

APPENDIX N: Overland Exceedance Flow Route Plan



 SITE BOUNDARY
 OVERLAND EXCEEDANCE FLOW ROUTE

- **ATTENUATION BASIN 01A**
- Top of Bank (min) = 55.00m AOD
- Bottom of Bank = 53.80m AOD
- Designed for the 1in100yr + 45% CCA Storm Event
- Storage Depth = 1.20m
- 1in3 Side Slopes
- Plan Area = 6540m²
- Storage Volume = 7228m³
- Provision of at least 300mm freeboard

- Top of Bank (min) = 54.20m AOD
- Bottom of Bank = 53.05m AOD
- Designed for the 1in100yr + 45% CCA Storm Event
- Storage Depth = 1.15m
- 1in3 Side Slopes
- Plan Area = 5157m²
- Storage Volume = 5289m³

- Catchment area = 0.91ha
- Hardstand Area = 0.374ha
- Designed for the 1in100yr + 45% CCA Storm Event
- Discharge rate 1.26l/sec (70% QBar)

Proposed Ditch Outfall
IL: 52.96m AOD
Max Discharge rate:
12.70l/s (70% QBAR)

Proposed Ditch Outfall
IL: 53.20m AOD
Max Discharge rate:
1.925l/s (70% QBAR)

Proposed Ditch Outfall
IL: 53.53m AOD
Max Discharge rate:
12.70l/s (70% QBAR)

Proposed Ditch Outfall
IL: 52.64m AOD
Max Discharge rate:
1.925l/s (70% QBAR)

- **ATTENUATION BASIN 02A**
- Top of Bank (min) = 54.40m AOD
- Bottom of Bank = 53.40m AOD
- Designed for the 1in100yr + 45% CCA Storm Event
- Storage Depth = 1m
- 1in3 Side Slopes
- Plan Area = 585m²
- Storage Volume = 460m³
- Provision of at least 300mm freeboard

- **ATTENUATION BASIN 03**
- Top of Bank (min) = 53.30m AOD
- Bottom of Bank = 52.10m AOD
- Designed for the 1in100yr + 45% CCA Storm Event
- Storage Depth = 1.20m
- 1in3 Side Slopes
- Plan Area = 4605m²
- Storage Volume = 4911m³
- Provision of at least 300mm freeboard
- Draining Catchments 03, 04, and 05.

- **ATTENUATION BASIN 02B**
- Top of Bank (min) = 54.00m AOD
- Bottom of Bank = 52.80m AOD
- Designed for the 1in100yr + 45% CCA Storm Event
- Storage Depth = 1.20m
- 1in3 Side Slopes
- Plan Area = 1940m²
- Storage Volume = 2045m³
- Provision of at least 300mm freeboard

- Catchment area = 2.98ha
- Hardstand Area = 1.148ha
- Designed for the 1in100yr + 45% CCA Storm Event
- Discharge rate 3.85l/sec (70% QBar)

Proposed Ditch Outfall
IL: 51.80m AOD
Max Discharge rate:
8.19l/s (70% OBAR)

PRELIMINARY
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

rev.	amendment	checked	date
------	-----------	---------	------



project

FOREST FARM, CHIPPENHAM

scale 1:1000	drawn by PO	checked by SL
date JUNE 2026	cad file EXCEEDANCE FLOW.dwg	

OVERLAND EXCEEDANCE FLOW PLAN

Mayer Brown Limited jobcode	suitability	revision
SL/GLFORESTFARM.23	-	P4

GLFORESTFARM.23/24

APPENDIX O: Wessex Water Response

Response to:	Developer	email: falkhatib@mayerbrown.co.uk		
Planning Ref:		Our Ref: ST97SW/ 401	Our Email:	planning.liaison@wessexwater.co.uk
Proposal:	Up to 585 dwellings, Proposals will include the first phase of the strategic link road between the A4 London Road and the A350 that forms part of the wider allocation, including a new site access roundabout on the A4. Pedestrian and cycle links will be created through the site.			
Location:	Land east of Forest Farm, London Road Pewsham Chippenham	DATE	21/11/2024	

Thank you for your pre-development enquiry. Extracts from our records showing the approximate location of our apparatus within the vicinity of the site are attached.

Existing Apparatus

The following Wessex Water Assets are located within the red line boundary of the proposed site:

- 100mm diameter foul rising main.

