

## Table 1.0 - Detention basin operation & maintenance requirements

	Recommended Frequency		
noval.	Monthly.		
pillways and access routes.	Monthly (during growing season) or a required		
dow grass in and around basin.	Half yearly (spring - before nesting season, and autumn)		
tation and remove nuisance	Monthly (at start then as required).		
n before start of growing	Annually.		
from inlets, outlet and	Annually. (or as required)		
lants in outlet pool - where	Annually.		
or vegetation growth.	Annually. (or as required)		
s and remove cuttings.	2 years, (or as required)		
from forebay, when 50% full and volume is reduced by >25%	3-10 years, (or as required)		
other damage by re-seeding or	As required.		
rap.	As required.		
n of inlets, outlets and overflows	As required.		
faces and reinstate design levels.	As required.		
ts and overflows for blockages, d.	Monthly/after large storms.		
structures and pipework, etc for I damage.	Monthly/after large storms.		
ncility surface for slit olish appropriate slit removal	Half yearly		
d other mechanical devices.	Half yearly		

# Table 1.2 - Operation and maintenance

•	•
Required action	Record frequency
uuming (standard cosmetic e surface)	Once a year, after autumn leaf, or reduced frequency as required, based on site-specific observations of clogging or manufacturer's recommendations.
w contributing and adjacent	As required
s or management using ied directly into the weeds by ner than spraying	As required - once per year on less frequently used pavements
ndscaping which, through enance or soil slip, has been 0mm of the level of the paving	As required
o any depressions, rutting and n blocks considered e structural performance or a and replace lost jointing	As required
surface and upper emedial sweeping	Every 10-15 years or as required
	Monthly for three months after installation
nce of poor operation and/or required, take remedial action	Three-monthly, 48 hours after large storms in first six months
nulation rates and establish hing frequencies	Annually
on chambers	Annually

Surface Water Drainage Heirarchy

Infiltration testing has been undertaken as part of Soiltechnics initial ground investigation report STU5850. Test results conclude that discharge by infiltration would be unfeasible.
No ditches are present within close vicinity of the site so discharging to a watercourse/ditch has been deemed unfeasible.
The proposed strategy is to outfall the surface water drainage into the existing Thames Water manhole 3207 subject to Section 106 approval. A pre-development enquiry has been undertaken and an agreed flow rate of 3.6 l/s has been agreed.

#### **General Notes**

This drawing is to be used in conjunction with all relevant drawings, specifications and details. All dimensions are in metres unless noted otherwise.

Do not scale from this drawing. Drawing Key

Site boundar

Taken from

	Existing foul water drainage Taken fro
2001 CL:53.200 IL:51.000	Existing surface water drainage <b>f</b> records
<u>150</u> Ø <u>@ 1 in 150</u> — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —	Proposed surface water drainage
<del></del>	Indicative private trapped pot gully
	Proposed private headwall
<u> </u>	Proposed foul drainage
	Tanked Permeable paving
	Call day stranger such

Cellular storage crate Flood routing arrows

Filter Drain

Pond Area

### Water Quality Management

Water quality management in accordance with document E26 of SUDs manual

Total SUDs mitigation index = mitigation index + 0.5 (mitigation index) Network 1

Pollution hazard indices for different land use classifications 26.2	Pollut Hazaro Level		Total Suspended Solids (TSS)		etals	Hydro carbons
Commercial Roofs	Low		0.3	wh is p for lea	(up to 0.8 ere there ootential metals to ch from e roof)	0.05
Individual property driveways, residential car parks, low traffic roads (e.g cul de sacs, homezones and general access roads) and non-residential car parking with infrequent change (e.g schools, offices) i.e <300 traffic movements/day	Low		0.5	0.	4	0.4
Indicative SUDs M mitigation indices for discharges to surface waters 26.3			tigation Indic	es		
Si		Sus	Total Suspended Solids (TSS)		Metals	Hydro carbons
Pond		0.7	· · ·		0.7	0.5
Permeable Paving		0.7				0.7
Filter Drain					0.4	0.4

Total SUDs mitigation index ≥ pollution hazard index therefore SUDs mitigation is appropriate as per in accordance with document E26 of SUDs manual

#### Table 1.3 - Operation and maintenance requirements for pipes, gullies and manholes

1aintenance schedule	Required action	Record frequency
Regular naintenance	Inspect and identify areas that are not operating correctly. If required, take remedial action	Monthly for first 3 months and then six monthly Monthly
	Debris removal from catchment surface (where may cause risk to performance) Remove sediment from pre-treatment structure (e.g. gullies) Cleaning/jetting of annually, or as required, pipes and manholes	Annually or as required As required

			Client	Luton Borough Cou	uncil
<ul> <li>Infrastructure Design</li> <li>Structural Engineering</li> <li>Development Planning</li> <li>Professional Advice</li> <li>Geotechnical &amp; Environmental</li> <li>Surveying</li> </ul>		Project	New SEN School Kestrel Way, Luton		
<b>Northampton</b> Grand Union Works, Whilton Locks, Daventry Northamptonshire, NN11 2NH T: 01604 781811		Title	Drainage Strategy Plan		
Poole Milte	on Keynes	Warwick			
E: mail@jppuk.	net <b>W</b> : jp	puk.net			
Scale at A1 1:250	Drawn by	ЕН	Checked I	by ™ Date	June 2023
Status	Project ref		Drawing r	10.	Revision
FOR PLANNING	25910		102		
					JPP QA Document T07 R3