

From: Laura Gibbons
Sent: 03 May 2019 16:02
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Hi Simon,

Still not happy with the details or the proposed landscaping details. My original comments are shown in blue, the applicants responses are provided in red, and my responses to these are shown in *purple*:

1. There are still trees proposed in close proximity to the southern-most attenuation tank. 2 no. trees close to this tank have been removed. Refer to updated ACD landscaping drawings. *On the ACD landscape drawing sheet 4 revision G there are trees in close proximity to the crate nearest the pumping station. Please can a plan be provided which shows both the proposed drainage and the proposed planting and associated potential root areas on the same drawing.*
2. A ground investigation report has been provided which details how groundwater monitoring was conducted November to December 2015. Peak ground water levels within this window were 1.64m bgl near the proposed location for the attenuation pond. Winter monitoring is required to be completed October to March inclusive. This is required even when infiltration is not proposed to ensure that the effects of flotation are adequately accounted for in design. Groundwater levels recorded are below the basin levels (the basin is also shallow at approximately 600mm deep/300mm water level.). Flotation assessment will be carried out where necessary as part of the detailed design and in discussion with the relevant attenuation tank manufacturer. *We do not know if groundwater levels are below the basin levels, the monitoring completed is insufficient. This level of detail regarding lining and flotation is required in order to discharge the drainage condition as it is quite a fundamental issue. I also would be very hesitant at agreeing a layout without this level of detail as we would affectively be confining the space available for surface water drainage and ending up with an implementable scheme.*

3. The ground investigation report includes results of infiltration testing completed at two locations. Both tests were completed at over 2m depth. One test gave results which are acceptable to support infiltration. Shallow infiltration testing needs to be completed in the winter to ascertain the potential for permeable paving and shallower infiltrating crate systems. The evidence provided to date is insufficient to justify not utilising infiltration. Our design is based on the recommended advice by the geotechnical engineers (BRD), which advises that the site "has low permeability and therefore poor infiltration, which would be expected given its cohesive nature.... Consequently the disposal of collected surface water to conventional soakaways are not considered particularly feasible at this site. It is anticipated that any drainage associated with the proposed development will need to feed into the existing local drainage network...". Planning has been given on this basis and we are progressing site design to accord with planning/FRA/strategies. *Other nearby sites have found shallow infiltration is achievable. Describing a soil as cohesive is insufficient to rule out infiltration. We did not agree the strategy, in all of our responses to the outline application we stated that infiltration should be investigated, especially shallow infiltration. Shallow infiltration tests must be completed in the winter.*
4. Top of bank levels, invert levels and slope need to be labelled on proposed ponds. These have been added to the drainage plan. *Okay, but will review further once the points above are resolved.*
5. Proposed invert levels of outfalls to ditches appear to be low in comparison to surrounding bed levels. A minimum of 150mm must be provided between the invert level of outfall and ditch bed level. The site is quite constrained as we have had to look to achieve outfalls without impacting significantly on pipe depths in the road (for adoption), meeting highway adoption standards and building regulations/level design requirements, existing tree retention at boundaries, minimising roof heights etc. We have amended the outfall pipe diameter and gradient and pulled the headwalls back/provided a new short section of ditch prior to connecting the site to the existing ditch. This improves the level difference by around 50-100mm. *Site specific detail drawings of outfalls need to be provided. 150mm is our absolute minimum requirement.*
6. Details of how the permeable paving links to the main drainage system have not been provided. Typical arrangement/details have been shown on the drainage plan. These still don't seem to have been provided.
 - a. *Construction detail drawings have been provided of diffuser units stating inlet from house, is this what is proposed? It isn't actually clear from the layouts if standard rwp connecting to the main piped network are proposed. There certainly are no diffuser units shown on layouts.*
 - b. *There are still no drawings or indications on the layout of how the permeable paving connects to the main network. Please provide these. Please also ensure formation and finish levels of permeable paving is provided.*
7. Construction detail drawings need to be provided. I recommend that the applicant refers to our checklist for further detail of our requirements. Construction details provided. *Construction details of tanks, ponds and outfalls need to be provided.*
8. Please can the applicant supply a catchment area plan. Catchment area plan provided. *Please provide area figures on this plan.*
9. Again it would be inappropriate to comment in detail on maintenance proposals whilst design has not been agreed. However, I note that the document does not state how maintenance will be funded. This must be detailed. Maintenance will be by the highway authority (WSSC) for road gullies and highway drains, by Southern Water for the main adopted sewers (subject to a s104), and privately maintained for areas that fall outside of these. Bovis have advised that privately maintained areas will go over to a management company with all residents paying a fee towards upkeep. *I will comment further once details have been agreed.*

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

Internal: 37818 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737818 | Fax: +44 (0) 1903 716018 | E-mail: laura.gibbons@arun.gov.uk

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



From: Simon Davis
Sent: 29 April 2019 10:26
To: Laura Gibbons
Subject: FW: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Hi Laura,

Please see below. These will not be added to the website unless you advise they are acceptable.

