

Appendix A

Previous Submission Consultation



Hampshire County Council

Universal Services
The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD

Tel: 0300 555 1375
Fax 01962 847055
www.hants.gov.uk

Enquiries to	Sarah Reghif	My reference	SWM/2022/0506
Direct Line	0370 779 7497	Your reference	F/22/93194
Date	12 May 2023	Email	SWM.consultee@hants.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam,

Full planning application for the erection of 185 dwellings, a 71-bedroom care home (Use Class C2), a 142-bedroom hotel (Use Class C1), a well-being centre (Use Class E / F2), a new pavilion building and improvements to existing stadium, new vehicular access, car parking, pedestrian circulation and processional ramp, together with associated tree planting, landscaping, SuDS and biodiversity enhancements at THE AGEAS BOWL, MARSHALL DRIVE, WEST END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 3XH(Application No. F/22/93194

Hampshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority has provided comments in relation to the above application in our role as statutory consultee on surface water drainage for major developments.

This response does not reflect the position of Hampshire County Council as the Highway Authority. If there is a potential for the drainage features to be offered for adoption, this will need to be discussed separately with Highways development planning as they might not be considered acceptable by the Highway Authority.

In order to assist applicants in providing the correct information to their Local Planning Authority for planning permission, Hampshire County Council has set out the information it requires to provide a substantive response at <https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/environment/flooding/planning>

The County Council has reviewed the following documents relating to the above application:

- Flood Risk Assessment Addendum 2 and Appendices

Director of Universal Services
Patrick Blogg

Additional information has been provided although primarily as a result of a meeting held with the applicants.

This has addressed a number of points however some additional information is still required at this stage while other elements could be conditioned.

Confirmation is required in relation to Character areas 2 and 3. These have been grouped together in the flood risk assessment with an overall storage requirement shown. However, these do not appear to be hydraulically connected on the drainage plans and no storage is shown for the pavilion. Evidence is needed to demonstrate that these proposals will not increase runoff at each individual location.

No pre / post development exceedance flow plans have been provided. Some narrative is included within the reports but plans are essential to show how water will flow in and around the development to ensure water is not directed to new locations. Although requested previously, no exceedance flow plans have been provided and on plan D12 there is a low point identified with exceedance routing to be considered by others. This information will need to be provided to give sufficient certainty that minor level adjustment is achievable and to understand the potential impacts.

The northern basin needs to be reviewed in terms of layout. The inlet and outlet are very close together and this is unlikely to be effective either hydraulically or from a water quality perspective. Refer to the SuDS Manual for additional guidance on basin design.

As has been highlighted previously, ordinary watercourse consent will be required for changes to ditches and watercourses affected by the works so extents of culverting / diversion and access chambers can be addressed through that process. There are no objections to the general principles currently proposed.

To assist with water quality, the applicant is proposing to enhance the existing watercourse and ponds and this can be accepted providing the details are confirmed by condition in conjunction with the relevant consultees. There is one section where a filter drain is proposed to provide additional treatment. Given the relatively minimal impact of this on overall design, this can also be conditioned.

Providing the initial 3 points are addressed, we would recommend the following condition:

1. No development shall begin until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the principles within the Flood Risk Assessment and addendums, has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details should include:

- a. A technical summary highlighting any changes to the design from that within the approved Flood Risk Assessment.
- b. Confirmation that sufficient water quality measures have been included to satisfy the methodology in the Ciria SuDS Manual C753.
- c. Details of the Biodiverse Channel and Lakes identifying works proposed to enhance from the current situation and provide sufficient water quality benefits.

As a statutory consultee, the County Council has a duty to respond to consultations within **21 days**. The 21 day period will not begin until we have received sufficient information to enable us to provide a meaningful response.

Please ensure all data is sent to us via the relevant Local Planning Authority.

This response has been provided using the best knowledge and information submitted by the applicant as part of the planning application at the time of responding and is reliant on the accuracy of that information.

