

Mr Walton's Response to 'Proof of Evidence by Councillor Simon Pike on Outline Sustainable Drainage Strategy Issue 4'

I have reviewed Councillor Pike's observation on the Outline Sustainable Drainage Strategy, Issue 4 and have set out my comments below.

I am pleased to note at Point 6 of his proof that Cllr Pike considers Issue 4 is a significant improvement on Issue 2, a view that is clearly shared by Mr Bacchus as the Council has now removed its objection to the development on drainage grounds and is content that drainage design can be made the subject of a suitably worded condition.

I do not agree that the storage volume is 'inadequate'. The outline sustainable drainage design provided in Issue 4, including the estimate of the attenuation storage required, has been completed in accordance with current good practice, principally The SuDS Manual (C753)¹. Again, by withdrawing their objection, the Council are clearly satisfied with the attenuation storage volume provided by Issue 4 (it was the deficiency with the attenuation storage volume that was the principal reason for the preparation of Issue 4).

In response to the points raised at '*2.1 Definition of extreme event*' and '*2.2 Flow control chambers*' as I mention above, the outline sustainable drainage strategy has been completed in accordance with current good practice, including consideration of an extreme event, i.e. the 1 in 100 (1%) AEP event allowing for the impact of climate change.

If the storage capacity is exceeded by events greater than that designed for (referred to as 'exceedance events') then the excess runoff will be shed via the spillway from the pond. Again, this is matter agreed with the Council.

In response to the comments raised at '*2.3 Other inconsistencies, ambiguities and omissions in the Drainage Strategy Issue 4*' I would comment as follows:

Point 14. Without incising the levels shown by the topographic survey, the provision of a flat 5m wide strip along the boundary of the plots would require the slope across the plots to be increase from the current approximate 10% to circa 13%. I understand from Mr Crandon that this would have no significant impact on the layout and landscaping of the site.

Point 15. This was an error on my part in not changing the annotation in the key. As shown by the drawings and described in the text the depth of the crates is 0.8m.

Point 16. This is a matter for detailed design. In practice, drainage crates are designed to support the loads imposed by HGVs and so depending on how the mobile homes are installed, it may be possible to support them off the surface of the block paving.

Point 17. See my comment above regarding the support of the mobile homes. It may well be possible to run the utilities serving the mobile homes within the depth of the cover to the drainage crates or even above ground beneath the mobile homes. Again, this is a matter for detailed design.

Point 18. This is a matter for detailed design. Please also refer to Mr Crandon's comments in response to '*3 Inconsistencies between the Drainage Strategy and Site Layout Plan*' set out below.

¹ CIRIA, 2015

Point 19. FEH22 has not yet been implemented in Microdrainage. FEH13 uses data up to 2005. The principle means by which the impact of climate change is addressed in the outline drainage strategy is through the 40% increase in rainfall intensity. The Council are satisfied with the use of the FEH99 model, however, this can be updated as part of the detailed design prepared to discharge the condition if they require.

Point 20. This is an omission on the drawing but has no impact on the outline sustainable drainage strategy of the proposed means of disposing of foul drainage.

In response to the comments raised at '*3 Inconsistencies between the Drainage Strategy and Site Layout Plan*', I have spoken to Mr Crandon with respect to the issues raised and he has responded:

'TDA drawing no. TDA.2692.02 Revision B entitled 'Revised Site Layout, Landscape Strategy & Arboricultural Mitigation Measures.' sets out a clear landscape strategy for the site.

Should the inspector be minded to allow the appeal then the submission of full detailed hard & soft Landscape proposals together with an implementation timetable and a landscape management plan should be conditioned.

During the process of detailed landscape design, further consultation will be undertaken with Mr. Ian Walton of SLR and Mr. Giles Coe of Co-Ecology to ensure that the detailed landscape proposals dovetail with and complement both drainage and ecological proposals respectively.

Whilst there may be some minor conflicts between drainage, landscape and ecological proposals at this stage, these will all be resolved when developing the scheme further for the release of any relevant conditions.'