There must be no buildings or structures within a minimum of 3m either side of the foul rising main. This includes no surface water attenuation features and associated earthworks cuttings or embankments in the easement strip, changes in ground levels resulting in additional loading or excavation can lead to instability in the pressurised rising main.

The rising main must not run through enclosed private rear gardens, it must be within a 6m (3m either side) open access easement strip or roads. Wessex Water require unrestricted access to maintain and repair our apparatus. No tree planting within a minimum of 6 metres.

It may be possible to divert the rising main at the Developers cost to suit the site layout, but a clear diversion route must be demonstrated on layout plans to show how this will be achieved.

The applicant will need to agree protection arrangements for working in proximity of the rising main.

All apparatus must be accurately located on site and marked on deposited drawings.

Foul Sewerage – Point of Discharge


Development of this scale requires a minimum 300mm foul sewer connection.

The nearest 300mm size for size point of discharge is manhole ST93713502

Cover Level; 51.950 Invert Level; 49.810

Co-ords; 393309,171594

Location; Kings roundabout on Pewsham Way at junction with King Henry Drive



Continued.....

A development of this magnitude would create a significant increase in foul flows through the network and sewage treatment works. We are currently strategically modelling foul and water supply for the whole South Chippenham consortium covering the Local Plan sites that are under consideration. We understand this site could be first to come forward, however we are taking a holistic approach and considering all parts of the wider strategic development which consists of circa 4100 houses plus commercial aspects. Development of this site should be mindful of the wider allocation and must not impinge our ability to provide water and sewerage to the wider sites in the Local Plan allocation.

The point of connection to the public foul network is by application and agreement and Wessex Water will accommodate domestic type foul flows in the public foul sewer with connections made on a 'size for size' basis, Developers fund the cost of connecting to the nearest 'size for size' foul sewer and Wessex Water will manage the foul sewer network to accommodate foul flows from granted development. We fund this through our infrastructure charging arrangements.

It is likely a pumped connection will be required, and provision should be made within the site layout for a suitable compound location with adequate access directly off adopted road with turning arrangements for tanker lorries. Dwellings must be located a minimum 15 metres from the wet well.

Separated systems of drainage are required: Wessex Water will not accept surface water or land drainage flows to the public foul sewer and treatment works, either directly or indirectly.

Proposed Surface Water Sewerage

Surface Water to be disposed of in accordance with SUDS Hierarchy and NPPF Guidelines.
We expect point of discharge to be direct to the watercourse.

Surface water strategy is subject to the approval of the Lead Local Flood Authority and drainage arrangements and discharge rates must be discussed and agreed with the Wiltshire Council drainage engineer.

No surface water runoff, land drainage or ground water will be accepted into the foul sewer either directly or indirectly.

Water Supply – Point of Connection

Development of this scale requires a minimum 250mm water main connection.

The 3" & 4" water main along the northeastern site boundary with London Road, is too small diameter main for a 'size for size' connection.

The nearest 250mm 'size for size' point of connection is the 10" (250mm) water main in Pewsham Way and nearest point of connection would be at the junction of Pewsham Way with London Road

Co-ords; 393694,172155



Continued.....

A development of this magnitude would create a significant increase in demand on the water network and source. We are currently strategically modelling water supply for the whole South Chippenham consortium covering the Local Plan sites that are currently under consideration. We understand this site could be first to come forward, however we are taking a holistic approach and considering all parts of the wider strategic allocation. Development of this site should be mindful of the wider allocation and must not impinge our ability to provide water and sewerage to the wider sites in the Local Plan allocation.

The point of connection to the water network is by application and agreement with connection on a 'size for size' basis, Developers fund the cost of connecting to the nearest 'size for size' water main and Wessex Water will manage the water supply network to accommodate additional demand from granted development. We fund this through our infrastructure charging arrangements.

For more details and guidance for applying to connect to our networks please see our website:

<https://www.wessexwater.co.uk/services/building-and-developing/building-multiple-properties-or-large-developments>

New Appointments and Variations (NAVs)

The NAV Market enables developers to choose their water or sewerage undertaker for a specific geographic area. For developers wishing to consider an alternative supplier or seeking further information, a full list of appointees and further guidance can be found on the [Developing a new site \(wessexwater.co.uk\)](https://www.wessexwater.co.uk/services/building-and-developing/building-multiple-properties-or-large-developments) and [Ofwat website](#).

