

Infrastruct CS Ltd The Stables, High Cogges Farm, High Cogges, Oxon Ox29 6UN Tel: 01993 709709 Email: info@infrastructcs.co.uk Web: www.infrastructcs.co.uk

## CAROL STREET, CAMDEN SuDS Assessment and Drainage Statement



<u>Site reference</u>

25 Carol Street, Camden, North West London, NW1 0HT Client engineersHRW Date July 2017

<u>Report No.</u>

ICS-1909.07.001 Rev B

Revision	Compiled by	Checked by	Issue date
Α	Richard White B.Sc (Hons) C.Env C.WEM I.Eng MCIWEM	William Piotrowski B.Sc. (Hons)	1 <sup>st</sup> September 2017
В	Richard White B.Sc (Hons) C.Env C.WEM I.Eng MCIWEM	William Piotrowski B.Sc. (Hons)	15 <sup>th</sup> September 2017

This document has been prepared solely as a SuDS Assessment for the Client, Engineers HRW. No responsibility or liability will be accepted for any use that is made of this document other than by the Client for the purpose it was written. The conclusions resulting from this study and contained within this report are not necessarily indicative of future conditions or operating practices at or adjacent to the site.

No person other than the client may copy use or rely on the contents of this document without prior permission.

Some of the information presented within this report is based on third party information which is believed to be correct; no liability will be accepted for any discrepancies in accuracy, mistakes or omissions in such information.

Registered Office: Jamesons House, Compton Way, Witney, OX28 3AB Registered in England and Wales 07521130,



## **Table of Contents**

## Contents

1.0 SUMMARY
2.0 INTRODUCTION
2.1 Commission
2.2 GUIDANCE
2.3 Aims and Objectives
3.0 SITE DETAILS
3.1 LOCATION
3.2 Grid Reference
3.3 Topography and Description of the Site
3.5 Existing Drainage Description
3.6 Local Rivers and Water Courses
3.7 Proposed Development
4.0 FLOOD RISK POLICY
4.1 Environment Agency Flood Map
5.0 FLOOD RISK AS A RESULT OF THE DEVELOPMENT
5.1 Effect of The Development Generally
5.2 Surface Water Drainage & Sustainable Drainage Systems
5.3 Greenfield Runoff Rates
5.3 Existing Runoff Rates
6.0 Assessment OF Suds Hierarchy 11
6.1 Store rainwater for later use
6.2 USE INFILTRATION TECHNIQUES, SUCH AS POROUS SURFACES IN NON-CLAY AREAS
6.3 Attenuate rainwater in ponds or open water features for gradual release
6.4 Attenuate rainwater by storing in tanks or sealed water features for gradual release $12$
6.5 Discharge rainwater direct to a watercourse
6.6 DISCHARGE RAINWATER TO A SURFACE WATER/DRAIN
6.7 Discharge rainwater to a combined water/drain12
7.0 Assessment OF SuDS Measures
7.1 Rainwater Harvesting
7.2 Green Roofs
7.3 FILTER STRIPS
7.4 FILTER DRAINS



7.5 Pervious Pavements	14
7.6 Swales	14
7.7 Geocellular/Modular Systems	14
7.8 Sand Filters	15
7.9 Infiltration Basins	15
7.10 Detention Basins	15
7.11 Ponds	16
7.12 Stormwater Wetlands	16
7.13 Perforated Ring Soakaways	16
7.14 BIO-RETENTION AREAS	16
8.0 PROPOSED DRAINAGE STRATEGY	17
8.1 Drainage Strategy & Design	17
8.2 Proposed Foul Water Strategy	17
8.3 Proposed Surface Water Strategy	17
9.0 CONCLUSION	
REFERENCES & BIBLIOGRAPHY	
APPENDIX A – SITE TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY	
APPENDIX B – MASTER PLANS AND FLOOR PLANS	
APPENDIX C – DRAINAGE STRATEGY	
Appendix D – Sewer Records	
APPENDIX E – MICRO DRAINAGE CALCULATIONS	
APPENDIX F – LBC SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE PRO-FORMA	



## 1.0 Summary

This SuDS Assessment and drainage statement is to support proposed development at Carol Street, and finds the following:

ITEM	RESPONSE
Site Location	The site is located in Camden, North West London, fronting onto Carol Street, with St. Martin's Gardens to the rear, 175m East of Camden Town Station. The approximate grid reference of E = 529082, N = 183859.
Size and Current Land Usage	The site area extends to 290m <sup>2</sup> and currently contains a play area with soft landscaping with approximately 72.5m <sup>2</sup> of paving.
Flood Zone	The whole site falls within Flood Zones 1, which is classified as low probability of flooding.
Proposed Development	It is proposed to clear the existing site and to construct a live/work building containing studio and workshop space at ground and basement levels and a two bedroom dwelling with further studio space at first and second floors.
Floor Levels	Finished floor levels for the ground floor have been set by the Architect at 26.00m AOD for the ground floor and 22.75m AOD for the basement.
Proposed Foul Drainage	It is proposed that the bulk of the site will discharge via a gravity drainage system utilising a new combined water connection from the site. Flows from the basement will need to be pumped, as there are insufficient falls to allow a gravity connection.
Proposed Surface Water Drainage	It is proposed that the site will discharge via a gravity drainage system utilising the new combined water connection from the site. The discharge will be limited to 5 I/s in line with guidance from HR Wallingford. Surface waters from the West of the building will need to be pumped to the attenuation tank due to complexities in routing the drains though the building.



## 2.0 Introduction

## 2.1 Commission

The Client, Engineers HRW has commissioned Infrastruct CS Ltd to prepare a SuDS Assessment and drainage statement to support a planning application for the development of a new live/work building.

## 2.2 Guidance

This SuDS assessment has been compiled in accordance with the recommendations of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Planning Practice Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework and Ciria C753.

## 2.3 Aims and Objectives

The purpose of this SuDS assessment is to demonstrate where SuDS systems can safely be implemented within the best practice guidelines given in C753.

This report will also identify the flood risk zone, consider the proposed drainage, recommend appropriate flood risk mitigation measures, where necessary and will be used to support the planning application proposals.

This report is based on information made available at the time of writing. Consequently, there is potential for additional information to be published which may lead to changes to the conclusions drawn in this report. As such Infrastruct CS Ltd cannot be held responsible for such changes.



## 3.0 Site Details

## 3.1 Location

The site is located in Camden, North West London, fronting onto Carol Street, with St. Martin's Gardens to the rear. Located approximately 175m East of Camden Town Station.



## Fig 3.1 Location Plan

## 3.2 Grid Reference

The approximate Ordnance Survey national grid reference for the centre of the site;

## E = 529082, N = 183859.

## 3.3 Topography and Description of the Site

A detailed topographic survey for the development site has been undertaken by Randall Surveys LLP in February 2015 and this can be found within Appendix A of this report.

The site is rectangular is shape, approximately 21.5m in length and 14m in width. The site is largely soft landscaping and unmade ground with approximately 80m2 of paving.

The topography of the overall site is relatively flat, with a low point of 25.41mAOD where the site adjoins No 23.

The site area extends to 290m<sup>2</sup> and was last used as a garden/recreation area. Comprised of soft landscaping with approximately 80m2 of paving. The site is surrounded by commercial and residential properties.

A site investigation has not been undertaken. However, information obtained from the British Geological Survey indicate that the strata is likely to be silty clays or clay, which are assumed to have poor infiltration properties.

## 3.5 Existing Drainage Description

From a review of the topographic survey, there does not appear to be a positive drainage connection serving the site.

ICS\_1909.07.001-B Carol Street, Camden - SuDS Assessment



## 3.6 Local Rivers and Water Courses

The nearest main river watercourse to the development site is the Regents Canal 200m to the North. The local water courses are highlighted in the below figure.



Fig 3.6.1 – Local Above Ground Watercourses

There is also a culverted watercourse taking flows from the Highgate Ponds running adjacent to Royal College Street, approximately 250m to the East.



Fig 3.6.2 – Local Below Ground Watercourses

The local rivers are not shown to pose any risk to the development itself on the EA flood maps.

ICS\_1909.07.001-B Carol Street, Camden - SuDS Assessment



## 3.7 Proposed Development

It is proposed to clear the existing site to provide a live/work building consisting of a 2-bedroom dwelling within the upper floors and an associated ground floor and basement studio. The footprint of the building is 137sqm at ground floor level with a slightly larger basement which has a footprint of 207sqm.

The overall impermeable area of the site will increase following the proposed the works. As a result, the flow rates, and volumes will increase without mitigation measures in place. The final design will look to mitigate any increase in the flood risk this development will have both on itself and on downstream properties.

A copy of the site master plan and floor plans can be found within Appendix B of this report.



## 4.0 Flood Risk Policy

## 4.1 Environment Agency Flood Map

The development site is situated in the Environment Agency Thames Region and their Flood Zone maps for the area indicate fluvial flooding extents.

The flood map for the development site shown below suggests that the whole site falls within Flood Zone 1, which is defined as land assessed as having a less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of tidal flooding in any one year.



Fig 4.1 – Environment Agency Flood Zone map



## 5.0 Flood Risk As A Result Of The Development

## 5.1 Effect of The Development Generally

Development by its nature usually has the potential to increase the impermeable area with a resultant increased risk of causing rapid surface water runoff to watercourses and sewers, thereby causing surcharging and potential flooding. There is also the potential for pollutants to be mobilised and consequently flushed into the receiving surface water system.

Increases in both the peak runoff rate (usually measured in litres per second I/s) and runoff volume (cubic metres m<sup>3</sup>) can result.

## 5.2 Surface Water Drainage & Sustainable Drainage Systems

Sustainable Drainage techniques (SUDS) covers a range of approaches to manage surface water runoff so that-

'Surface water arising from a developed site should, as far as is practicable, be managed in a sustainable manner to mimic the surface water flows arising from the site prior to the proposed development, while reducing the flood risk to the site itself and elsewhere, taking climate change into account.' This should be demonstrated as part of the SuDS assessment.

## 5.3 Greenfield Runoff Rates

The site has an area of 0.030ha. MicroDrainage calculation for this area gives the rates below for a greenfield site of this size.

Return Period	Runoff Rate (I/s)
1	0.1
2 - Qbar	0.1
30	0.2
100	0.4

Table 5.3.1: Greenfield runoff rates - See Appendix E for MicroDrainage calculations. Please refer to section 8.3 for a discussion to the proposed outflow rates from the site.

## 5.3 Existing Runoff Rates

The existing site has an impermeable area of 0.008ha. MicroDrainage calculation for this area gives the rates below for an impermeable area of this size.

Return Period	Runoff Rate (I/s)	Runoff Volume (m <sup>3</sup> )
1	1.3	3.3
2 - Qbar	1.7	3.8
30	3.3	6.1
100	3.9	7.5

Table 5.3.2: Existing runoff rates and volumes - See Appendix E for MicroDrainage calculations.



