

### Julie Barrow

---

**From:** Beeden Julia [Julia.Beeden@cambridgeshire.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** 16 October 2017 17:05  
**To:** Richard Fullerton  
**Cc:** Julie Barrow; Ellis Hilary  
**Subject:** Land to the rear of The Paddocks, Cheveley 17/01518/FUM  
**Attachments:** 171013 Response to R Fullerton.docx

Dear Richard,

Thank you for sending through the report that was commissioned for land to the rear of the Paddocks, Cheveley. We have reviewed the report prepared by JPC Environmental Services in detail and have summarised our thoughts in the attached Word document. For ease we have split our response into the same titles as each section of the report.

Apologies that I was not able to issue this last week as I had hoped. I note also that you have sent Hilary and I a further email today so I have just paused to look at that before sending this through.

I appreciate there is local concern regarding the proposed development and its drainage arrangements and can confirm that my team have taken these concerns seriously. The report raises relevant areas for consideration, however many of the issues raised by JPC have been addressed by the application, so we are in agreement. We will of course object to developments where no feasible solutions are presented, but in this case, the strategy and the limiting of the flow to greenfield runoff rates is appropriate. I do understand that you will be disappointed by our decision, but after reviewing the report we do not propose to change our response to the planning authority. When we object to a site we need to have solid reasons why the surface water management strategy is not appropriate that we could explain and defend to a planning inspector. While this was the case with the previous application, it is not the case this time.

There was no letter attached to your email of this afternoon. However I guess that the developer is not referring to this current situation, but to the fact that we objected to a prior application for the site, but not to this newer application. While in our minds they are separate applications the developer may be referring to it as one process.

Kind regards

Julia Beeden  
Flood and Water Business Manager  
Cambridgeshire County Council  
Shire Hall SH1315  
Castle Street  
Cambridgeshire County Council  
CB3 0AP  
Tel: 01223 699976 / 07880 473715  
Email: [julia.beeden@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:julia.beeden@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)

For planning emails: [frplanning@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:frplanning@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)

For consents for watercourse changes and general flood queries: [floodandwater@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:floodandwater@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. If you receive this email by mistake please notify the sender and delete it immediately. Opinions expressed are those of the individual and do not necessarily represent the opinion of Cambridgeshire County Council. All sent and received email from Cambridgeshire County Council is automatically scanned for the presence of computer viruses and security issues. Visit [www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk](http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk)

## Site adjacent to the Paddocks, Cheveley

### Infiltration Testing

The method used to test the permeability of the ground is not in accordance with BRE365 as correctly outlined within the report. We would however comment that a vast amount of available evidence suggests that the site is underlain by impermeable soils. This is also supported within the 'Local Geology' section of the JPC report. For this reason, and given that the tests that were undertaken showed such little fall in water level, we would not require further testing to be undertaken in this instance.

### SuDS Component: Permeable Paving

Whilst the site is relatively steep, a fall of 3 m over 150 m (equivalent to 1:50) is still considered appropriate (Ciria SuDS Manual and Marshalls Interpave manual) without the use of baffles/check dams. It may however be that, to alleviate local concerns, the applicant chooses to incorporate such features at the stage at which they discharge any drainage conditions. We would encourage them to discuss this with us at the time.

The report is correct that the drainage drawing doesn't show a point of discharge for excess surface water (i.e. an overflow); however within the text of the Surface Water Drainage Strategy it is stated that perforated pipes will be used to deal with excess water. When discharging any drainage conditions we would insist that these are designed and shown appropriately on submitted plans.

### SuDS Component: Swales/Ditches

It is acknowledged that the presence of 10 headwalls and corresponding pipework isn't a perfect solution; however as a result of our request, the system that was proposed to be located at the rear of the homes has now been moved to the front of properties. This will help ensure that any blockages or issues with the pipework are more easily identified and can be remedied. We have been informed that a management company has been identified to manage these structures.

### SuDS Component: Rainwater Harvesting System

We have reviewed the report and can confirm the rainwater harvesting system has not been included in the attenuation calculations. Therefore it can be assumed that the system is full, as recommended by JPC.

### Disagreement within the submitted information regarding the attenuation lagoons point of discharge

It is correct that the proposals are to discharge to a surface water sewer associated with the neighbouring paddocks development. The water flowing from The Paddocks has been taken into account when assessing whether this new site can be accommodated. The evidence presented to us shows the pipe has sufficient capacity.

### Retention of 1 in 1 year rainfall event on site

It is unclear where the reference to our guidance document requiring the 1 in 1 year rainfall to be retained on site, has come from. It is however true as pointed out by JPC that greenfield rates must be replicated. The proposed surface water strategy has demonstrated this.

### Impact of failure

As outlined above, the evidence presented to us shows the pipe into which the proposed development would connect does have sufficient capacity to take flows. We have also been presented with evidence that the pond has an outfall pipe which is used to take flows away from the pond.