If you are making a NAV enquiry, there is a Wessex Water dedicated wholesale team that deal with NAV enquiries. Full details are on our website including guidance notes, our policy and contact details.

<https://developerservices.wessexwater.co.uk/new-appointments-and-variations>

NAV enquiries

All NAV enquiries should be directed to Wessex Water's Wholesale Service Desk.

Email: wholesaleservicedesk@wessexwater.co.uk

Phone: [0330 123 1122](tel:03301231122)

Post: Wholesale Service Desk, Wessex Water, Claverton Down, Bath, BA2 7WW

These comments are based upon known circumstances prevailing at the time of writing. A review of the contents of this email is required where 18 months or more have elapsed since issue, or in the light of significant changes likely to impact on our response such as development numbers or phasing. Please email review requests to planning.liaison@wessexwater.co.uk

APPENDIX P: LLFA Correspondence

Steven Lecocq

From: Wilding, Ben <Ben.Wilding@atkinsrealis.com>
Sent: 09 January 2026 12:38
To: Steven Lecocq
Cc: MX0300 - Wiltshire LLFA; Farris Alkhatib
Subject: Re: Gleeson Land at Forest Farm, Chippenham - Drainage Queries

Hi Steven
Thanks for your time this morning - I am in agreement with the below meeting notes

Kind Regards

Ben Wilding *MEng (Hons) Eur Ing CEng MICE*

AtkinsRéalis on behalf of Wiltshire Council Drainage

E: ben.wilding@atkinsrealis.com / wilts.drainage@atkinsrealis.com

Stay Informed: Discover Wiltshire Council's latest updates on Drainage Betterment Strategy [here](#).

Out of office : -

AtkinsRéalis - Baseline / Référence

From: Steven Lecocq <slecocq@mayerbrown.co.uk>
Sent: 09 January 2026 11:24
To: Wilding, Ben <Ben.Wilding@atkinsrealis.com>
Cc: MX0300 - Wiltshire LLFA <wilts.drainage@atkinsrealis.com>; Farris Alkhatib <falkhatib@mayerbrown.co.uk>
Subject: FW: Gleeson Land at Forest Farm, Chippenham - Drainage Queries

Good morning Ben,

Many thanks for your time this morning, its very much appreciated as always.

As promised, I have provided some meeting notes from today on the below email chain in purple for our records.

I would be grateful if you could review briefly when you get a chance and confirm, so we can progress this with confidence.

Thanks,

Steven

From: Steven Lecocq

Sent: 16 May 2025 08:35

To: 'Wilding, Ben' <Ben.Wilding@atkinsrealis.com>

Cc: MX0300 - Wiltshire LLFA <wilts.drainage@atkinsrealis.com>; Farris Alkhatib <falkhatib@mayerbrown.co.uk>

Subject: RE: Gleeson Land at Forest Farm, Chippenham - Drainage Queries

Good morning Ben,

Many thanks for the below, that's super helpful.

I think were OK for a meeting on the basis of the below, but we will update our information, and if anything crops up that we feel is worth discussing we will reach back out if that's OK?

Have a great weekend.

Thanks,

Steven

From: Wilding, Ben <Ben.Wilding@atkinsrealis.com>

Sent: 14 May 2025 17:21

To: Steven Lecocq <slecocq@mayerbrown.co.uk>

Cc: MX0300 - Wiltshire LLFA <wilts.drainage@atkinsrealis.com>; Farris Alkhatib <falkhatib@mayerbrown.co.uk>

Subject: Re: Gleeson Land at Forest Farm, Chippenham - Drainage Queries

Thanks Steven

Please see my responses below and let me know if you feel a further meeting will be beneficial for you.

Kind Regards

Ben Wilding MEng (Hons) Eur Ing CEng MICE

AtkinsRéal is on behalf of Wiltshire Council Drainage

E: ben.wilding@atkinsrealis.com / wilts.drainage@atkinsrealis.com

Stay Informed: Discover Wiltshire Council's latest updates on Drainage Betterment Strategy [here](#).

Annual Leave: 16 May | 27 June

From: Steven Lecocq
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2025 16:32
To: Wilding, Ben
Cc: MX0300 - Wiltshire LLFA; Farris Alkhatib
Subject: RE: Gleeson Land at Forest Farm, Chippenham - Drainage Queries

Good afternoon Ben,

Many thanks for your email, and for sending this through.

