

Hi David

Further to recent discussions, I am pleased to attach a copy of the updated FRA, which addresses the comments made by the LLFA in their consultation response. In addition, my colleagues in the WYG Drainage Team have provided a response to the specific points raised, which are shown in red below:

Evidence of and information on the existing surface water flow paths of undeveloped (greenfield) sites.

It is not clear why the LLFA are asking for greenfield flow paths as this is a brownfield site, however surface water flood risk map is shown at Figure 5. A surface water velocities map is also included at Figure 8 to show direction of these flows.

Evidence of and information on the existing drainage network for previously developed (brownfield) sites.

Southern Water sewer records are shown in Appendix C. This Only shows foul water records, surface water details would need to be found from a survey which would only be carried out for a detailed design.

Evidence that the proposed drainage will follow the same pattern as the existing. This avoids directing flow to other locations.

The report clearly shows that discharge will be held to the existing regime. This discharge will be limited by the flow control devices mentioned in 4.1.15 and the conclusions.

Information evidencing that the correct level of water treatment exists in the system in accordance with the Ciria SuDS Manual C753.

Petrol interceptors have been included in the drainage strategy as a minimum treatment. Additional treatment has been considered in SuDS section 5.0.

Maintenance regimes of entire surface water drainage system including individual SuDS features, including a plan illustrating the organisation responsible for each element. Evidence that those responsible/adopting bodies are in discussion with the developer. For larger/phased sites, we need to see evidence of measures taken to protect and ensure continued operation of drainage features during construction.

Maintenance is referred to in 4.1.20 and a SuDS maintenance plan is included at Appendix D. A plan illustrating responsibility for each element is an unusual request and not normally provided at this stage.

Evidence that enough storage/attenuation has been provided without increasing the runoff rate or volume. This must be shown for a 1 in 100 year plus climate change event. Details of orifice diameters to be provided.

This evidence is provided in the calculations in Appendix B. The storage calculations have accounted for 1 in 100 year plus climate change. Details of orifice diameters are not normally provided at this stage and would be a part of detailed design.

Exceedance flows are considered in the event of the pipe being non-operational. Evidence that Exceedance flows and runoff in excess of design criteria have been considered - calculations and plans should be provided to show where above ground flooding might occur and where this would pool and flow.

Information regarding exceedance flows is provided in section 3.7.

Evidence that Urban Creep has been considered in the application and that a 10% increase in impermeable area has been used in calculations to account for this.

Table 1, 4.1.15 and Appendix A have been updated to show the inclusion of Urban Creep.

I hope this now provides all the information you require to progress the determination of this application. As I mentioned previously, I am now on leave for two weeks, so if there is anything else you need during this time, I would be grateful if you could contact Jeremy direct.

Many thanks

Sarah Hains
Principal Planner

WYG