## 6.0 Assessment Of Suds Hierarchy

A hierarchical approach has been undertaken in consideration of the application of SuDS in relation to the development. This is in order to meet the design philosophy of ensuring that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible and the existing situation is replicated as closely as possible.

The following drainage hierarchy has been undertaken with reference to the procedures set out in the SuDS Manual (CIRIA C753, 2015) to assess the viability of the application of SuDS techniques to this scheme:

#### 1. store rainwater for later use

- 2. use infiltration techniques, such as porous surfaces in non-clay areas
- 3. attenuate rainwater in ponds or open water features for gradual release
- 4. attenuate rainwater by storing in tanks or sealed water features for gradual release
- 5. discharge rainwater direct to a watercourse
- 6. discharge rainwater to a surface water sewer/drain
- 7. discharge rainwater to the combined sewer.

The sustainable drainage hierarchy shown above is intended to ensure that all practical and reasonable measures are taken to manage surface water higher up the hierarchy (1 being the highest) and that the amount of surface water managed at the bottom of the hierarchy is minimised.

Sustainable urban drainage systems have been considered for this development unless there are practical reasons for not doing so. Such reasons include the local ground conditions, rising groundwater, and risk from fluvial flooding.

## 6.1 Store rainwater for later use

Given the scale of the project and the extent of permeable landscaping provided combined with the rainwater attenuation we do not believe rainwater harvesting would be required or economically viable for this development. Provision for storing rainwater below ground for either irrigation of landscaping areas or internal re-use within the building has been discounted.

However, Water Butts should be installed for the irrigation of the garden area. As the water butts may be full at the time of an extreme storm event, any capacity within these cannot be used to offset the attenuation tank.

## 6.2 use infiltration techniques, such as porous surfaces in non-clay areas

Due to the layout of the site, there is insufficient area greater than 5m from proposed buildings, the existing buildings, retaining wall or roads. It would therefore not be possible to utilise an infiltration system within the requirements of Building Regulations Part H.

The anticipated clay strata is also unlikely to lend itself to an infiltration system.

As such this report finds item 2 of the drainage hierarchy unsuitable given the constraints of the development site.

## 6.3 Attenuate rainwater in ponds or open water features for gradual release

Due to the layout of the site, there is insufficient area within the site in which to site a suitably sized pond.



As such this report finds item 3 of the drainage hierarchy unsuitable given the constraints of the development site.

# 6.4 attenuate rainwater by storing in tanks or sealed water features for gradual release

It is proposed that the rain water be attenuated to a rate of 51/s within the tanked crates, for release into the existing Thames Water combined drainage system.

Unfortunately, the site has no water courses in the immediate vicinity. Meaning waters will need to be discharged at an attenuated rate to the local combined water drainage system. See 6.7 below and 8.4 later in the report for a discussion of this.

### 6.5 Discharge rainwater direct to a watercourse

There are no watercourses within the locality of the site. As such this report finds item 5 of the drainage hierarchy unsuitable given the constraints of the development site.

### 6.6 Discharge rainwater to a surface water/drain

There are no existing Thames Water surface water sewers in the vicinity of the development site, so this technique has been discounted.

### 6.7 Discharge rainwater to a combined water/drain

It is proposed that waters are discharged into the Combined Water Sewer serving the site at an attenuated rate of 51/s. The proposed rate is discussed further in section 8.3.



## 7.0 Assessment Of SuDS Measures

SuDS are drainage systems that aim to reduce the runoff rate by adopting techniques which replicate the natural drainage of the area. By temporarily storing stormwater on-site, they gain the advantage of a reduction in the runoff rates. In addition to this, SuDS provides further additional benefits to the environment and to the local environment, such as improvement to the biodiversity, water quality, health, and wellbeing. As well as reducing urban heat, air pollution, and CO2 levels.

SuDS have various components that can realise a reduction to the runoff rate and provide a sustainable solution to drainage. The following is a discussion of the typical SuDS components which can be installed in a residential development such as the one proposed:

## 7.1 Rainwater Harvesting

#### DESCRIPTION

Rainwater harvesting (RWH) is the collection of rainwater runoff for use. Runoff can be collected from roofs and other impermeable areas, stored, treated (where required) and then used as a supply of water for domestic, commercial, industrial and/or institutional properties. RWH systems have several key benefits:

- They can meet some of the buildings water demand, delivering sustainability and climate resilience benefits.
- They can help reduce the volume of runoff from a site.
- They can help reduce the volume of attenuation storage required on the site.

#### SUITABILITY

Given the scale of the project and the extent of permeable landscaping provided combined with the rainwater attenuation we do not believe rainwater harvesting would be required or economically viable for this development.

## 7.2 Green Roofs

#### DESCRIPTION

Green roofs are areas of living vegetation, installed on the top of buildings, for a range of reasons including visual benefit, ecological value, enhanced building performance and the reduction of surface water runoff.

#### SUITABILITY

The current roof design does not lend itself to a green roof.

### 7.3 Filter Strips

#### DESCRIPTION

Filter strips are vegetated strips of land designed to accept runoff as overland sheet flow from upstream development. They lie between a hard-surfaced area and a receiving stream, surface water collection, treatment or disposal system.

They treat runoff by vegetative filtering and promote settlement of particulate pollutants and infiltration.

#### SUITABILITY

Due to the layout of the site, there is insufficient area available for filter strips to be utilised properly.



## 7.4 Filter Drains

#### DESCRIPTION

Filter drains are shallow excavations filled with rubble or stone that create temporary subsurface storage for either infiltration or filtration of storm water runoff. Ideally, they should receive lateral inflow from an adjacent impermeable surface, but point source inflows may be acceptable. Infiltration filter drains allow water to exfiltrate into the surrounding soils from the bottom and sides of the trench. Filtration or filter trenches can be used to filter and convey storm water to downstream SuDS components.

#### SUITABILITY

Due to the layout of the site, there are insufficient areas greater than 5m from proposed buildings, the existing buildings, retaining wall or roads. We also anticipate poor soakage rates, based on the information from the BGS. It would therefore not be possible to utilise an infiltration system within the requirements of Building Regulations Part H.

### 7.5 Pervious Pavements

#### DESCRIPTION

Pervious pavements provide a pavement suitable for pedestrian and/or vehicular traffic while allowing rainwater to infiltrate through the surface and into the underlying layers. The water is temporarily stored before infiltration to the ground, reuse, or discharge to a watercourse or other drainage system. Pavements with aggregate sub-bases can provide good water quality treatment.

#### SUITABILITY

With the exception of areas above the proposed basement, permeable paving is to be used on the site. Please see appendix C for confirmation of the proposed areas

## 7.6 Swales

#### DESCRIPTION

Swales are shallow, flat-bottomed, vegetated open channels designed to convey, treat and often attenuate surface water runoff. When incorporated into site design, they can enhance the natural landscape and provide aesthetic and biodiversity benefits. They are often used to drain roads, paths or car parks, where it is convenience to collect distributed inflows or runoff, or as means of conveying runoff on the surface while enhancing access corridors or other open space. Swales can have a variety of profiles, can be uniform or non-uniform, and can incorporate a range of different planting strategies depending upon the site characteristics and system objectives.

#### SUITABILITY

Due to the layout of the site, there is insufficient area within the development site in which to locate any swales.

## 7.7 Geocellular/Modular Systems

#### DESCRIPTION

Modular plastic geocellular systems with a high void ratio, that can be used to create a below ground infiltration (soakaway) or storage structure or a tanked attenuation system with limited outflow.

#### SUITABILITY



Whilst geocellular systems cannot be used for infiltration, they can be used as an attenuation structure. These will need to be sized to ensure sufficient storage is provided for the proposed outflow rates.

### 7.8 Sand Filters

#### DESCRIPTION

Sand filters are single or multi-chambered structures designed to treat surface water runoff through filtration using a sand bed as the primary filter medium. The filters can be designed with an impervious lining, or to allow infiltration, depending on the soil type. Temporary storage of runoff is achieved through ponding above the filter layer. They are used where particularly high pollutant removal is required.

#### SUITABILITY

High levels of pollutants are not anticipated to come from the roof or paved elements of the works. This technique has therefore been discounted.

## 7.9 Infiltration Basins

#### DESCRIPTION

Infiltration basins are vegetated depressions designed to store runoff and infiltrate it gradually into the ground.

#### SUITABILITY

Due to the layout of the site, there is insufficient area within the site in which to site a suitably sized infiltration basin, there would also be concerns regarding the proximity of an infiltration feature to local structures, both on and off site.

## 7.10 Detention Basins

#### DESCRIPTION

Detention basins are landscaped depressions that are normally dry except during and immediately following storm events. They can be on-line components where surface runoff from regular events is routed through the basin and when the flows rise, because the outlet is restricted, the basin fills and provides storage of runoff and flow attenuation. They can also be off-line components into which runoff is diverted once flows reach a specified threshold.

Detention basins can be vegetated depressions (that can provide treatment when designed to manage regular flows) or hard landscaped storage areas (that will tend not to provide any treatment and are normally designed as off-line components).

Where the basin is vegetated, the soil surface can absorb some runoff, so can be used to support the prevention of runoff from the site for small rainfall events (interception), provided that small amounts of infiltration would not pose a risk to ground water. The principal water quality benefits of vegetated detention basins are associated with the removal of sediment and buoyant materials, but levels of nutrients, heavy metals, toxic materials and oxygen-demanding materials may also be significantly reduced. The water quality benefits of a vegetated detention basin increase as the detention time for an event becomes longer. Where designed appropriately, some or all the basin area can also be used as a recreational or other amenity facility.

#### SUITABILITY

Due to the layout of the site, there is insufficient area within the site in which to site a suitably sized detention basin.



## 7.11 Ponds

#### DESCRIPTION

Ponds can provide both stormwater attenuation and treatment. They are designed to support emergent and submerged aquatic vegetation along their shoreline. Runoff from each rain event is detained and treated in the pool. The retention time promotes pollutant removal through sedimentation and the opportunity for biological uptake mechanisms to reduce nutrient concentrations.

#### SUITABILITY

Due to the layout of the site, there is insufficient area within the site in which to site a suitably sized pond.

## 7.12 Stormwater Wetlands

#### DESCRIPTION

Wetlands provide both stormwater attenuation and treatment. They comprise shallow ponds and marshy areas, covered almost entirely in aquatic vegetation. Wetlands detain flows for an extended period to allow sediments to settle and to remove contaminants by facilitating adhesion to vegetation and aerobic decomposition. They also provide significant ecological benefits.

#### SUITABILITY

Due to the layout of the site, there is insufficient area within the site in which to site a suitably sized pond.

### 7.13 Perforated Ring Soakaways

#### DESCRIPTION

Perforated ring soakaways are circular manhole segment rings with perforations to allow surface water to be stored inside them and then dispersed into the surrounding ground strata.