Please accept my apologies for the delay in getting back to you, and I agree another meeting may be helpful.

In the meantime, I have provided my initial responses below in green. Would you possibly be able to review and provide your thoughts, and then if required we can have another meeting?

Thanks,

Steven

From: Wilding, Ben <Ben.Wilding@atkinsrealis.com>
Sent: 02 May 2025 15:24
To: Steven Lecocq <slecocq@mayerbrown.co.uk>
Cc: MX0300 - Wiltshire LLFA <wilts.drainage@atkinsrealis.com>
Subject: Re: Gleeson Land at Forest Farm, Chippenham - Drainage Queries

Hi Steven

Apologies this has taken so long to get to. I have provided some brief notes below, these are provided without prejudice.

2.9	Am I correct in saying that based on CIRIA guidance, that this will preclude the use of formal soakaway features on the site. I would be happy that as the GWL has been identified, we would not need to see soakaway tests completed? – Correct. Noting we couldn't achieve the 1m unsaturated zone between the bottom of the infiltration features and the groundwater levels, this precludes the use of infiltration. This is explained in Para 6.4. In addition to this, infiltration testing has been undertaken, and the rates were too low to calculate, so I think this is suitably covered. Agreed <i>Meeting Note 09.01.26 – Steven Lecocq (SL) and Ben Wilding (BW) in agreement this is sufficient evidence to discount formal infiltration features.</i>
3.2	Are the catchments listed here linked to specific outfalls or linked to parts of the development. We would want to see catchments defined hydraulically rather than by project phases.? These catchments relate to the separate outfalls into the existing ditch/watercourses, so are linked hydraulically as you have suggested. 5no basins, 5no outfalls, 5no catchments. I trust that makes sense. Thanks for clarification <i>Meeting Note 09.01.26 – SL clarified that it is essentially one large catchment that all drains to the ditch/watercourse to the south, however it has been broken up into development parcels based on the outfalls. BW advised including a section explaining that its one large catchment broken down into development parcels. SL and BW agreed this would address this comment.</i>
5.4	I have had a look at this on Scalgo, which is a tool we use to look at flow paths. It does not always pick up all ditches but it currently would indicate that there would be flow coming into Area A from adjacent land. I appreciate this may not be correct, but feel it would be worth in your report including site photos, cross sections and extents of the ditches you mention just so as it can be demonstrated that they do exist (and therefore so as to validate some of your statements made) Thanks for these comments, all of which are noted. We have a full topographic survey of the ditch demonstrating that it's there, so I trust this would be sufficient? Topo survey of the ditch would be sufficient - thanks for clarifying On the basis that the Area A did only drain itself and not have contributing flows from adjacent land (as I have indicated) I think this sentence may be missing the second half, but I trust it was going to say "On the basis that the Area A did only drain itself and not have contributing flows from adjacent land (as I have indicated), then this would be acceptable". Can you please confirm? Your suggestion is correct (sorry for the mistake in the comment) - Agreed



Meeting Note 09.01.26 – SL clarified with BW that it was the flow path circled in Figure 1 below that was being referred to, which BW confirmed. SL advised following this comment he went back out to site to confirm the extent and location of the ditch networks, which are indicatively shown by the thick magenta lines in Figure 2 below. The site visit identified a break in the ditches on the north western field boundary, however both SL and BW agree that this does not alter the conclusion that the flood risk in Area A is only contributed by the site itself. In relation to the flow path described in BW's comments above, noting the London Road ditch continues at this location (as evidenced by the Topographic Survey and site inspections and photographs) both BW and SL agree that the flood risk in Area A is only contributed to by the site itself. A photograph of upstream side of ditch culvert underneath the site access is contained in Figure 3 with the location of the photo shown by an X in Figure 1 below. These will be included within the FRA for clarity.

