

From: Stephen Manning <sm@gouldbaxter.co.uk>
Sent: 14 February 2025 16:41:40 UTC+00:00
To: "drainage" <drainage@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: "Rachel Richardson" <Rachel.Richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>; "Richard Carr" <southernrockproperty@gmail.com>; "Tim Mole" <tmf@gouldbaxter.co.uk>; "Matthew Comber" <mc@gouldbaxter.co.uk>; "HH Filing" <ghfiling@gouldbaxter.co.uk>
Subject: FW: 2025.02.07 DM/24/3050 - App - Minor - Bolney Chapel Road Twineham RH17 5NN - GH652 Riverside
Attachments: DRAFT PL-209 - Section Through Site Showing Modelled Flood Levels.pdf
Importance: High

To Whom it May Concern,

I have been unable to speak with Rachel on the phone following issue of the below/ attached earlier today.

With time of the essence, I thought it prudent to forward this over to try and expedite an initial response from yourselves.

We look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Best Regards,

Stephen



Stephen Manning BSc (Hons) MCIAT

Associate

Chartered Architectural Technologist

01444 452604

07840 854218

www.gouldbaxter.co.uk

Gould Baxter is the trading name of Gould Property Consultants LLP. Registered in England and Wales with Partnership No. OC318407
Registered office: 2 Lucastes Mews, Haywards Heath RH16 1HE



From: Stephen Manning

Sent: 14 February 2025 13:40

To: 'Rachel Richardson' <Rachel.Richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>

Cc: Tim Mole <tmf@gouldbaxter.co.uk>; Matthew Comber <mc@gouldbaxter.co.uk>; HH Filing <ghfiling@gouldbaxter.co.uk>; phil@csidestructures.co.uk; Ryan Hofman <Ryan@cgscivils.co.uk>;

Richard Carr <southernrockproperty@gmail.com>

Subject: RE: 2025.02.07 DM/24/3050 - App - Minor - Bolney Chapel Road Twineham RH17 5NN - GH652
Riverside

Importance: High

Dear Rachel,

Please see below for initial responses/ proposals in response to the Drainage Officer comments.

We would be grateful if you could please reconsult with the Drainage Officer urgently to confirm agreement to proposed approach. We can then formally update and re-issue drawings/ documents etc, as necessary.

Flood Risk – Response from CGS Civilis

- The FRA submitted states that Node 3 is the closest upstream node to the site. We disagree with this approach. As the river flows in an east-to-west direction in the location of the site, the closest upstream node is Node 2, which we would expect to be utilised for the FRA.
This is a typo in the report, Node 2 data has been used to set the DFL of 10.84m (see highlighted in Table 1 – below highlight the DFL based on the 1% + 105% climate change event).
- As the site is partially located within the functional flood plain (Flood Zone 3b) any proposed land raising, raised patio's and built footprint would need to be located outside of this flood level (1:20) and above the designed flood level (1:100+CC). Level for level, flood compensation may need to be applied.
No buildings are proposed on land below the DFL. Minor landscaping works may occur below the DFL and within the flood plain, but these will not result in an increase in ground levels or a displacement of flood levels.
- Elevation plan of the proposed layout, proposed finished floor levels and proposed site levels with the modelled flood levels clearly marked (1:20, 1:100, 1:100+CC and 1:1,000)
Refer to attached elevation plans showing the assigned flood levels as highlighted the Product 4 data extract below:

Table 1: Water Levels: Fluvial Undefended

Node Ref	NGR		Modelled Flood Levels in Metres AOD					
			Undefended Annual Exceedance Probability					
	Eastings	Northings	5%	1%	1% +CC (35%)	1% +CC (45%)	1% +CC (105%)	0.1%
1	525938	120632	10.22	10.43	10.61	10.68	10.98	10.73
2	525662	120460	10.08	10.31	10.49	10.55	10.84	10.60
3	525581	120340	10.06	10.28	10.43	10.49	10.77	10.57
4	525573	120333	10.04	10.26	10.18	10.24	10.54	10.55
5	525318	120169	8.92	9.08	9.23	9.29	9.60	9.35

- Details of how the FFL has been derived have not been provided within the FRA. It is unclear from the FRA which freeboard allowance has been applied. Finished floor levels should be a minimum of whichever is higher of 600mm above the:
 - average ground level of the site
 - adjacent road level to the building(s)
 - estimated river or sea flood level for the site

Where there is a high level of certainty about your estimated flood level, you may be able to reduce this to 300mm. If there is a particularly high level of uncertainty, it may need to be increased.