#### SUITABILITY

Due to the layout of the site, there is insufficient area greater than 5m from proposed buildings, the existing buildings, retaining wall or roads. It would therefore not be possible to utilise an infiltration system within the requirements of Building Regulations Part H. It is also anticipated that soakage will be poor within the development site.

### 7.14 Bio-Retention Areas

#### DESCRIPTION

Rainwater gardens are usually above ground vegetated drainage features in which roof runoff can be drained into and infiltrated through a filter material contained within a retaining structure such as timber or concrete container. They are designed to allow infiltration. They promote the capture of suspended particulate load in roof runoff to settle out, thus providing effective pollutant removal.

#### SUITABILITY

High levels of pollutants are not anticipated to come from the roof or paving elements of the works. This technique has therefore been discounted.



## 8.0 Proposed Drainage Strategy

## 8.1 Drainage Strategy & Design

The information below is not intended to provide a definitive solution to the drainage associated with the development site but to outline the design intent and ensure that a suitable solution is feasible within the constraints of the development site and development proposals. Reference should be made to the strategic drainage arrangement drawing listed within Appendix C of this report.

## 8.2 Proposed Foul Water Strategy

Foul water flows generated from the new dwelling and studio are proposed to discharge in a Northerly direction and join the adopted combined water sewer within the Carol Street. As there is no connection from the existing site, a new connection will need to be made to the 1219x813 Combined Sewer beneath Carol Street.

Due to the depth of the basement, is unlikely that the flows from the studio will be able to gravitate to this sewer. These will need to be pumped up to the gravity system serving the ground floor and dwelling above. Providing additional protection, should the Thames Water system surcharge.

A Section 106 agreement will be required to allow connection of the on-site system to the Thames Water Sewer.

## 8.3 Proposed Surface Water Strategy

Surface water flows generated from the new dwelling and hardstanding are proposed to discharge in a Northerly direction and join the adopted combined water sewer within the Carol Street.

The London Borough of Camden Advice Note on contents of a Surface Water Drainage Statement requires that:

"Within Camden, SuDS systems must be designed in accordance with London Plan policy 5.13. This requires that developments should utilise sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) unless there are practical reasons for not doing so, and should aim to achieve **greenfield runoff rates** and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible"

The UK Sustainable Drainage Guidance and Tools produced by HR Wallingford recommend that where sites are small and limits of discharge are less than 5l/s there is a risk of throttle blockage. In this situation a minimum of 5l/s or the calculated values of Q1, Q30 or Q100 is allowed, whichever is the greater. Given the constraints of flow control valves, this report considers a proposed flow rate of 5.0 l/s for the development site, with sufficient on-site storage to accommodate the flows associated with a 1 in 100-year storm event with an additional allowance of 40% for climate change. It is therefore proposed to utilise a flow control device such as an 62mm orifice plate, set to 5.0 l/s and tanked storage crates to attenuate flows within the development site. The MicroDrainage results for these calculations can be found at the rear of this document, Appendix E.



## 9.0 Conclusion

The Environment Agency requires that for all sites, the following surface water principles have been followed. Based on the strategy within this report, all of the following have been met.

- That surface water runoff from the development will not increase flood risk to the development or third parties.
- That an allowance for climate change has been incorporated, which means adding an extra amount to peak rainfall, which relates to the lifetime of the development.
- That the residual risk of flooding has been addressed should failure or exceedance of the drainage system occur.

Furthermore, the development itself has achieved:

• Construction techniques that will help mitigate against flood risk.

The development site lies within land classified as Flood Zone 1, which is considered at a low risk of flooding. The concern is, therefore, the flood risk that the new development may have off-site. As the flows from site are reduced to the minimum achievable under HR Wallingford guidance, with permeable paving use to reflect the current situation wherever possible; it is the view of this report that the site addresses all requirements of SuDS systems noted in Ciria C753 and the SFRA for the Camden area.



## References & Bibliography

- The National Planning Policy Framework March 2012
- Planning Practice Guidance.
- Code for Sustainable Homes Department of Communities and Local Government. Revised February 2008.
- Environment Agency Rainfall-Runoff Management for Developments
- Environment Agency indicative flood maps http://maps.environment- agency gov.uk
- Environment Agency indicative groundwater source protection zone maps http://maps.environment- agency gov.uk
- Environment Agency indicative Aquifer designation maps http://maps.environmentagency gov.uk
- CIRIA 2007, The Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) Manual C697
- CIRIA 2015, The Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) Manual C753
- Sewers for Adoption 6<sup>th</sup> Edition and interim guidance prior to the introduction of sewers for adoption 7<sup>th</sup> edition WRC
- Flood Warning information https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/
- Environment Agency Adapting to Climate Change: Advice for the Flood and Coastal Erosion Management Authorities March 2016
- Flood Risk Assessments: Climate Change Allowances https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances
- Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances Environment Agency Updated 12 April 2016.
- Environment Agency updated flood maps for surface water (ufmfsw), <u>http://watermaps.environment-</u> agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiyby.aspx?topic=ufmfsw#x=357683&y=355134&scale=2
- <u>http://camden.gov.uk</u> Camden Development Policy 23
- <u>http://camden.gov.uk</u> Camden SFRA
- <u>http://camden.gov.uk</u> Camden Planning Guidance 3 (CPG3)



## Appendix A – Site Topographic Survey





## Appendix B – Master Plans and Floor Plans

S NO NO S

0

0

0

МН

S/P





## Appendix C – Drainage Strategy





## Appendix D – Sewer Records



Based on the Ordnance Survey Map with the Sanction of the controller of H.M. Stationery Office, License no. 100019345 Crown Copyright Reserved.

Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Property Searches, PO Box 3189, Slough SL1 4W, DX 151280 Slough 13 T 0845 070 9148 E searches@thameswater.co.uk I www.thameswater-propertysearches.co.uk

Manhole Reference	Manhole Cover Level	Manhole Invert Level
08GE	n/a	n/a
0801	n/a	n/a
0901	n/a	n/a
0804	27.71	25.24
0702	27.97	23.66
0703	27.59	23.06
0805	26.34	24.87
08EJ	n/a	n/a
08EH	n/a	n/a
08EI	n/a	n/a
1806	26.3	21.78
1904	n/a	n/a
18CI	n/a	n/a
18DA	n/a	n/a
18CJ	n/a	n/a
1804	27.28	22.18
19GE	n/a	n/a
1805	26.63	n/a
19GF	n/a	n/a
19FC	n/a	n/a
1703	27.45	22.73
19FE	n/a	n/a
1802	26.8	21.57
07CD	n/a	n/a
9802	26.55	23.53
08GF	n/a	n/a
08GH	n/a	n/a
08GI	n/a	n/a
08GJ	n/a	n/a
99AB	n/a	n/a
The position of the apparatus shown on this plan i	s given without obligation and warranty, and the acc	uracy cannot be guaranteed. Service pipes are not

NB. Levels quoted in metres Ordnance Newlyn Datum. The value -9999.00 indicates that no survey information is available

shown but their presence should be anticipated. No liability of any kind whatsoever is accepted by Thames Water for any error or omission. The actual position of mains and services must be verified and established on site before any works are undertaken.





#### **Sewer Fittings**

A feature in a sewer that does not affect the flow in the pipe. Example: a vent is a fitting as the function of a vent is to release excess gas.

- Air Valve Dam Chase
- Fitting Σ Meter

0 Vent Column

#### **Operational Controls**

A feature in a sewer that changes or diverts the flow in the sewer. Example: A hydrobrake limits the flow passing downstream.

Control Valve Drop Pipe

Ancillary Weir

Outfall

Inlet

Undefined End

member of Property Insight on 0845 070 9148.

#### End Items

X

4

End symbols appear at the start or end of a sewer pipe. Examples: an Undefined End at the start of a sewer indicates that Thames Water has no knowledge of the position of the sewer upstream of that symbol, Outfall on a surface water sewer indicates that the pipe discharges into a stream or river.

6) The text appearing alongside a sewer line indicates the internal diameter of the pipe in milimetres. Text next to a manhole indicates the manhole

reference number and should not be taken as a measurement. If you are

unsure about any text or symbology present on the plan, please contact a

#### Other Symbols

Symbols used on maps which do not fall under other general categories

- 🔺 / 🔺 Public/Private Pumping Station
- \* Change of characteristic indicator (C.O.C.I.)
- Ø Invert Level
- <1Summit

#### Areas

Lines denoting areas of underground surveys, etc.



#### Other Sewer Types (Not Operated or Maintained by Thames Water)



#### Notes:

1) All levels associated with the plans are to Ordnance Datum Newlyn.

2) All measurements on the plans are metric.

3) Arrows (on gravity fed sewers) or flecks (on rising mains) indicate direction of flow

4) Most private pipes are not shown on our plans, as in the past, this information has not been recorded.

5) 'na' or '0' on a manhole level indicates that data is unavailable.

Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Property Searches, PO Box 3189, Slough SL1 4W, DX 151280 Slough 13 T 0845 070 9148 E searches@thameswater.co.uk I www.thameswater-propertysearches.co.uk