Figure 1



Figure 2




Figure 3



5.5	Agree with the principles of the statement in that the flow paths are directed to the existing ditch The statement that water could not accumulate in these areas is not strictly correct as that would imply that there is full, unimpeded flow paths to the watercourse. I doubt if this will be the case and therefore some localised ponding of water could be reasonably expected. Agreed and accepted. We will reword this to include that there would only be expected to be a few small areas of localised ponding. <i>Meeting Note 09.01.26 – SL advised a section will be included in the report to cover this, which BW agreed was acceptable.</i>
5.6	For the interception drains we would look for these to be open ditches / swales in order to ease maintenance etc. Noted. We will feed this back to the project team. <i>Meeting Note 09.01.26 – SL advised they are referenced as interception drains in the Outline FRA, however they will likely be open ditches / swales, which BW confirmed was acceptable.</i>
6.6	I am happy with this conclusion. In line with SuDS principles we should still be promoting interception storage across the development even if formal soakaway-type features have been demonstrated to be unfeasible. Noted. Permeable paving is proposed, and swales are proposed at suitable locations throughout the layout, which I expect covers this point. Agreed <i>Meeting Note 09.01.26 – SL advised that the permeable paving, swales and basins will provide interception storage, and that a commitment to them all being unlined subject to groundwater constraints will be included in the report, which BW confirmed is acceptable in terms of interception storage.</i>
6.7	From an LLFA perspective this is correct, but the Urban Design and Landscape officers will be looking at the potential amenity / biodiversity function of the proposed SuDS features Noted, thank you.
6.9	The full hierarchy also should include "collection of water for reuse" ahead of disposal via infiltration systems. Additional text should be provided to demonstrate how this has been considered / included for. Noted. We will feed this back to the project team. <i>Meeting Note 09.01.26 – BW suggested the water butts with a slow drain down would be preferable to facilitate some interception storage benefits, which SL agreed with. SL advised he would include a commitment to this in the FRA, which BW advised was acceptable.</i>
6.10	We would like to see drawings provided showing existing catchment areas (01, 02 , 03 ,04, 05) - this is important so as we can assure the greenfield runoff calculations and ensure that the limits have been appropriately determined. Noted, this will be provided as part of the application. <i>Meeting Note 09.01.26 – SL advised that as above it is essentially one large catchment draining to the ditch / watercourse, however the catchments were shown on the drawing provided, but on review SL noticed they were behind other layers. SL advised he would ensure the catchments are shown clearly on the drawings with labels identifying the areas, hardstanding areas and QBAR greenfield rates, which BW advised is acceptable.</i>
6.12	SuDS should also be designed to provide interception storage as well - whilst the statement in 6.12 is factually correct we would obviously expect interception storage to be provided in the less heavy rainfall events. – As above, permeable paving and swales are provided throughout the layout in addition to the SuDS Basins. Furthermore, groundwater permitting, the SuDS basins could be unlined, which would allow for some infiltration losses. <i>Meeting Note 09.01.26 – SL advised that the permeable paving, swales and basins will provide interception storage, and that a commitment to them all being unlined subject to groundwater constraints will be included in the report, which BW confirmed is acceptable in terms of interception storage.</i>

6.13	Agree in principle with this with the following caveats - Long term storage to be provided to ensure that the greenfield 100yr 6hr discharge volumes are not exceeded – My understanding is that as we are discharging at 70% QBAR rate for the 1in100yr plus climate change event, then long term storage is not required. Is this not the case? You are correct if limiting to 70% of Qbar throughout - You will need to provide a comparison pre- vs post- development to demonstrate that there will be no catchment transfer as a result of the development Noting the entire site discharges to the existing ditch/watercourse in the existing situation, and this is the same in the proposed scenario, I don't believe this will be required? We broke the site into catchments reliant on the levels and outfalls required as a result. Agreed - it would be useful to just add a line to the strategy stating that there will be no catchment transfer from existing - You will need to demonstrate that there is no increase in discharge against the Q1 flows as well We will review this.
6.17	Will the permeable paving be type A (to promote some infiltration) or type C (non infiltrating) - assume non infiltrating based on the soil conditions? Where ground conditions permit, it is envisaged that Type A would be used, although this will be confirmed at the RM stages. Agree this can be confirmed at RM stage We will want to see cross-section and long-section drawings through all attenuation features Noting this is for Outline Planning, are the cross and long sections still required or will this be for the RM stages? Agree this can be at RM stage <i>Meeting Note 09.01.26 – SL advised that a commitment to them all being unlined subject to groundwater constraints will be included in the report, which BW confirmed is acceptable.</i>
6.18	Agree
6.19	Culverting should be avoided wherever possible - bridges would be preferable from a drainage perspective. Where culverting is proposed, you will need to demonstrate that culverts can convey the 1in 100yr + cc flows, and achieve freeboard and embedment in line with CIRIA C786 Guidance with regards to freeboard and embedment / sedimentation depth Noted. We will feed this back to the Team and report back, although the details of the Culverting would be provided at the RM and detailed design stages. A suitable allowance has been included in the levels design from the road level to the top of ditch levels to allow for this (1m+). Noted <i>Meeting Note 09.01.26 – SL advised that a 1m+ clearance over the top of bank levels to the surface is provided, and that this will be explained in the FRA, which BW confirmed is acceptable.</i>
6.20	Open channel features to be preferred over filter drains due to comparative ease of maintenance Noted. We will feed this back to the project team. <i>Meeting Note 09.01.26 – SL advised they are referenced as interception drains in the Outline FRA, however they will likely be open ditches / swales, which BW confirmed was acceptable</i>
6.25	A detailed plan of these exceedance flow routes should be provided The best exceedance plans are the ones that go into detail on where the flow paths will be, and include where the exceedance flows will be routed to and will pond Noted, thank you. We can include this for the Planning submission. <i>Meeting Note 09.01.26 – SL confirmed an exceedance flow plan will be included in the FRA.</i>
6.26	Agree with the principle of using the simple index method Noted, thank you.