The FFL has been defined based off the DFL and has been used to sequentially position the dwelling on the site, both terms of placing the building within the site to avoid the Design Flood Extents and to set the FFL to be above the DFL. If a freeboard is required, we would argue a maximum freeboard of 300mm is applied. This is based on the following:

1. A falling hydraulic grade from Node 2 to 3 of 70mm, and a continuing fall towards node 4 and 5.
2. An understanding that in channel flood levels are higher than associated 2D flood plain levels, therefore resulting a conservative estimate of DFL away from the river channel.
3. The DFL accounts for the most extreme upper end climate change predictions for the area and based on the latest guidance by the PPG and NPPF for climate change allowances.

Based on these considerations, we are confident that the proposed dwelling is unlikely to experience a DFL greater than 10.84mAOD. Therefore, we are confident that a 300mm freeboard will provide sufficient protection of the dwelling above the DFL.

Flood Risk – Elevation Plan Showing Modelled Flood Levels

Please see attached which has produced in conjunction with CGS Civils.

This has been produced using the increase in FFLs, as well as hard landscaping, as a result of the 300mm freeboard being applied. All other levels have been kept the same.

The landscaping plan underlay by others (and submitted landscaping plan itself) would need updating to reflect the revised levels. We can update and issue this formally with other documentation once the approach has been confirmed.

Foul and Surface Water Drainage – Response from Creative Structures

- a. The land drain around the basement retaining walls does not need to discharge to the river. This is simply to reduce any perched water pressure on the main 2.5m+ retaining walls. The land drain will envelope the building footprint but will not extend to the river. It will simply balance the water pressure(s) and be a closed loop only, thus avoiding any attenuation issues.
- b. The Klargestor is currently located 10m away from the watercourse/river. Approved Document H requires any foul treatment plant to be at least 10m from a watercourse. We will move this an additional 5m away (now 15m) to create a buffer and add a note specifying that this needs to be at least 10m from the watercourse.

As above, we would be grateful if approval of the proposed approach could be obtained from the Drainage Officer urgently to then enable the formal production and issue of revised documentation and drawings.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Best Regards,

Stephen



Stephen Manning BSc (Hons) MCIAT

Associate

Chartered Architectural Technologist

01444 452604

07840 854218

www.gouldbaxter.co.uk

Gould Baxter is the trading name of Gould Property Consultants LLP. Registered in England and Wales with Partnership No. OC318407
Registered office: 2 Lucastes Mews, Haywards Heath RH16 1HE



From: Stephen Manning

Sent: 10 February 2025 16:02

To: Rachel Richardson <Rachel.Richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>

Cc: Tim Mole <tmm@gouldbaxter.co.uk>; Matthew Comber <mc@gouldbaxter.co.uk>; HH Filing <ghfiling@gouldbaxter.co.uk>

Subject: RE: 2025.02.07 DM/24/3050 - App - Minor - Bolney Chapel Road Twineham RH17 5NN - GH652 Riverside

Dear Rachel,

Thank you for your email. We confirm agreement to a 5 weeks EoT, as requested, and I will revert on timescales once we have had the opportunity to review and discuss with necessary parties.

I trust this agreeable and would be grateful for confirmation of receipt.

Best Regards,

Stephen



Stephen Manning BSc (Hons) MCIAT

Associate

Chartered Architectural Technologist

01444 452604

07840 854218

www.gouldbaxter.co.uk

Gould Baxter is the trading name of Gould Property Consultants LLP. Registered in England and Wales with Partnership No. OC318407
Registered office: 2 Lucastes Mews, Haywards Heath RH16 1HE



From: Rachel Richardson <Rachel.Richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 February 2025 11:14
To: Stephen Manning <sm@gouldbaxter.co.uk>
Subject: FW: 2025.02.07 DM/24/3050 - App - Minor - Bolney Chapel Road Twineham RH17 5NN

Dear Stephen,

Please see the comments below from the Council's drainage consultant.

