

From: Anna Brindle

Sent: 07 April 2025 14:39

To: Richardson, Joe <Joe.Richardson@wiltshire.gov.uk>

Cc: Alex Smith

Subject: PL/2024/09976 - Land off Southampton Road and Junction Road, Alderbury, Wiltshire (E-mail 1 of 3)

Hi Joe,

I hope you are well?

We have been continuing to monitor the consultation responses submitted in connection with our application at Southampton Road, Alderbury, and have noted the most recent comments received from the LLFA (dated 13th March 2025) in relation to the proposed drainage arrangements for the development. In response to these, our Drainage Consultant has provided the following response:

Following our previous response to the LLFA consultation feedback, we are providing further comments as we believe that perhaps the key message was missed within our previous response, which was quite number-heavy.

To confirm, we are restricting the combined peak run-off from the site to 2 litres/second from the entire developed area. We can't do any better than 1 litre/second from each outfall.

The flow difference between the existing and proposed scenario is almost negligible, as follows:

- *Qbar; An extra 1.38 litres/second.*
- *1in30yr: An extra 0.26 litres/second.*
- *1in100yr: An extra 0.06 litres/second. For avoidance of doubt, we are increasing the flow into the ditch for the 1in100yr event by **0.06 litres/second**.*

It is correct that there is a catchment transfer as outlined in the LLFA response, but the flows are so miniscule that any predicted catchment analysis of the surrounding land flowing into the ditch to the north would be pointless, because even a 1% tolerance on the calculations would cancel out these extremely small flows we are comparing against.

The LLFA make reference to a 260% increase in flow over the Qbar rate, which appears quite bad, but in reality a 260% uplift applied a very small flow rate of 0.76 litres/second is still only 2 litres/second.

The LLFA want us to reduce the peak flows to less than 1 litres/second per outfall. Based upon 25 years' experience as a Consulting Engineer, specialising in flood risk and drainage design, it is not, in my experience, reasonably practicable to go lower than 1 litres/second on a surface water outfall. This introduces a risk of blockage, because the opening is very small, but it also starts to impact the half drain down times on the upstream attenuation.

We appreciate the LLFA's aspiration is to achieve "betterment" for new development, but it is also important this aspiration does not result in a planning approved drainage system that cannot be implemented. We want to also satisfy this aspiration, but in this instance 1 litre/second from each outfall is applying sound engineering practice that will result in a drainage system that will operate safely.

*We are not seeking a large relaxation and would like to reiterate that our submitted peak allowable discharge of 2 litres/second from the entire developed area will an extra **0.06 litres/second** for the 1in100yr event. This very small increased flow absolutely will not increase the risk of flooding to any properties downstream.*

Regarding the suggested draft Condition 1, we are concerned that the first three bullet points require the drainage strategy to be revisited. We would like the drainage strategy presented with the application to be approved and built and would therefore request that this condition is reworded to consider the details as submitted.

In addition to the above, we have also received an amended indicative layout plan, which has taken on board the previous feedback on the following matters:

- The inclusion of 2 x 1-bed maisonettes as required by the Housing Enabling Officer (see Plots 39 & 40)
- Alteration to the access along Southampton Road, to response to Highways advice
- Inclusion of noise attenuation boundary adjacent to Plot 1 (on Southampton Road frontage).

The amended layout has also been reflected in an updated D & A statement, updated landscaping drawings and LVIA. This e-mail represents No. 1 of 3, and includes the following attachments:

- Indicative site layout
- Design and Access Statement

As a final matter, I also just wanted to discuss the matter of the Nutrient solution that has previously been provided. We do not believe that the Ecology comments have taken account of the updated nutrient report provided. However, the solution puts forward the

upgrading of the septic tank at the Gray Manor Hotel. We would welcome your confirmation that this upgrade, could be secured via a s106 agreement.

Kind Regards

Anna

Anna Brindle