6.31	For attenuation basins to provide the treatment, you will need to demonstrate that a minimum 9min. Residence time in the basins is provided in line with CIRIA C753 guidance – Noted, thank you.
6.33	Fine in principle - suggest that all features are designed carefully in line with Wessex Water Adoption Guidance Noted. We will double check this with the Client and feedback.
6.35	Fine to use FEH If a comparison to FSR could be done to demonstrate how FEH is more conservative, that would be useful – We can provide this as part of the application. Meeting Note 09.01.26 – SL confirmed the FSR rates will be included as a comparison to evidence the most conservative rates are used.
6.37	Agree with the proposed PIMP values for buildings, paths, parking (i.e. PIMP = 100%) Ok that you have used 0% PIMP for the soft landscaping as you appear to have based the calculated discharge rates (Table 6.1) on the areas of hardstanding and not the full site area, and you have used a Cv value of 1 in your initial causeway flow calculations Noted, thank you.
7	Rates, point of connection and foul strategy to be agreed with WW – Noted, thank you.

I am happy to have another call if you wish to discuss any of the above

Kind Regards,

Ben Wilding *MEng (Hons) Eur Ing CEng MICE*

AtkinsRéalis on behalf of Wiltshire Council Drainage

E: ben.wilding@atkinsrealis.com / wilts.drainage@atkinsrealis.com

Stay Informed: Discover Wiltshire Council's latest updates on Drainage Betterment Strategy [here](#).

Annual Leave: 16 May | 27 June

From: Steven Lecocq <slecocq@mayerbrown.co.uk>

Sent: 23 April 2025 09:09

To: Wilding, Ben <Ben.Wilding@atkinsrealis.com>

Subject: RE: GLFORESTFARM - Drainage Queries

Good afternoon Ben,

I hope your keeping well, and enjoyed your Easter break.

Thought I would quickly check in to see if you have had the chance to review this yet?

If so, I would be grateful if you could provide any thoughts / comments, or alternatively, I would of course be happy to jump on another Teams call at a time that suits.

Thanks in advance,

Steven

From: Steven Lecocq

Sent: 26 March 2025 18:19

To: 'Wilding, Ben' <Ben.Wilding@atkinsrealis.com>

Subject: RE: GLFORESTFARM - Drainage Queries

Hi Ben,

No worries at all, please accept my apologies.

Please see updated link: <https://we.tl/t-DMTvkPEMcZ>

Any questions, please shout!

Thanks,

Steven

From: Wilding, Ben <Ben.Wilding@atkinsrealis.com>

Sent: 26 March 2025 10:23

To: Steven Lecocq <slecocq@mayerbrown.co.uk>

Subject: RE: GLFORESTFARM - Drainage Queries

Sorry Steven

Looks like the link below isn't working for me so can you please resend ?

Kind Regards

Ben Wilding MEng (Hons) Eur Ing CEng MICE

Associate

Networks & Drainage Solutions, Infrastructure

Tel: +44 121 483 5490 [LinkedIn](#)