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
Internal: 37874 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737874 | E-mail: simon.davis@arun.gov.uk
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: Zoe Knott [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 April 2019 08:45
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Kathryn Griffiths [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Morning Simon,

Please see the comments below in red in response to the email from Laura Gibbons and the attached supporting evidence.

Many thanks,

Zoe

Zoe Knott
Principal Planner

Nexus Planning is pleased to have been commended by the RTPI for Planning Consultancy of the Year 2019



Nexus Planning - Thames Valley
5th Floor
Thames Tower
Station Road
Reading
Berkshire RG1 1LX

Nexus Planning - Birmingham
Alpha Works
Alpha, Floors 21 & 22
Suffolk Street Queensway
Birmingham B1 1TT

nexusplanning.co.uk



From: Luke Hart [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 April 2019 17:48
To: Kathryn Griffiths [REDACTED] Zoe Knott [REDACTED]
Cc: Caroline Green [REDACTED] Ryan Saul [REDACTED] Dorota Kaminska-Majkowska [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Hi Kathryn,

Please see comments/response below in red against original email along with updated/additional drawings attached.

Any queries then let me know.

Kind Regards



Luke Hart | Associate Director

Tuscany House | White Hart Lane | Basingstoke | RG21 4AF

Visit <http://www.odysseyconsult.co.uk/disclaimer> for email disclaimer information

From: Laura Gibbons
Sent: 12 April 2019 12:16
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Simon,

Comments on the revised drainage and landscape proposals:

1. There are still trees proposed in close proximity to the southern-most attenuation tank. 2 no. trees close to this tank have been removed. Refer to updated ACD landscaping drawings.
2. A ground investigation report has been provided which details how groundwater monitoring was conducted November to December 2015. Peak ground water levels within this window were 1.64m bgl near the proposed location for the attenuation pond. Winter monitoring is required to be completed October to March inclusive. This is required even when infiltration is not proposed to ensure that the effects of flotation are adequately accounted for in design. Groundwater levels recorded are below the basin levels

(the basin is also shallow at approximately 600mm deep/300mm water level.). Flotation assessment will be carried out where necessary as part of the detailed design and in discussion with the relevant attenuation tank manufacturer.

3. The ground investigation report includes results of infiltration testing completed at two locations. Both tests were completed at over 2m depth. One test gave results which are acceptable to support infiltration. Shallow infiltration testing needs to be completed in the winter to ascertain the potential for permeable paving and shallower infiltrating crate systems. The evidence provided to date is insufficient to justify not utilising infiltration. Our design is based on the recommended advice by the geotechnical engineers (BRD), which advises that the site *"has low permeability and therefore poor infiltration, which would be expected given its cohesive nature.... Consequently the disposal of collected surface water to conventional soakaways are not considered particularly feasible at this site. It is anticipated that any drainage associated with the proposed development will need to feed into the existing local drainage network..."*. Planning has been given on this basis and we are progressing site design to accord with planning/FRA/strategies.
4. Top of bank levels, invert levels and slope need to be labelled on proposed ponds. These have been added to the drainage plan.
5. Proposed invert levels of outfalls to ditches appear to be low in comparison to surrounding bed levels. A minimum of 150mm must be provided between the invert level of outfall and ditch bed level. The site is quite constrained as we have had to look to achieve outfalls without impacting significantly on pipe depths in the road (for adoption), meeting highway adoption standards and building regulations/level design requirements, existing tree retention at boundaries, minimising roof heights etc. We have amended the outfall pipe diameter and gradient and pulled the headwalls back/provided a new short section of ditch prior to connecting the site to the existing ditch. This improves the level difference by around 50-100mm.
6. Details of how the permeable paving links to the main drainage system have not been provided. Typical arrangement/details have been shown on the drainage plan.
7. Construction detail drawings need to be provided. I recommend that the applicant refers to our checklist for further detail of our requirements. Construction details provided.
8. Please can the applicant supply a catchment area plan. Catchment area plan provided.
9. Again it would be inappropriate to comment in detail on maintenance proposals whilst design has not been agreed. However, I note that the document does not state how maintenance will be funded. This must be detailed. Maintenance will be by the highway authority (WSCC) for road gullies and highway drains, by Southern Water for the main adopted sewers (subject to a s104), and privately maintained for areas that fall outside of these. Bovis have advised that privately maintained areas will go over to a management company with all residents paying a fee towards upkeep.

I will review further once points 1-3 are resolved.

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

Internal: 37818 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737818 | Fax: +44 (0) 1903 716018 | E-mail: laura.gibbons@arun.gov.uk

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.