

**District:** Choose District

Application no: 16/00041/DISC-2

**Proposal:** | Discharge of conditions 13 (landscaping), 17 (lighting), 20 (means of access), 22 (parking), 23 (travel information), 24 (archaeological scheme), 25 (archaeological evaluation), 26 (drainage) and 27 (water supply) of 14/01737OUT

**Location:** The Paddocks, The Hale, Chesterton

---

## Transport

### Recommendation

Objection

### Key issues

- Condition 17 – street lighting design drawings are required to show street lighting specifications.
- Condition 22 – improvements are required to the pedestrian provisions within the site.
- Condition 26 – further drainage information is required regarding soakaway tests, volumetric control, site flooding criteria.

### Detailed comments

#### **Condition 13 Landscaping**

No Comment

#### **Condition 17 Lighting**

From the information provided, the County would not have an objection for the type of LED lantern specified. The street lighting design drawing No. 15-DSR087958 has been reviewed, but the provided street lighting specifications are not shown on the drawing so The County is unable to discharge this condition.

The County would also need a design carried out for the Section 278 agreement as Green Lane is a very busy and high speed road.

**The County can not recommend discharge of this condition** until further information is received for review.

#### **Condition 20 Access**

The site access junction arrangements, and associated visibility splays, are acceptable. The access road is 5.5m and the tactile crossing is within the development allowing safe crossing with good visibility. **No objection.**

### **Condition 22 Accesses, driveways, parking and manoeuvring**

The vehicle swept path analysis demonstrates acceptable vehicle circulation. The level of provision and dimensions of car parking for each plot meets standards.

The site layout plan shows a path that runs to the allotments part way along the north-eastern boundary of the development. However, there is no public access across the allotments so there would be nowhere for this path to continue. However, there is an informal route along the south-eastern edge of the allotments which could be formalised to link with the route running through to the Alchester Road. This route would require access from the south-eastern end of the development. Formalisation of the route through the allotments would require liaison with the Parish Council. **The County can not recommend discharge of this condition until this improvement is made.**

### **Condition 23 Travel Information Pack**

The Travel Information Pack that has been submitted is of a high standard and will help new residents to settle into their new homes and to orientate themselves locally. It is suggested that the pack is offered to new residents both in a paper format but also electronically. This might cut down on printing costs and has the advantage of allowing residents to directly access things like timetables through operator's web sites. **No objection.**

### **Condition 24 Archaeological investigation**

No comment

### **Condition 25 Archaeological evaluation**

No comment

### **Condition 26 Drainage**

Referring to correspondence and the RSK Factual Soakaway Test Report (313035-02(00)) submitted following the application to discharge the drainage condition. Although progress has been made the information provided has raised some further concerns that need to be addressed prior to the discharge of the condition. These are set out in detail below

#### Soakaway Factual Report

Table 1 identifies soakage tests having been carried out in five trial pits TP 9,10,11,12 and 13. Figure 2 shows that the distribution of the test pits are particularly skewed to the north eastern side of the site. Accordingly, the positioning of the soakage pits does not demonstrate a fair representation of the potential for SUDS infiltration across the whole site. To appraise potential an even spread of tests is required to be carried out by the developer across the total site, unless access is not available and SUDS is clearly not an option.

The Figure 2 plan reveals that trial holes TP 1, 3, 6 are also pits where soakage test were performed, but no comment or log is provided on the results in the factual report. Please advise whether this is a mistake in the report or make the logs available.

It is considered that all the soakage test results in the factual report do not rule out the potential for infiltration techniques at any of the locations tested, as all meet the minimum OCC standard for infiltration rates to be not lower than  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  m/s. Please explain why limited use has been made of infiltration techniques at the site, wholly confined to the south-east part of the site. Please advise and confirm.

Control of peak runoff

In order to comply with Non- Statutory Technical Standards S2 and S3 Please confirm the following information:

|                           | <u>Existing Rates (l/s)</u> | <u>Proposed Rates (l/s)</u> | <u>Difference</u> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Greenfield QBar           |                             | N/A                         | N/A               |
| 1 in 1                    |                             |                             |                   |
| 1 in 30                   |                             |                             |                   |
| 1 in 100                  |                             |                             |                   |
| <u>1 in 100 + 30 % CC</u> | <u>N/A</u>                  |                             |                   |

To mitigate for climate change the proposed 1 in 100 + 30% must be no greater than the existing 1 in 100 runoff rate. Control of the 1 in 1 and 1/30 year peak discharge rate needs to be controlled to greenfield rates. This may require control structure such as orifice or weir. Please confirm.

Peak discharge volumes

Because the volume of run-off from the site can be as damaging to downstream flood as peak flow rates, it is necessary to ensure discharge volumes are controlled for storm events to greenfield volumes. Non - Statutory Technical Standards S4 to S9 apply. The SuDS Manual advises that ideally volumetric control should be achieved for all events. (Paragraph 3.3.1) and proposes a practical approach for dealing with the issue. Please confirm.

Site flooding criteria

Local Plan policy and non – statutory national technical standards apply. Policy EDS6 of the local plan is:

*Developments will not flood from surface water up to and including the design storm event or any surface water flooding beyond the 1 in 30 year storm event, up to and including the design storm event will be safely contained on Site.*

Please confirm that appropriate Microsimulation modelling has been undertaken to comply with the requirement.

The outline maintenance proposal is sufficient at this time, but will need to be further developed into a Site SUDS Management Plan that can be signed up to by all stakeholders.

**The County can not recommend discharge of this condition** until further information is supplied for review.

**Condition 27 Existing water supply infrastructure**

No comment

**Officer's Name** : Chris Nichols  
**Officer's Title** : Transport Development Control  
**Date** : 26 April 2016

---