Please can you address these accordingly.

Please advise on when I am likely to receive an update and I will then have to reconsult.

By way of return, please agree to a further extension of time as this application is due for determination today. I would suggest another 5 weeks, taking us to 17th March. I am on annual leave the week before.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Kind regards,

Rachel.

Rachel Richardson Bsc (Hons) DIP TP MRTPI
Senior Planning Officer
Development Management
www.midsussex.gov.uk
01444 477 224

Please note I work part-time (usually over Monday to Thursday) and from home Monday to Wednesday.

From: drainage <drainage@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 February 2025 13:30
To: Rachel Richardson <Rachel.Richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: drainage <drainage@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: 2025.02.07 DM/24/3050 - App - Minor - Bolney Chapel Road Twineham RH17 5NN

Dear Rachel,

Thank you for consulting the Flood Risk and Drainage Team on the above application. Having reviewed the information provided, we can provide the following comment:

Flood Risk

- The FRA submitted states that Node 3 is the closest upstream node to the site. We disagree with this approach. As the river flows in an east-to-west direction in the location of the site, the closest upstream node is Node 2, which we would expect to be utilised for the FRA.
- As the site is partially located within the functional flood plain (Flood Zone 3b) any proposed land raising, raised patio's and built footprint would need to be located outside of this flood level (1:20) and above the designed flood level (1:100+CC). Level for level, flood compensation may need to be applied.
- Elevation plan of the proposed layout, proposed finished floor levels and proposed site levels with the modelled flood levels clearly marked (1:20, 1:100, 1:100+CC and 1:1,000)
- Details of how the FFL has been derived have not been provided within the FRA. It is unclear from the FRA which freeboard allowance has been applied. Finished floor levels should be a minimum of whichever is higher of 600mm above the:
 - average ground level of the site
 - adjacent road level to the building(s)
 - estimated river or sea flood level for the site

Where there is a high level of certainty about your estimated flood level, you may be able to reduce this to 300mm. If there is a particularly high level of uncertainty, it may need to be increased.

As the site is within 20m's of a 'main river' the eastern branch of the River Adur, we advise that the EA should be consulted on this application.

Surface Water Drainage

- It is proposed for the surface water to be discharged to the watercourse adjacent to the site at an attenuated rate via an attenuation tank. Evidence should be supplied that no surface water runoff from the land drain will discharge into the watercourse at an unattenuated rate.

Foul Water Drainage

- It is proposed that the foul water will discharge to the watercourse adjacent to the site via a foul treatment plant. Evidence should be supplied that the sewage treatment plant has sufficient offsets (e.g. from the dwelling/ watercourse).

Receipt of the requested additional information does not mean further information will not be requested, nor does it guarantee that the Flood Risk and Drainage Team will not object to the development. Neither does it prevent the team from recommending a flood risk or drainage condition.

Best Wishes

Flood Risk and Drainage Team

Estate Services and Building Control
Mid Sussex District Council
drainage@midsussex.gov.uk

The information contained in this email may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless the information contained in this email is legally exempt from disclosure, we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this email to a third party making a request for information about the subject matter of this email. This email and any attachments may contain confidential information and is intended only to be seen and used by the named addressees. If you are not the named addressee, any use, disclosure, copying, alteration or forwarding of this email and its attachments is unauthorised. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately by email or by calling +44 (0) 1444 458 166 and remove this email and its attachments from your system. The views expressed within this email and any attachments are not necessarily the views or policies of Mid Sussex District Council. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise you to carry out your own virus checks before accessing this email and any attachments. Except where required by law, we shall not be responsible for any damage, loss or liability of any kind suffered in connection with this email and any attachments, or which may result from reliance on the contents of this email and any attachments.