## Appendix E – Micro Drainage Calculations

Infrastruct CS Ltd							Page 1
The Stables	The Stables						
High Cogges, Witney			arol Stre	et			4
Ovfordshiro			aror 0010	00			1 m
							– Micro
Date 1//0//201/		טן	esigned b	Y RJW			Drainago
File 1909-SW STORAGE	.SRCX	C	hecked by				Diamage
Micro Drainage		S	ource Con	trol 2016	.1		-
Summary of	of Resul	ts for	<u>100 year</u>	Return B	Period	(+40응)	_
	Ha	lf Drai	n Time : 6	minutes.			
Storm	Max I	Max	Max	Max Control N	Max	Max	Status
Event	(m)	eptn in (m)	(1/a)	(1/a)	(1/c)	(m <sup>3</sup> )	
	(111)	(111)	(1/5)	(1/5)	(1/5)	(	
15 min Summer	25.062 0	.362	0.0	4.6	4.6	2.6	O K
30 min Summer	25.076 0	.376	0.0	4.7	4.7	2.7	O K
60 min Summer	25.023 0	.323	0.0	4.3	4.3	2.3	O K
120 min Summer	24.930 0	.230	0.0	3.6	3.6	1.6	O K
180 min Summer	24.871 0	.171	0.0	3.0	3.0	1.2	O K
240 min Summer	24.834 0	.134	0.0	2.6	2.6	1.0	O K
360 min Summer	24.795 0	.095	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.7	ОК
480 min Summer	24.780 0	.080	0.0	1.7	1.7	0.6	ОК
600 min Summer	24.771 0	.071	0.0	1.4	1.4	0.5	ОК
720 min Summer	24.765 0	.065	0.0	1.2	1.2	0.5	ОК
960 min Summer	24.756 0	.056	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.4	0 K
1440 min Summer	24.746 0	.046	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.3	0 K
2160 min Summer	24.736 0	.036	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.3	0 K
2880 min Summer	24 733 0	033	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.2	0 K
4320 min Summer	24 728 0	028	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.2	0 K
5760 min Summer	24 725 0	025	0.0	0.9	0.5	0.2	0 K
7200 min Summer	24.723 0	020	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	O K
8640 min Summer	24 721 0	021	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0 K
10080 min Summer	24.721 0	020	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.1	O K
15 min Winter	25 109 0	409	0.0	4 9	4 9	2 9	O K
15 mill wincer	20.109 0	. 105	0.0	1.9	1.5	2.9	0 10
	Storm	Rai	in Flooded	l Discharge	Time-Pe	ak	
	Event	(mm/	hr) Volume	Volume	(mins)	)	
			(m³)	(m³)			
1 5	min Cumm	ar 150	774 0.0	5 1		16	
10	min Summ	r $a7$	235 0.0	. J.I I 6.6		±∪ 23	
50	min Summ	51 9/.	200 U.U			2.J 1.0	
100	min Summe	JJ.		0.0		70	
120	min Summe	=1 33. or 05	200 U.U	y.5	1	00	
180	min Summe	z = 20	310 0.0	11 0	1	30	
240	min Summe	=1 ZU.	C20 0.0	11.0	1	JU 00	
360	min Summe	=1 14.	502 U.U	10 5	1	00	
480	min Summe	=1 11.	J92 U.U	12.5	2	- U 0 0	
600	min Summe	er 9.		13.0	3	00	
720	min Summe	er 8.	530 0.0	13.5	3	80	
960	min Summe	er 6.	JUSJ U.U	14.2	4	9U 20	
1440	min Summe	er 4.	ν±α U.U	15.3	./	32 76	
2160	min Summe	er 3.	3/6 0.0	16.4	10	16	
2880	min Summe	er 2.	юб <u>т</u> 0.0	17.2	14	68	
4320	min Summe	er 1.	900 0.0	18.5	21	96	
5760	min Summe	er 1.	495 0.0	19.4	29	36 70	
/200	min Summe	er 1.	241 0.0	20.1	36	12	
8640	min Summe	εr Ι.	0.0	20.7	43	12	
10080	min Summe	er U.	930 U.U	21.2	50	00 1.C	
15	min Winte	er 120.	//4 0.0	5./		тρ	

©1982-2016 XP Solutions

Infrastruct CS Ltd							Page 2
The Stables		Prop	osed S	ite			
High Cogges, Witnev		Carc	ol Stre	et			<u> </u>
Oxfordshire				-			1 mm
				D T-7			- Micro
Date 1//0//201/		Desi	.gnea b	Y KJW			Drainage
File 1909-SW STORAGE	.SRCX	Chec	ked by				
Micro Drainage		Sour	ce Con	trol 201	6.1		
Summary	of Results	for 10	)0 year	<u>Return</u>	Period	(+40%)	
_			_				
Storm	Max Max	c M	lax	Max	Max	Max	Status
Event	Level Dept	h Infil	tration	Control $\Sigma$	Outflow	Volume	
	(m) (m)	(1	/s)	(1/s)	(l/s)	(m³)	
20 min Minton	05 100 0 40		0.0	4 0	4 0	2 0	0.14
30 min Winter	25.109 0.40	20	0.0	4.9	4.9	2.9	OK
120 min Winter	24 894 0 10	.0 A.4	0.0	4.5	4.5	2.3	0 K 0 K
180 min Winter	24.832 0.13	32	0.0	2.5	2.5	0.9	0 K
240 min Winter	24.799 0.09	9	0.0	2.1	2.1	0.7	ΟK
360 min Winter	24.776 0.07	6	0.0	1.5	1.5	0.5	0 K
480 min Winter	24.765 0.06	55	0.0	1.2	1.2	0.5	0 K
600 min Winter	24.758 0.05	58	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.4	O K
720 min Winter	24.753 0.05	53	0.0	0.9	0.9	0.4	ОК
960 min Winter	24.746 0.04	16	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.3	ОК
1440 min Winter	24.737 0.03	5 / > 1	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.3	OK
2880 min Winter	24.731 0.03	) Q	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.2	0 K 0 K
4320 min Winter	24.724 0.02	24	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0 K
5760 min Winter	24.721 0.02	21	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.1	ОК
7200 min Winter	24.719 0.01	.9	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	O K
8640 min Winter	24.718 0.01	.8	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	O K
10080 min Winter	24.716 0.01	. 6	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0 K
	Storm	Rain	Flooded	1 Discharge	e Time-Pe	ak `	
	Event	(mm/nr)	volume	volume	(mins	)	
			(m-)	(m-)			
30	min Winter	97.235	0.0	7.3	3	24	
60	min Winter	59.609	0.0	) 9.0	0	40	
120	min Winter	35.288	0.0	10.	7	70	
180	min Winter	25.632	0.0	) 11.	6 1	.00	
240	min Winter	20.319	0.0	12.	3 1	_30	
360	min Winter	11 500	0.0	J 13.	5 1 0 1	-00 246	
480	min Winter	9 667	0.0		6 3	240	
720	min Winter	8.330	0.0	) 1.5	1 3	368	
960	min Winter	6.583	0.0	) 15.	94	192	
1440	min Winter	4.718	0.0	) 17.	1 7	26	
2160	min Winter	3.376	0.0	18.	4 10	68	
2880	min Winter	2.661	0.0	19.	3 14	156	
4320	min Winter	1.900	0.0	20.	7 21	.80	
5760	min Winter	1.495	0.0	21.	7 28	340	
7200	min Winter	1.241	0.0	22.	5 36 2 Ar	000 252	
10000	min Winter	U 036 T.002		J 23.	∠ 43 8 50	)22 )80	
10080	min willer	0.930	0.0	23.1	5 50	,00	

©1982-2016 XP Solutions

Infrastruct CS Ltd			
The Stables	Proposed Site		
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u>Y</u>	
Oxfordshire		Micro	
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW		
File 1909-SW STORAGE.SRCX	Checked by	Diginarie	
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	1	

#### <u>Rainfall Details</u>

Rainfall Model			FSR	Winter Storms Yes
Return	Period (years)		100	Cv (Summer) 0.750
	Region	England	and Wales	Cv (Winter) 0.840
	M5-60 (mm)		21.000	Shortest Storm (mins) 15
	Ratio R		0.441	Longest Storm (mins) 10080
	Summer Storms		Yes	Climate Change % +40

#### <u>Time Area Diagram</u>

Total Area (ha) 0.018

Time	(mins)	Area	Time	(mins)	Area	
From:	To:	(ha)	From:	To:	(ha)	
0	4	0.010	4	8	0.008	

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 4
The Stables	Proposed Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW STORAGE.SRCX	Checked by	Digitigh
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	1

#### Model Details

Storage is Online Cover Level (m) 25.900

#### Cellular Storage Structure

Invert Level (m) 24.700 Safety Factor 2.0 Infiltration Coefficient Base (m/hr) 0.00000 Porosity 0.95 Infiltration Coefficient Side (m/hr) 0.00000

#### Depth (m) Area (m<sup>2</sup>) Inf. Area (m<sup>2</sup>) Depth (m) Area (m<sup>2</sup>) Inf. Area (m<sup>2</sup>)

0.000	7.5	7.5	0.500	0.0	12.7
0.400	7.5	12.7			

Orifice Outflow Control

Diameter (m) 0.062 Discharge Coefficient 0.600 Invert Level (m) 24.700

Infrastruct CS Ltd									
The Stables									
High Cogges, Witney	4								
Oxfordshire	1 mm								
$D_{2} = 17/07/2017$	- Micro								
	Drainage								
FILE 1909-SW STORAGE.SRCX	Brainage								
Micro Drainage									
Summary of Resul	ts for 100	year Retui	<u>rn Period</u>						
Half D	rain Timo · 6	minutos							
	tatii iime . (	minuces.							
Storm Max Max	Max	Max	Max Max	Status					
Event Level Depth	Infiltration	Control E	Outflow Volum	ne					
(m) (m)	(1/s)	(1/s)	(l/s) (m <sup>3</sup> )	)					
15 min Summer 24 941 0 241	0 0	37	37 1	7 ОК					
30 min Summer 24.949 0.249	0.0	3.7	3.7 1	.8 OK					
60 min Summer 24.911 0.211	0.0	3.4	3.4 1	.5 O K					
120 min Summer 24.847 0.147	0.0	2.7	2.7 1	.1 OK					
180 min Summer 24.811 0.111	0.0	2.3	2.3 0.	.8 OK					
240 min Summer 24.790 0.090	0.0	2.0	2.0 0.	.6 OK					
360 min Summer 24.773 0.073	0.0	1.5	1.5 0.	.5 ОК					
480 min Summer 24.764 0.064	0.0	1.2	1.2 0.	.5 O K					
600 min Summer 24.757 0.057	0.0	1.0	1.0 0.	.4 ОК					
720 min Summer 24.753 0.053	0.0	0.9	0.9 0.	.4 ОК					
960 min Summer 24.745 0.045	0.0	0.7	0.7 0.	.3 ОК					
1440 min Summer 24.736 0.036	0.0	0.5	0.5 0.	.3 ОК					
2160 min Summer 24.731 0.031	0.0	0.4	0.4 0.	.2 ОК					
2880 min Summer 24.728 0.028	0.0	0.3	0.3 0.	.2 O K					
4320 min Summer 24.723 0.023	0.0	0.2	0.2 0.	.2 ОК					
5760 min Summer 24.721 0.021	0.0	0.2	0.2 0.	.1 ОК					
7200 min Summer 24.719 0.019	0.0	0.1	0.1 0.	.1 ОК					
8640 min Summer 24.717 0.017	0.0	0.1	0.1 0.	.1 ОК					
10080 min Summer 24.716 0.016	0.0	0.1	0.1 0.	.1 ОК					
15 min Winter 24.970 0.270	0.0	3.9	3.9 1.	.9 ОК					
Storm	Rain Floode	d Discharge	Time-Peak						
Event (1	mm/hr) Volum	e Volume	(mins)						
	(m³)	(m³)							
15 min Summer 1	07.695 0.	0 3.6	15						
30 min Summer	69.453 0.	0 4.7	23						
60 min Summer	42.578 0.	0 5.7	38						
120 min Summer	25.206 0.	0 6.8	68						
180 min Summer	18.309 0.	0 7.4	98						
240 min Summer	14.513 0.	0 7.8	128						
360 min Summer	10.456 0.	0 8.5	188						
480 min Summer	8.280 0.	0 8.9	246						
600 min Summer	6.905 0.	0 9.3	308						
720 min Summer	5.950 0.	0 9.6	368						
960 min Summer	4.702 0.	0 10.2	490						

