

# Consultee Comments for Planning Application 23/02758/FUL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 23/02758/FUL

Address: Land North Of 1 To 16 Sturt Avenue Camelsdale Linchmere West Sussex GU27 3SJ

Proposal: Erection of 9 no. dwellingshouses together with associated access, infrastructure, parking and landscaping.

Case Officer: Martin Mew

## Consultee Details

Name: Mr Coast Protection & Land Drainage Officer

Address: Chichester District Council, East Pallant House, 1 East Pallant Chichester, West Sussex PO19 1TY

Email: Not Available

On Behalf Of: Coastal And Drainage Engineer

## Comments

Dear Martin

Thank you for consulting us with regards to this application.

Flood Risk:

The assessment of flood risk section of the application form contains some concerning answers.

Firstly, the answer Yes is given to the question; Will the proposal increase the flood risk elsewhere?

Secondly, the answer No is given to the question; Is the site within an area at risk of flooding? However, parts of the site appear to fall within flood zones 2/3 (High Risk) and the surface water flood risk maps also show areas of the site are at risk of surface water flooding. Therefore, the Environment Agency should be consulted and should comment on the acceptability of the development in this location.

Additionally, I would like to draw your attention, and the Environment Agencys attention, to the comments made by Kevin Macknay, dated 11.10.2021 in relation to a previous application on this site (21/02428/FUL). At the time of making the following comments Kevin was the Flood Risk Management Team Leader at the Lead Local Flood Authority.

photos were sent to me by the residents of Sturt Avenue and the Parish Council and show the proposed development site flooded both during periods of heavy summer rainfall and during the winter months due to high groundwater levels. Unfortunately, the flood risk mapping for this site

does not appear to reflect reality, with limited areas being within Flood Zone 2 and 3, and limited surface water flooding shown across the site. WSCC are not a statutory consultee for this development as it is for only 9 houses, however based on the photographs and comments received from the local residents and having seen the site myself in the last few days, I do have concerns about any development on this site. Historic OS mapping shows the land behind Sturt Avenue as marsh and the area is locally known as the water meadows. This ability to absorb water both during summer rainfall events and during the winter months due to prolonged high groundwater levels is clearly reducing flood risk elsewhere in the area, a function that would be lost if the area was developed.

I also disagree with the following statement from section 4.2 of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy:

Following receipt of the Hydrogeology report, the groundwater has been shown to be at 0.8m to 1.3m across the site. This was recorded in November 2023 following a very wet period of weather over a number of months. The report states that it is anticipated that the levels shown would be close the maximum levels expected.

Regardless that the measurements quoted above were taken following a period of very wet weather; I would expect to see groundwater levels peaking much later in the wet winter months, (late January through to early March), plus given my knowledge of the site I suspect groundwater levels may be much closer to, or even at, the surface at those times.

The site is well known for its widespread waterlogging (I refer you to the multiple references to waterlogging on the existing site layout; Appendix C of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy). I have concerns that the large volumes of water, that are held on site during and following significant rainfall events, may be displaced beyond the boundary of the site by the changes in the sites topography required to deliver this proposed development.

#### Existing Pond

I also note the proposed reduction in the area of the existing on-site pond. The existing pond straddles the red-line boundary of the site, but the proposed site layout shows the entirety of the pond outside the red-line boundary. For a clear illustration of this point I refer you to the image at the top of page 19 (section 5.2.10) of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy document, where the grey outline of the existing pond can be seen extending beneath the proposed structure of plot 7.

Ponds offer surface water storage capacity and natural attenuation. Therefore, we would prefer that the ponds existing footprint is retained and that it is subjected to routine maintenance (in the form of de-siltation and the removal of excess vegetation) as part of these proposals.

The FRA document confirms a private management company will be set up to manage and

maintain the developments SuDS. It would be helpful; for the applicant to confirm where the ownership and maintenance responsibilities (including riparian responsibilities) of the pond, riverbanks and other parts of the site, currently located outside of the developments red-line, will lie, should the development be approved. (For these matters to be appropriately controlled would/should the developments red line encapsulate the pond and the banks of the designated main river that runs adjacent to the sites boundary?).

#### Sequential Test:

The National Planning Policy Framework dictates that new development should be directed away from Flood Zone 3. Therefore, the Local Planning Authority will need to be satisfied that the sequential and/or exception tests have been passed.

