pursuant to condition 12. In my view however, there is sufficient information before the Council to ensure compliance with condition 12. There is a lack of winter infiltration tests and ground water monitoring. Without this information it is not possible to review the efficacy of design. Full construction details are always required to discharge this condition. Without these there is no way for us to check compliance.

The reason for condition 12 requiring approval of the design of the reservoir and flood barrier is *"To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of surface water from the site in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework"*. As such, provided the information has demonstrated that there is sufficient capacity for storage of surface water and will prevent flooding, the details should be approved and the condition discharged. The Envireau Water report prepared for the client clearly demonstrates that there is sufficient capacity, and includes the location of controlled outflows to manage stormwater discharge to agreed rates, to prevent flooding. The information provided does not demonstrate if the infiltration swales provided are viable. Therefore flood risk could be increased at times when water levels in the ditch in Maypole Lane are high. No information as to the structural stability of the reservoir and flood barrier have been provided. Therefore, they could be increasing flood risk as a result of their proposals.

As I understand it, Laura has no objection in principle to the proposed strategy, layout, runoff-rates, reservoir capacity, location of outflows, construction of the floor barrier, etc. It is therefore unclear why the information provided thus far is insufficient to meet the requirements of condition 12. The Council has already approved a site plan showing the layout/footprint of the reservoir and location/extent of the floor barrier and elevations showing cross sections of the reservoir (which show the level of excavation and height of the reservoir sides), by virtue of the list of approved plans on the original decision notice. The Envireau Water report confirms the reservoir has the

necessary capacity to manage stormwater runoff from the site and includes the location of outflows and discharge rates. The covering letter accompanying the application for approval of details pursuant to conditions confirmed the type of lining to the approved reservoir and we have provided the manufacturers details of the flood barrier. Together, this information demonstrates that the design of the reservoir will prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of surface water as required by condition 12.

There will be no material change to the information before the Council if detailed construction drawings are prepared by the final construction contractors. However, drawings to this level of detail not yet been prepared as the civil engineering contractors have not yet been appointed. If the drainage scheme and reservoir design as currently presented is approved, but requires amendment in the future, the developer will have to return to the Council with either an amended planning application or alternative details pursuant to conditions of the current permission (depending on the degree of change), or risk be in breach of condition/planning control.

Please also bear in mind that there will need to be approvals and regular inspections of the reservoir under the Reservoirs Act, which is also relevant to the consideration of whether the requirements for approval of 'reservoir design' are met. Planning guidance is clear that planning conditions should not overlap with other consents regimes, and therefore the level of detail provided at this stage should be sufficient to demonstrate compliance with condition 12. As stated previously the proposals are for 6,000m³ of water to be stored above ground, the reservoir act only applies for volumes in excess of 25,000m³. Therefore, no assurances as to structural suitability have been provided.

As per my earlier voicemail, do give me a call to discuss further,

Kind regards,

Rosie Foreman
BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI
Senior Planner



DOWSETTMAYHEW Planning Partnership
63a Ship Street | Brighton | BN1 1AE



This email is confidential and may contain legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient it may be unlawful for you to read, copy, distribute, disclose or otherwise make use of the information herein. If you have received this email in error please contact us immediately. DOWSETTMAYHEW PLANNING PARTNERSHIP LTD will accept no liability for the mis-transmission, interference or interception of any email and you are reminded that email is not a secure method of communication.