960	min	Summer	4.702		0.0		10.2	490		
1440	min	Summer	3.370		0.0		10.9	720		
2160	min	Summer	2.412		0.0		11.7	1084		
2880	min	Summer	1.901		0.0		12.3	1464		
4320	min	Summer	1.357		0.0		13.2	2172		
5760	min	Summer	1.068		0.0		13.8	2864		
7200	min	Summer	0.886		0.0		14.4	3648		
8640	min	Summer	0.761		0.0		14.8	4400		
10080	min	Summer	0.669		0.0		15.2	5048		
15	min	Winter	107.695		0.0		4.1	16		
		©198	82-2016	ХР	Solu	utior	ns			

Infrastruct CS Ltd					
The Stables	Proposed Site				
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>			
Oxfordshire		Micco			
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW				
File 1909-SW STORAGE.SRCX	Checked by	Digitigh			
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1				

#### Summary of Results for 100 year Return Period

	Storr Event	n t	Max Level (m)	Max Depth (m)	Max Infiltration (1/s)	Max Control (l/s)	Max Σ Outflow (l/s)	Max Volume (m³)	Status
30	min	Winter	24.965	0.265	0.0	3.9	3.9	1.9	ОК
60	min	Winter	24.902	0.202	0.0	3.3	3.3	1.4	ОК
120	min	Winter	24.822	0.122	0.0	2.4	2.4	0.9	ΟK
180	min	Winter	24.787	0.087	0.0	1.9	1.9	0.6	ОК
240	min	Winter	24.775	0.075	0.0	1.5	1.5	0.5	ОК
360	min	Winter	24.761	0.061	0.0	1.1	1.1	0.4	ОК
480	min	Winter	24.753	0.053	0.0	0.9	0.9	0.4	ОК
600	min	Winter	24.747	0.047	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.3	ОК
720	min	Winter	24.743	0.043	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.3	ОК
960	min	Winter	24.736	0.036	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.3	ΟK
1440	min	Winter	24.731	0.031	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.2	ΟK
2160	min	Winter	24.727	0.027	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.2	ОК
2880	min	Winter	24.724	0.024	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	ОК
4320	min	Winter	24.720	0.020	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	ΟK
5760	min	Winter	24.718	0.018	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	ΟK
7200	min	Winter	24.716	0.016	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	ОК
8640	min	Winter	24.715	0.015	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	ОК
10080	min	Winter	24.714	0.014	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	ОК

Storm		m Rain		Flooded	Discharge	Time-Peak		
	Event			Volume	Volume	(mins)		
				(m³)	(m³)			
30	min	Winter	69.453	0.0	5.2	24		
60	min	Winter	42.578	0.0	6.4	40		
120	min	Winter	25.206	0.0	7.6	70		
180	min	Winter	18.309	0.0	8.3	98		
240	min	Winter	14.513	0.0	8.8	128		
360	min	Winter	10.456	0.0	9.5	186		
480	min	Winter	8.280	0.0	10.0	250		
600	min	Winter	6.905	0.0	10.4	310		
720	min	Winter	5.950	0.0	10.8	370		
960	min	Winter	4.702	0.0	11.4	492		
1440	min	Winter	3.370	0.0	12.2	722		
2160	min	Winter	2.412	0.0	13.1	1072		
2880	min	Winter	1.901	0.0	13.8	1468		
4320	min	Winter	1.357	0.0	14.8	2128		
5760	min	Winter	1.068	0.0	15.5	2920		
7200	min	Winter	0.886	0.0	16.1	3632		
8640	min	Winter	0.761	0.0	16.6	4376		
10080	min	Winter	0.669	0.0	17.0	5080		

©1982-2016 XP Solutions
Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 3
The Stables	Proposed Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW STORAGE.SRCX	Checked by	Diamaye
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	•

	Rainfall Model		FSR	Winter Storms Yes
Return	Period (years)		100	Cv (Summer) 0.750
	Region	England	and Wales	Cv (Winter) 0.840
	M5-60 (mm)		21.000	Shortest Storm (mins) 15
	Ratio R		0.441	Longest Storm (mins) 10080
	Summer Storms		Yes	Climate Change % +0

## <u>Time Area Diagram</u>

Total Area (ha) 0.018

Time	(mins)	Area	Time	(mins)	Area	
From:	To:	(ha)	From:	To:	(ha)	
0	4	0.010	4	8	0.008	

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 4
The Stables	Proposed Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW STORAGE.SRCX	Checked by	Digitigh
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	1

Storage is Online Cover Level (m) 25.900

#### Cellular Storage Structure

Invert Level (m) 24.700 Safety Factor 2.0 Infiltration Coefficient Base (m/hr) 0.00000 Porosity 0.95 Infiltration Coefficient Side (m/hr) 0.00000

#### Depth (m) Area (m<sup>2</sup>) Inf. Area (m<sup>2</sup>) Depth (m) Area (m<sup>2</sup>) Inf. Area (m<sup>2</sup>)

0.000	7.5	7.5	0.500	0.0	12.7
0.400	7.5	12.7			

Orifice Outflow Control

Diameter (m) 0.062 Discharge Coefficient 0.600 Invert Level (m) 24.700

Infrastruct CS Ltd						Page 1
The Stables	Prop	osed S	ite			
High Cogges, Witney	Carc	l Stre	et			4
Oxfordshire						Misso
Date 17/07/2017	Desi	gned b	y RJW			
File 1909-SW STORAGE.SRCX	Chec	ked by	-			Urainage
Micro Drainage	Sour	ce Con	trol 2016	5.1		
Summary of Re	sults fo	or 30 y	ear Retu	rn Perioc	1	
		-				
Hal	f Drain T	ime : 5	minutes.			
Storm Max M	ax M	lax	Max	Max	Max	Status
Event Level Dep	pth Infil	tration	Control <b>D</b>	Outflow Vo	olume	
(m) (i	m) (1	./s)	(1/s)	(1/s)	(m³)	
15 min Summer 24.876 0.	176	0.0	3.1	3.1	1.3	ОК
30 min Summer 24.879 0.	179	0.0	3.1	3.1	1.3	O K
60 min Summer 24.851 0.	151	0.0	2.8	2.8	1.1	0 K
120 min Summer 24.807 0.	107	0.0	2.2	2.2	0.8	0 K
180 min Summer 24.785 0.	085	0.0	1.8	1.8	0.6	OK
240 min Summer 24.774 0. 360 min Summer 24.762 0	0/4 062	0.0	1.5	1.5	0.5	OK
480 min Summer 24.754 0.	054	0.0	0.9	0.9	0.4	O K
600 min Summer 24.749 0.	049	0.0	0.8	0.8	0.4	0 K
720 min Summer 24.745 0.	045	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.3	0 K
960 min Summer 24.738 0.	038	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.3	O K
1440 min Summer 24.732 0.	032	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.2	ОК
2160 min Summer 24.728 0.	028	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.2	ОК
2880 min Summer 24.725 0.	025	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	OK
5760 min Summer 24,719 0.	021	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1	0 K
7200 min Summer 24.717 0.	017	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0 K
8640 min Summer 24.716 0.	016	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0 K
10080 min Summer 24.715 0.	015	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	ОК
15 min Winter 24.897 0.	197	0.0	3.3	3.3	1.4	O K
Storm	Rain	Flooded	Discharge	Time-Peal	c	
Event	(mm/hr)	Volume	Volume	(mins)		
		(m³)	(m³)			
15 min Summe:	r 82.739	0.0	2.8	15	5	
30 min Summe:	r 52.969	0.0	3.6	5 23	3	
60 min Summe:	r 32.372	0.0	4.4	38	3	
120 min Summe:	r 19.195	0.0	5.2	68	3	
180 min Summe: 240 min Summe:	r 13.994 r 11 137	0.0	5.7	96 129	2	
360 min Summe	r 8.066	0.0	6.5	, 120 5 188	3	
480 min Summe:	r 6.410	0.0	6.9	248	3	
600 min Summe:	r 5.361	0.0	7.2	308	3	
720 min Summe:	r 4.631	0.0	7.5	368	3	
960 min Summe:	r 3.674	0.0	7.9	488	3	
1440 min Summe:	r 2.649	0.0	8.6	2 734	± >	
2100 IIIII SUMME	r 1.508	0.0	9.3 Q R	ο 1092 3 1ΔΛ/	1	
4320 min Summer	r 1.087	0.0	10.6	2148	- 3	
5760 min Summe:	r 0.859	0.0	11.1	2864	1	
7200 min Summe:	r 0.716	0.0	11.6	3592	2	
9610 min Cummo	∽ 0 €17	0 0	10 0	1201	>	

8640 min Summer 0.617

15 min Winter 82.739

10080 min Summer 0.544

0.0

0.0

0.0

©1982-2016 XP Solutions

12.0

12.3

3.1

4392

5032

15

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 2
The Stables	Proposed Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW STORAGE.SRCX	Checked by	Digiliada
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	

	Summa	ary of	Resul	ts for 30 y	vear Ret	urn Peri	<u>od</u>	
	Storm Event	Max Level (m)	Max Depth (m)	Max Infiltration (l/s)	Max Control 2 (l/s)	Max E Outflow (l/s)	Max Volume (m³)	Status
30	min Winter	24.890	0.190	0.0	3.2	3.2	1.4	ΟK
60	min Winter	24.842	0.142	0.0	2.7	2.7	1.0	O K
120	min Winter	24.789	0.089	0.0	1.9	1.9	0.6	ΟK
180	min Winter	24.773	0.073	0.0	1.5	1.5	0.5	ΟK
240	min Winter	24.763	0.063	0.0	1.2	1.2	0.4	ΟK
360	min Winter	24.752	0.052	0.0	0.9	0.9	0.4	ΟK
480	min Winter	24.745	0.045	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.3	ΟK
600	min Winter	24.740	0.040	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.3	ΟK
720	min Winter	24.736	0.036	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.3	ΟK
960	min Winter	24.732	0.032	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.2	ΟK
1440	min Winter	24.728	0.028	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.2	ΟK
2160	min Winter	24.724	0.024	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	ΟK
2880	min Winter	24.721	0.021	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.1	ΟK
4320	min Winter	24.718	0.018	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	ΟK
5760	min Winter	24.716	0.016	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	ΟK
7200	min Winter	24.714	0.014	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	O K
8640	min Winter	24.713	0.013	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	ОК
10080	min Winter	24.713	0.013	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	O K

ummary	of	Results	for	30	year	Return	Period

	Stor Even	m t	Rain (mm/hr)	Flooded Volume (m³)	Discharge Volume (m³)	Time-Peak (mins)
30	min	Winter	52.969	0.0	4.0	23
60	min	Winter	32.372	0.0	4.9	38
120	min	Winter	19.195	0.0	5.8	68
180	min	Winter	13.994	0.0	6.3	98
240	min	Winter	11.137	0.0	6.7	128
360	min	Winter	8.066	0.0	7.3	186
480	min	Winter	6.410	0.0	7.8	248
600	min	Winter	5.361	0.0	8.1	314
720	min	Winter	4.631	0.0	8.4	366
960	min	Winter	3.674	0.0	8.9	494
1440	min	Winter	2.649	0.0	9.6	734
2160	min	Winter	1.908	0.0	10.4	1100
2880	min	Winter	1.511	0.0	11.0	1416
4320	min	Winter	1.087	0.0	11.8	2148
5760	min	Winter	0.859	0.0	12.5	2880
7200	min	Winter	0.716	0.0	13.0	3592
8640	min	Winter	0.617	0.0	13.4	4360
10080	min	Winter	0.544	0.0	13.8	5040