Yours faithfully,



Flood and Water Management Team
 Economy, Transport & Environment Department,
 Hampshire County Council, 1st Floor, Ell Court West,
 The Castle, Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD
 Web:

<https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/environment/flooding>

General guidance for the application

It is important to ensure that the long-term maintenance and responsibility for Sustainable Drainage Systems is agreed between the Local Planning Authority and the applicant before planning permission is granted. This should involve discussions with those adopting and/or maintaining the proposed systems, which could include the Highway Authority, Planning Authority, Parish Councils, Water Companies and private management companies.

For SuDS systems to be adopted by Hampshire Highways it is recommended that you visit the website at:

<https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/constructionstandards> for guidance on which drainage features would be suitable for adoption.

Where the proposals are connecting to an existing drainage system it is likely that the authorities responsible for maintaining those systems will have their

own design requirements. These requirements will need to be reviewed and agreed as part of any surface water drainage scheme.

Works in relation to ordinary watercourses

*PLEASE NOTE: If the proposals include works to an ordinary watercourse, under the Land Drainage Act 1991, as amended by the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, prior consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority is required. **This consent is required as a separate permission to planning.***

Information on ordinary watercourse consenting can be found at the following link

<https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/environment/flooding/c/hangewatercourse>

It is strongly recommended that this information is reviewed before Land Drainage consent application is made.

*For guidance on providing the correct information, we recommend you use our **Ordinary Watercourse Consents Pre-application service** and help avoid delays occurring at the formal application stage. A Pre-application service for Ordinary Watercourse Consents is available, allowing consents to go through in a smoother, often more timely manner. For full information please visit:*

<https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/environment/flooding/c/hangewatercourse>

Ecology response 18 1 23 on FRA addendum F/22/93194 THE AGEAS BOWL, MARSHALL DRIVE, WEST END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 3XH

A Flood Risk Assessment Addendum was submitted on 23.12.22 in relation to HCC Flood & Water's comments. Please let me know if you have any comments on the additional information submitted.

Liz Harrison

18/1/23

I have reviewed the Flood Risk Addendum response to the LLFA comments (Andy Clay Consulting, December 2022) along with the related appendices:

A 1-4, drainage catchment areas 1-4

B 1-5, existing drainage for character areas 1-5

C 1-5, microdrainage for character areas 1-5

D1 flood modelling study, D2 node locations proposed scenario, D3 proposed glass wall scenario

Given the complexity of this site, the overlapping of the existing surface water drainage from the Ageas Bowl and the proposed surface water drainage, I will have to rely on the LLFA to assess the capacity of the proposed system to deal with the volume of water and flow routes.

In the results section of the Glasswalled Scenario Draft Results statement in appendix D3 it states that *an appropriate freeboard allowance will need to (be) added to the peak water elevation provided should this be required* and that *a further iteration of modelling will need to be undertaken when the development design is completed if there is any requirement to assess the following: on-site flood risk, off-site impacts, residual risk (for example exceedance events or blockage scenarios), sensitivity to storm duration and sensitivity to modelling choices*. I think that a freeboard allowance would be needed, and the further iteration of modelling would also be required. Given the scale of this proposed development and the potential for impacts due to flooding, I think this would be essential information for the decision-making process. If there is a risk of on-site flooding, off-site impacts (particularly to Telegraph Woods SINC) and opportunities for damage due to exceedance or blockage it raises questions about whether this development is feasible at all.

In the LLFA response it was noted that *not all surface water passes through a permeable paving element and it is not clear whether there are 3 naturalised (above ground) treatment forms proposed* for all surface water drainage as required by EBC local plan policy DM6. I do not see any additional documents which address this issue.

The water quality assessment was also mentioned in the LLFA response. It needs to be amended to include the worst-case indices and the proposed access roads must be included in the factors affecting water quality. The response requested *more detail on the elements going into the northern ditch which is not thought to connect to the ponds*.

Lisa Malter

Ecologist