#### Surface Water Drainage:

The application form submitted as part of this application concerningly indicates that the main sewer (alongside SuDS) is proposed destination for the developments surface water. It would be good if the applicant could confirm if that box were ticked in error, as this would be unacceptable (and conflicts with the information in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy).

The Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy documents suggests that the proposed means of surface water drainage is through the use of SuDS features to attenuate the developments run-off followed by a restricted discharge to a local watercourse. This approach is acceptable in principle as ground investigation results have shown the on-site infiltration is unviable at this location. (Any discharge should be restricted to greenfield run-off rates). Therefore, the proposals do follow the hierarchy of preference as set out in Approved Document H of the Building Regulations and the SuDS Manual produced by CIRIA.

However, we suggest that, at the earliest stage, the developer gives due consideration to the appropriate location and design of surface water drainage features to achieve necessary capacity, water quality (via the SuDS management/treatment train), as well as ease of on-going maintenance. Surface water drainage features should also be designed in a manner that positively affects the amenity of the site.

We would like to remind the developer that, open features, such as swales, basins, and ponds, when designed correctly, can satisfy all the above aspirations in addition to; being easier to maintain, having longer lifespans and offering ecological advantages over subterranean features (such as the plastic crate system which, disappointingly, appears to be the current proposal).

Well-designed SuDS components include features that are no more hazardous than those found in the existing urban landscape, for example ponds in parks or footpaths alongside canals, therefore if the SuDS features are designed in an appropriate and safe manner, there should be no need for unsightly fencing and areas of restricted access. Additionally, consideration should be given to the nature of SuDS features that are chosen to be incorporated into the design, for

example will the SuDS features be useable open spaces (such as detention basins etc.) in all but the most extreme weather events, or will they be year-round water features such as ponds.

Given the nature of the development, to bring it in line with current guidance, the documentation supporting the drainage design should be able to demonstrate that the infiltration/SuDS features can accommodate the water from a 1 in 100-year critical storm event, plus an additional 45% climate change allowance (rather than the 40% referred to in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy document).

As the surface water drainage from the site is ultimately to be discharged to the adjacent designated main river the applicant may need to obtain the appropriate permission from the Environment Agency, in parallel with planning permission. Additionally, the EA should be consulted about their satisfaction that the proposed layout does not prevent the future appropriate maintenance of the River Wey (again, clarification of where the land ownership and riparian responsibilities related to the land between the developments red line and the river will lie is needed). Concerningly, the SuDS discharge pipe and headwall also are located outside of the red line of the development.

I suggest the site layout is not agreed until all the matters discussed above are resolved.

Should the application be approved we recommend the following conditions be applied to ensure the site is adequately drained:

Development shall not commence until the full details of the proposed surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The design should follow the hierarchy of preference for different types of surface water drainage disposal systems, as set out in Approved Document H of the Building Regulations and the SuDS Manual produced by CIRIA. Winter groundwater monitoring, to establish the highest annual ground water levels, and winter percolation testing, to BRE 365 or a similar approved method, will be required to support the design of any infiltration drainage. No building shall be occupied until the complete surface water drainage system serving the property has been implemented in accordance with the agreed details.

Development shall not commence until full details of the maintenance and management of the SuDS system is set out in a site-specific maintenance manual and submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The manual is to include details of financial management and arrangements for the replacement of major components at the end of the manufacturer's recommended design life. Upon completed construction of the SuDS System, the owner or management company shall strictly adhere to and implement the recommendations contained within the manual.

No construction is permitted which will restrict current and future landowners from undertaking

their riparian maintenance responsibilities of any watercourse on or adjacent to the site.

#### Surface Water Drainage Proposal Checklist

The council has created a Surface Water Drainage Proposal Checklist document that can be found in the downloadable documents box on the following webpage:

<http://www.chichester.gov.uk/landdrainage>. This document is designed to clearly outline the councils expectations and requirements for Surface Water Drainage Proposals. If the applicant wishes to avoid pre-commencement conditions relating to surface water drainage, we ask that they submit detailed surface water drainage proposals in line with the requirements of this checklist. Alternatively, if pre-commencement surface water conditions are applied to their application this document should then be used for any subsequent Discharge of Conditions Applications.

Kind regards

Duncan Keir

Engineer (Coastal and Water Management)

Coastal Partners (on behalf of Chichester District Council)