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 3
The Stables	Proposed Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	4
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW STORAGE.SRCX	Checked by	Dialinatie
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	

	Rainfall Model		FSR	Winter Storms Yes
Return	Period (years)		30	Cv (Summer) 0.750
	Region	England	and Wales	Cv (Winter) 0.840
	M5-60 (mm)		21.000	Shortest Storm (mins) 15
	Ratio R		0.441	Longest Storm (mins) 10080
	Summer Storms		Yes	Climate Change % +0

## <u>Time Area Diagram</u>

Total Area (ha) 0.018

Time	(mins)	Area	Time	(mins)	Area	
From:	To:	(ha)	From:	To:	(ha)	
0	4	0.010	4	8	0.008	

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 4
The Stables	Proposed Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW STORAGE.SRCX	Checked by	Digitigh
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	1

Storage is Online Cover Level (m) 25.900

#### Cellular Storage Structure

Invert Level (m) 24.700 Safety Factor 2.0 Infiltration Coefficient Base (m/hr) 0.00000 Porosity 0.95 Infiltration Coefficient Side (m/hr) 0.00000

#### Depth (m) Area (m<sup>2</sup>) Inf. Area (m<sup>2</sup>) Depth (m) Area (m<sup>2</sup>) Inf. Area (m<sup>2</sup>)

0.000	7.5	7.5	0.500	0.0	12.7
0.400	7.5	12.7			

Orifice Outflow Control

Diameter (m) 0.062 Discharge Coefficient 0.600 Invert Level (m) 24.700

Infrastruct CS Ltd							Page 1
The Stables		Propo	sed S	ite			
High Cogges, Witney		Caro	Stre	≏t			4
Oxfordshire	1 mm						
$D_{2}$ = 17/07/2017		Dogi	mod by				– Micro
Date 17/07/2017	apav	Desig	jnea b	Y RUW			Drainage
File 1909-SW STORAGE	.SRCX	Check	ked by				brainage
Micro Drainage		Sourc	ce Con	trol 2016	.1		
Summ	<u>ary of Resul</u>	<u>lts ic</u>	<u>or l y</u> e	<u>ear Retur</u>	n Perio	<u>d</u>	
	Half Dr	ain Ti	me · 6	minutes			
	nurr br	uin ii	. 0	milliuces.			
Storm	Max Max	Ma	x	Max	Max	Max	Status
Event	Level Depth	Infilt	ration	Control $\Sigma$	Outflow V	Volume	
	(m) (m)	(1/	s)	(1/s)	(1/s)	(m³)	
15 min Summer	24.773 0.073		0.0	1.5	1.5	0.5	ОК
30 min Summer	24.774 0.074		0.0	1.5	1.5	0.5	O K
60 min Summer	24.768 0.068		0.0	1.3	1.3	0.5	O K
120 min Summer	24.757 0.057		0.0	1.0	1.0	0.4	O K
180 min Summer	24.749 0.049		0.0	0.8	0.8	0.4	O K
240 min Summer	24.744 0.044		0.0	0.7	0.7	0.3	O K
360 min Summer	24.737 0.037		0.0	0.5	0.5	0.3	O K
480 min Summer	24.734 0.034		0.0	0.4	0.4	0.2	ОК
600 min Summer	24.731 0.031		0.0	0.4	0.4	0.2	O K
720 min Summer	24.730 0.030		0.0	0.3	0.3	0.2	O K
960 min Summer	24.726 0.026		0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	O K
1440 min Summer	24.723 0.023		0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	O K
2160 min Summer	24.720 0.020		0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	O K
2880 min Summer	24.717 0.017		0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	O K
4320 min Summer	24.715 0.015		0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	O K
5760 min Summer	24.713 0.013		0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	O K
7200 min Summer	24.712 0.012		0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	O K
8640 min Summer	24.711 0.011		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	O K
10080 min Summer	24.711 0.011		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	O K
15 min Winter	24.778 0.078		0.0	1.6	1.6	0.6	OK
	Storm H	Rain	Flooded	Discharge	Time-Pea	ak	
	Event (m	m/hr)	Volume	Volume	(mins)		
			(m³)	(m³)			
1 5	min Summor ?	3 693	0 0	1 1	-	15	
10	min Summer ?	1 722	0.0	1 5	-	- J 22	
60	min Summer 1	3.524	0.0	1 8	2	36	
120	min Summer	8.238	0.0	2.0		68	
180	min Summer	6.132	0.0	2.2		98	
240	min Summer	4.966	0.0	2.3	1:	28	
360	min Summer	3.663	0.0	3.0	18	88	
480	min Summer	2.946	0.0	3.2	2.4	48	
600	min Summer	2.487	0.0	3.4		08	
720	min Summer	2.166	0.0	3.5	36	66	
960	min Summer	1.742	0.0	3.8	49	92	
1.1.10					-	~ ~	

1440 min Summer

2160 min Summer

2880 min Summer

4320 min Summer

5760 min Summer

7200 min Summer

8640 min Summer

15 min Winter

10080 min Summer

0.0

0.0

0.0

0.0

0.0

0.0

0.0

0.0

0.0

©1982-2016 XP Solutions

4.1

4.6

4.9

5.8

6.1

6.4

6.6

1.3

5.4

732

1092

1464

2148

2848

3640

4360

5104

15

1.281

0.942

0.758

0.557

0.448

0.378

0.329

0.293

33.683

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 2
The Stables	Proposed Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW STORAGE.SRCX	Checked by	Digitigh
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	

	<u>Sumr</u>	<u>nary of</u>	Resu	<u>lts for l y</u>	<u>ear Ret</u> i	<u>urn Peri</u>	<u>5d</u>	
	Storm	Max	Max	Max	Max	Max	Max	Status
	Event	Level	Depth	Infiltration	Control	Σ Outflow	Volume	
		(m)	(m)	(1/s)	(1/s)	(1/s)	(m³)	
30	min Winter	24.777	0.077	0.0	1.6	1.6	0.5	ОК
60	min Winter	24.765	0.065	0.0	1.2	1.2	0.5	ΟK
120	min Winter	24.751	0.051	0.0	0.8	0.8	0.4	ΟK
180	min Winter	24.742	0.042	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.3	ΟK
240	min Winter	24.737	0.037	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.3	ΟK
360	min Winter	24.732	0.032	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.2	ΟK
480	min Winter	24.730	0.030	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.2	ОК
600	min Winter	24.727	0.027	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.2	ОК
720	min Winter	24.725	0.025	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	ΟK
960	min Winter	24.722	0.022	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	ОК
1440	min Winter	24.719	0.019	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	ОК
2160	min Winter	24.716	0.016	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	ОК
2880	min Winter	24.715	0.015	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	ОК
4320	min Winter	24.713	0.013	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	ОК
5760	min Winter	24.711	0.011	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	ОК
7200	min Winter	24.710	0.010	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	ОК
8640	min Winter	24.710	0.010	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	ОК
10080	min Winter	24.709	0.009	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	ОК

	Stor	m	Rain	Flooded	Discharge	Time-Peak
	Even	t	(mm/hr)	Volume	Volume	(mins)
				(m³)	(m³)	
30	min	Winter	21.722	0.0	1.6	22
60	min	Winter	13.524	0.0	2.0	38
120	min	Winter	8.238	0.0	2.5	68
180	min	Winter	6.132	0.0	2.8	98
240	min	Winter	4.966	0.0	3.0	128
360	min	Winter	3.663	0.0	3.3	186
480	min	Winter	2.946	0.0	3.6	252
600	min	Winter	2.487	0.0	3.8	306
720	min	Winter	2.166	0.0	3.9	370
960	min	Winter	1.742	0.0	4.2	490
1440	min	Winter	1.281	0.0	4.6	714
2160	min	Winter	0.942	0.0	5.1	1092
2880	min	Winter	0.758	0.0	5.5	1480
4320	min	Winter	0.557	0.0	6.1	2224
5760	min	Winter	0.448	0.0	6.5	2840
7200	min	Winter	0.378	0.0	6.9	3608
8640	min	Winter	0.329	0.0	7.2	4288
10080	min	Winter	0.293	0.0	7.4	5080

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 3
The Stables	Proposed Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW STORAGE.SRCX	Checked by	Diamaye
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	L

	Rainfall Model		FSR	Winter Storms Yes
Return	Period (years)		1	Cv (Summer) 0.750
	Region	England	and Wales	Cv (Winter) 0.840
	M5-60 (mm)		21.000	Shortest Storm (mins) 15
	Ratio R		0.441	Longest Storm (mins) 10080
	Summer Storms		Yes	Climate Change % +0

## <u>Time Area Diagram</u>

Total Area (ha) 0.018

Time	(mins)	Area	Time	(mins)	Area	
From:	To:	(ha)	From:	To:	(ha)	
0	4	0.010	4	8	0.008	

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 4
The Stables	Proposed Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW STORAGE.SRCX	Checked by	Digitigh
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	1

Storage is Online Cover Level (m) 25.900

#### Cellular Storage Structure

Invert Level (m) 24.700 Safety Factor 2.0 Infiltration Coefficient Base (m/hr) 0.00000 Porosity 0.95 Infiltration Coefficient Side (m/hr) 0.00000

#### Depth (m) Area (m<sup>2</sup>) Inf. Area (m<sup>2</sup>) Depth (m) Area (m<sup>2</sup>) Inf. Area (m<sup>2</sup>)

0.000	7.5	7.5	0.500	0.0	12.7
0.400	7.5	12.7			

Orifice Outflow Control

Diameter (m) 0.062 Discharge Coefficient 0.600 Invert Level (m) 24.700

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 1
The Stables High Cogges, Witney Oxfordshire		Le com
Date 17/07/2017 11:24	Designed by Richard-Dell	Drainage
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	
ICP SUD	<u>S Mean Annual Flood</u> Input	
Return Period (yea: Area () SAAR (1	rs) 100 Soil 0.450 ha) 0.030 Urban 0.000 mm) 600 Region Number Region 6	
	Results 1/s	
	QBAR Rural 0.1 QBAR Urban 0.1	
	Q100 years 0.4	
	Q1 year 0.1 Q30 years 0.2 Q100 years 0.4	

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 1
The Stables	Exisitng Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	L'
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW Exisiting.SRCX	Checked by	Dialitaye
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	
Summary of Result	s for 100 year Return Period	

Storm Event		Max Level (m)	Max Depth (m)	Max Control (1/s)	Max Volume (m <sup>3</sup> )	Status	
15	min	Summer	24.807	0.107	4.2	0.1	ОК
30	min	Summer	24.796	0.096	3.5	0.1	ΟK
60	min	Summer	24.777	0.077	2.4	0.1	ОК
120	min	Summer	24.758	0.058	1.6	0.1	ОК
180	min	Summer	24.750	0.050	1.2	0.1	ОК
240	min	Summer	24.746	0.046	0.9	0.0	ОК
360	min	Summer	24.738	0.038	0.7	0.0	ΟK
480	min	Summer	24.734	0.034	0.6	0.0	ΟK
600	min	Summer	24.731	0.031	0.5	0.0	ОК
720	min	Summer	24.729	0.029	0.4	0.0	ОК
960	min	Summer	24.725	0.025	0.3	0.0	ОК
1440	min	Summer	24.722	0.022	0.2	0.0	ΟK
2160	min	Summer	24.718	0.018	0.2	0.0	ΟK
2880	min	Summer	24.716	0.016	0.1	0.0	ΟK
4320	min	Summer	24.713	0.013	0.1	0.0	ΟK
5760	min	Summer	24.712	0.012	0.1	0.0	ОК
7200	min	Summer	24.710	0.010	0.1	0.0	ОК
8640	min	Summer	24.710	0.010	0.1	0.0	ΟK
10080	min	Summer	24.709	0.009	0.0	0.0	ОК
15	min	Winter	24.807	0.107	4.2	0.1	ОК
30	min	Winter	24.788	0.088	3.1	0.1	ΟK

	Stor	m	Rain	Flooded	Discharge	Time-Peak	
	Even	t	(mm/hr)	Volume	Volume	(mins)	
				(m³)	(m³)		
15	min	Summer	107.695	0.0	1.6	10	
30	min	Summer	69.453	0.0	2.1	17	
60	min	Summer	42.578	0.0	2.6	32	
120	min	Summer	25.206	0.0	3.0	62	
180	min	Summer	18.309	0.0	3.3	94	
240	min	Summer	14.513	0.0	3.5	122	
360	min	Summer	10.456	0.0	3.8	184	
480	min	Summer	8.280	0.0	4.0	242	
600	min	Summer	6.905	0.0	4.1	300	
720	min	Summer	5.950	0.0	4.3	360	
960	min	Summer	4.702	0.0	4.5	486	
1440	min	Summer	3.370	0.0	4.9	720	
2160	min	Summer	2.412	0.0	5.2	1076	
2880	min	Summer	1.901	0.0	5.5	1424	
4320	min	Summer	1.357	0.0	5.9	2124	
5760	min	Summer	1.068	0.0	6.2	2936	
7200	min	Summer	0.886	0.0	6.4	3616	
8640	min	Summer	0.761	0.0	6.6	4296	
10080	min	Summer	0.669	0.0	6.7	5120	
15	min	Winter	107.695	0.0	1.8	10	
30	min	Winter	69.453	0.0	2.3	17	
		©198	82-2016	XP Sol	utions		

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 2
The Stables	Exisitng Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	L.
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW Exisiting.SRCX	Checked by	Diginarie
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	

## Summary of Results for 100 year Return Period

	Stor Even	m t	Max Level (m)	Max Depth (m)	Max Control (1/s)	Max Volume (m³)	Status
60	min	Winter	24.766	0.066	2.0	0.1	ОК
120	min	Winter	24.750	0.050	1.2	0.1	ОК
180	min	Winter	24.744	0.044	0.9	0.0	ОК
240	min	Winter	24.738	0.038	0.7	0.0	ОК
360	min	Winter	24.733	0.033	0.5	0.0	ΟK
480	min	Winter	24.729	0.029	0.4	0.0	ОК
600	min	Winter	24.726	0.026	0.3	0.0	ΟK
720	min	Winter	24.724	0.024	0.3	0.0	ΟK
960	min	Winter	24.722	0.022	0.2	0.0	ОК
1440	min	Winter	24.718	0.018	0.2	0.0	ОК
2160	min	Winter	24.716	0.016	0.1	0.0	ОК
2880	min	Winter	24.713	0.013	0.1	0.0	ΟK
4320	min	Winter	24.711	0.011	0.1	0.0	ОК
5760	min	Winter	24.710	0.010	0.1	0.0	ОК
7200	min	Winter	24.709	0.009	0.0	0.0	ОК
8640	min	Winter	24.708	0.008	0.0	0.0	ОК
10080	min	Winter	24.708	0.008	0.0	0.0	ОК

	Stor	m	Rain	Flooded	Discharge	Time-Peak
	Even	t	(mm/hr)	Volume	Volume	(mins)
				(m³)	(m³)	
<b>C</b> 0		1.7.1 to a	40 570	0 0	2 0	2.2
60	min	Winter	42.578	0.0	2.9	32
120	min	Winter	25.206	0.0	3.4	64
180	min	Winter	18.309	0.0	3.7	92
240	min	Winter	14.513	0.0	3.9	124
360	min	Winter	10.456	0.0	4.2	182
480	min	Winter	8.280	0.0	4.5	238
600	min	Winter	6.905	0.0	4.6	298
720	min	Winter	5.950	0.0	4.8	358
960	min	Winter	4.702	0.0	5.1	488
1440	min	Winter	3.370	0.0	5.4	712
2160	min	Winter	2.412	0.0	5.8	1104
2880	min	Winter	1.901	0.0	6.1	1464
4320	min	Winter	1.357	0.0	6.6	2196
5760	min	Winter	1.068	0.0	6.9	2800
7200	min	Winter	0.886	0.0	7.1	3728
8640	min	Winter	0.761	0.0	7.4	4256
10080	min	Winter	0.669	0.0	7.5	5176

Infrastruct CS Ltd			
The Stables	Exisitng Site		
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>	
Oxfordshire		Micco	
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW		
File 1909-SW Exisiting.SRCX	Checked by	Diamaye	
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1		

	Rainfall Model	FSR	Winter Storms Yes
Return	Period (years)	100	Cv (Summer) 0.750
	Region	England and Wales	Cv (Winter) 0.840
	M5-60 (mm)	21.000	Shortest Storm (mins) 15
	Ratio R	0.441	Longest Storm (mins) 10080
	Summer Storms	Yes	Climate Change % +0

## <u>Time Area Diagram</u>

Total Area (ha) 0.008

Time	(mins)	Area
From:	To:	(ha)

0 4 0.008

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 4
The Stables	Exisitng Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW Exisiting.SRCX	Checked by	Digiliada
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	

Storage is Online Cover Level (m) 25.900

#### <u>Pipe Structure</u>

Diameter (m) 0.150 Length (m) 5.000 Slope (1:X) 40.000 Invert Level (m) 24.700

## Pipe Outflow Control

Diameter (m) 0.100 Entry Loss Coefficient 0.500 Slope (1:X) 40.0 Coefficient of Contraction 0.600 Length (m) 5.000 Upstream Invert Level (m) 24.700 Roughness k (mm) 0.600

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 1
The Stables	Exisitng Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	Y L
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW Exisiting.SRCX	Checked by	Dialiaye
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	
Summary of Resu	Its for 30 year Beturn Period	

Storm			Max	Max	Max	Max	Status
	rven	L	(m)	(m)	(1/s)	(m <sup>3</sup> )	
			. ,		( ) = )		
15	min	Summer	24.791	0.091	3.2	0.1	O K
30	min	Summer	24.781	0.081	2.6	0.1	ΟK
60	min	Summer	24.764	0.064	1.9	0.1	ΟK
120	min	Summer	24.750	0.050	1.2	0.1	ΟK
180	min	Summer	24.744	0.044	0.9	0.0	ΟK
240	min	Summer	24.739	0.039	0.7	0.0	ΟK
360	min	Summer	24.734	0.034	0.5	0.0	ΟK
480	min	Summer	24.730	0.030	0.4	0.0	ΟK
600	min	Summer	24.727	0.027	0.4	0.0	ΟK
720	min	Summer	24.725	0.025	0.3	0.0	ΟK
960	min	Summer	24.723	0.023	0.2	0.0	ΟK
1440	min	Summer	24.719	0.019	0.2	0.0	ΟK
2160	min	Summer	24.716	0.016	0.1	0.0	ΟK
2880	min	Summer	24.714	0.014	0.1	0.0	ΟK
4320	min	Summer	24.712	0.012	0.1	0.0	ΟK
5760	min	Summer	24.710	0.010	0.1	0.0	ΟK
7200	min	Summer	24.709	0.009	0.1	0.0	ΟK
8640	min	Summer	24.709	0.009	0.0	0.0	ΟK
10080	min	Summer	24.708	0.008	0.0	0.0	ΟK
15	min	Winter	24.791	0.091	3.2	0.1	ΟK
30	min	Winter	24.774	0.074	2.3	0.1	ΟK

Storm		Rain	Flooded	Discharge	Time-Peak		
Event			(mm/hr)	Volume	Volume	(mins)	
				(m³)	(m³)		
15	min	Summer	82.739	0.0	1.2	10	
30	min	Summer	52.969	0.0	1.6	17	
60	min	Summer	32.372	0.0	1.9	32	
120	min	Summer	19.195	0.0	2.3	62	
180	min	Summer	13.994	0.0	2.5	92	
240	min	Summer	11.137	0.0	2.7	124	
360	min	Summer	8.066	0.0	2.9	182	
480	min	Summer	6.410	0.0	3.1	242	
600	min	Summer	5.361	0.0	3.2	300	
720	min	Summer	4.631	0.0	3.3	368	
960	min	Summer	3.674	0.0	3.5	482	
1440	min	Summer	2.649	0.0	3.8	724	
2160	min	Summer	1.908	0.0	4.1	1096	
2880	min	Summer	1.511	0.0	4.4	1436	
4320	min	Summer	1.087	0.0	4.7	2172	
5760	min	Summer	0.859	0.0	5.0	2920	
7200	min	Summer	0.716	0.0	5.2	3672	
8640	min	Summer	0.617	0.0	5.3	4552	
10080	min	Summer	0.544	0.0	5.5	5032	
15	min	Winter	82.739	0.0	1.4	10	
30	min	Winter	52.969	0.0	1.8	17	
		©198	32-2016	XP Sol	utions		

Infrastruct CS Ltd					
The Stables	Exisitng Site				
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	L'			
Oxfordshire		Micco			
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW				
File 1909-SW Exisiting.SRCX	Checked by	Diamaye			
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1				

## Summary of Results for 30 year Return Period

Storm Event			Max Level (m)	Max Depth (m)	Max Control (1/s)	Max Volume (m³)	Status
60	min	Winter	24.756	0.056	1.5	0.1	ОК
120	min	Winter	24.745	0.045	0.9	0.0	ОК
180	min	Winter	24.737	0.037	0.7	0.0	ΟK
240	min	Winter	24.733	0.033	0.5	0.0	ΟK
360	min	Winter	24.728	0.028	0.4	0.0	ΟK
480	min	Winter	24.725	0.025	0.3	0.0	ΟK
600	min	Winter	24.723	0.023	0.3	0.0	ОК
720	min	Winter	24.722	0.022	0.2	0.0	ОК
960	min	Winter	24.719	0.019	0.2	0.0	ΟK
1440	min	Winter	24.716	0.016	0.1	0.0	ΟK
2160	min	Winter	24.713	0.013	0.1	0.0	ΟK
2880	min	Winter	24.712	0.012	0.1	0.0	ΟK
4320	min	Winter	24.710	0.010	0.1	0.0	ΟK
5760	min	Winter	24.709	0.009	0.0	0.0	ΟK
7200	min	Winter	24.708	0.008	0.0	0.0	ΟK
8640	min	Winter	24.708	0.008	0.0	0.0	ΟK
10080	min	Winter	24.707	0.007	0.0	0.0	ΟK

Storm			Rain	Flooded	Discharge	Time-Peak
	Even	t	(mm/hr)	Volume	Volume	(mins)
				(m³)	(m³)	
60	mın	Winter	32.372	0.0	2.2	32
120	min	Winter	19.195	0.0	2.6	64
180	min	Winter	13.994	0.0	2.8	96
240	min	Winter	11.137	0.0	3.0	124
360	min	Winter	8.066	0.0	3.3	174
480	min	Winter	6.410	0.0	3.4	238
600	min	Winter	5.361	0.0	3.6	296
720	min	Winter	4.631	0.0	3.7	376
960	min	Winter	3.674	0.0	4.0	478
1440	min	Winter	2.649	0.0	4.3	714
2160	min	Winter	1.908	0.0	4.6	1096
2880	min	Winter	1.511	0.0	4.9	1464
4320	min	Winter	1.087	0.0	5.3	2108
5760	min	Winter	0.859	0.0	5.5	3016
7200	min	Winter	0.716	0.0	5.8	3616
8640	min	Winter	0.617	0.0	6.0	4320
10080	min	Winter	0.544	0.0	6.1	5152

Infrastruct CS Ltd					
The Stables	Exisitng Site				
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>			
Oxfordshire		Micco			
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW				
File 1909-SW Exisiting.SRCX	Checked by	Diamaye			
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	1			

	Rainfall Model	FSR	Winter Storms Yes
Return	Period (years)	30	Cv (Summer) 0.750
	Region	England and Wales	Cv (Winter) 0.840
	M5-60 (mm)	21.000	Shortest Storm (mins) 15
	Ratio R	0.441	Longest Storm (mins) 10080
	Summer Storms	Yes	Climate Change % +0

## <u>Time Area Diagram</u>

Total Area (ha) 0.008

Time	(mins)	Area
From:	To:	(ha)

0 4 0.008

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 4
The Stables	Exisitng Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW Exisiting.SRCX	Checked by	Digiliada
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	

Storage is Online Cover Level (m) 25.900

#### <u>Pipe Structure</u>

Diameter (m) 0.150 Length (m) 5.000 Slope (1:X) 40.000 Invert Level (m) 24.700

## Pipe Outflow Control

Diameter (m) 0.100 Entry Loss Coefficient 0.500 Slope (1:X) 40.0 Coefficient of Contraction 0.600 Length (m) 5.000 Upstream Invert Level (m) 24.700 Roughness k (mm) 0.600

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 1
The Stables	Exisitng Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW Exisiting.SRCX	Checked by	Dialitage
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	L

## Summary of Results for 2 year Return Period

Storm Event			Max Level (m)	Max Depth (m)	Max Control (1/s)	Max Volume (m³)	Status
15	min	Summer	24.759	0.059	1.7	0.1	ОК
30	min	Summer	24.754	0.054	1.4	0.1	ΟK
60	min	Summer	24.747	0.047	1.0	0.1	ΟK
120	min	Summer	24.737	0.037	0.6	0.0	ΟK
180	min	Summer	24.732	0.032	0.5	0.0	ΟK
240	min	Summer	24.729	0.029	0.4	0.0	ΟK
360	min	Summer	24.725	0.025	0.3	0.0	ΟK
480	min	Summer	24.722	0.022	0.2	0.0	ΟK
600	min	Summer	24.720	0.020	0.2	0.0	ΟK
720	min	Summer	24.719	0.019	0.2	0.0	ΟK
960	min	Summer	24.717	0.017	0.1	0.0	ΟK
1440	min	Summer	24.714	0.014	0.1	0.0	ΟK
2160	min	Summer	24.712	0.012	0.1	0.0	ΟK
2880	min	Summer	24.710	0.010	0.1	0.0	ΟK
4320	min	Summer	24.709	0.009	0.0	0.0	ΟK
5760	min	Summer	24.708	0.008	0.0	0.0	ΟK
7200	min	Summer	24.708	0.008	0.0	0.0	ΟK
8640	min	Summer	24.707	0.007	0.0	0.0	ΟK
10080	min	Summer	24.707	0.007	0.0	0.0	ΟK
15	min	Winter	24.759	0.059	1.7	0.1	ΟK
30	min	Winter	24.751	0.051	1.2	0.1	ΟK

Storm		Rain	Flooded	Discharge	Time-Peak		
	Even	t	(mm/hr)	Volume	Volume	(mins)	
				(m³)	(m³)		
15	min	Summer	43.505	0.0	0.7	10	
30	min	Summer	27.782	0.0	0.8	17	
60	min	Summer	17.052	0.0	1.0	32	
120	min	Summer	10.236	0.0	1.2	62	
180	min	Summer	7.551	0.0	1.4	92	
240	min	Summer	6.076	0.0	1.5	122	
360	min	Summer	4.455	0.0	1.6	180	
480	min	Summer	3.570	0.0	1.7	244	
600	min	Summer	3.005	0.0	1.8	300	
720	min	Summer	2.611	0.0	1.9	362	
960	min	Summer	2.090	0.0	2.0	484	
1440	min	Summer	1.528	0.0	2.2	728	
2160	min	Summer	1.117	0.0	2.4	1076	
2880	min	Summer	0.894	0.0	2.6	1424	
4320	min	Summer	0.653	0.0	2.8	2160	
5760	min	Summer	0.523	0.0	3.0	2904	
7200	min	Summer	0.440	0.0	3.2	3560	
8640	min	Summer	0.382	0.0	3.3	4240	
10080	min	Summer	0.339	0.0	3.4	4880	
15	min	Winter	43.505	0.0	0.7	10	
30	min	Winter	27.782	0.0	0.9	17	
		©198	32-2016	XP Sol	utions		

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 2
The Stables	Exisitng Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	4
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW Exisiting.SRCX	Checked by	Dialiaye
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	

## Summary of Results for 2 year Return Period

Storm Event		Max Level (m)	Max Depth (m)	Max Control (1/s)	Max Volume (m³)	Status	
60	min	Winter	24.741	0.041	0.8	0.0	ОК
120	min	Winter	24.732	0.032	0.5	0.0	ОК
180	min	Winter	24.727	0.027	0.4	0.0	ОК
240	min	Winter	24.724	0.024	0.3	0.0	ОК
360	min	Winter	24.721	0.021	0.2	0.0	ОК
480	min	Winter	24.719	0.019	0.2	0.0	ОК
600	min	Winter	24.717	0.017	0.1	0.0	ΟK
720	min	Winter	24.716	0.016	0.1	0.0	ΟK
960	min	Winter	24.714	0.014	0.1	0.0	ΟK
1440	min	Winter	24.712	0.012	0.1	0.0	ΟK
2160	min	Winter	24.710	0.010	0.1	0.0	ΟK
2880	min	Winter	24.709	0.009	0.0	0.0	ОК
4320	min	Winter	24.708	0.008	0.0	0.0	ΟK
5760	min	Winter	24.707	0.007	0.0	0.0	ΟK
7200	min	Winter	24.707	0.007	0.0	0.0	ΟK
8640	min	Winter	24.706	0.006	0.0	0.0	ОК
10080	min	Winter	24.706	0.006	0.0	0.0	ОК

Storm		Rain	Flooded	Discharge	Time-Peak	
	Even	t	(mm/hr)	Volume	Volume	(mins)
				(m³)	(m³)	
60	min	Winter	17.052	0.0	1.1	34
120	min	Winter	10.236	0.0	1.4	62
180	min	Winter	7.551	0.0	1.5	92
240	min	Winter	6.076	0.0	1.6	124
360	min	Winter	4.455	0.0	1.8	182
480	min	Winter	3.570	0.0	1.9	244
600	min	Winter	3.005	0.0	2.0	296
720	min	Winter	2.611	0.0	2.1	370
960	min	Winter	2.090	0.0	2.2	496
1440	min	Winter	1.528	0.0	2.5	734
2160	min	Winter	1.117	0.0	2.7	1132
2880	min	Winter	0.894	0.0	2.9	1360
4320	min	Winter	0.653	0.0	3.2	2224
5760	min	Winter	0.523	0.0	3.4	2696
7200	min	Winter	0.440	0.0	3.5	3496
8640	min	Winter	0.382	0.0	3.7	3936
10080	min	Winter	0.339	0.0	3.8	5048

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 3
The Stables	Exisitng Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>
Oxfordshire		Micro
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW Exisiting.SRCX	Checked by	Diamaye
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	•

Rainfall Model	FSR	Winter Storms Yes
Return Period (years)	2	Cv (Summer) 0.750
Region	England and Wales	Cv (Winter) 0.840
M5-60 (mm)	21.000	Shortest Storm (mins) 15
Ratio R	0.441	Longest Storm (mins) 10080
Summer Storms	Yes	Climate Change % +0

## <u>Time Area Diagram</u>

Total Area (ha) 0.008

Time	(mins)	Area
From:	To:	(ha)

0 4 0.008

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 4
The Stables	Exisitng Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW Exisiting.SRCX	Checked by	Digiliada
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	

Storage is Online Cover Level (m) 25.900

#### <u>Pipe Structure</u>

Diameter (m) 0.150 Length (m) 5.000 Slope (1:X) 40.000 Invert Level (m) 24.700

## Pipe Outflow Control

Diameter (m) 0.100 Entry Loss Coefficient 0.500 Slope (1:X) 40.0 Coefficient of Contraction 0.600 Length (m) 5.000 Upstream Invert Level (m) 24.700 Roughness k (mm) 0.600

Infrastruct CS Ltd				
The Stables	Exisitng Site			
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>		
Oxfordshire		Micco		
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW			
File 1909-SW Exisiting.SRCX	Checked by	Dialitada		
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	1		

## Summary of Results for 1 year Return Period

Storm Event			Max Level (m)	Max Depth (m)	Max Control (l/s)	Max Volume (m³)	Status
15	min	Summer	24.753	0.053	1.3	0.1	0 F
30	min	Summer	24.749	0.049	1.1	0.1	Οŀ
60	min	Summer	24.741	0.041	0.8	0.0	Οŀ
120	min	Summer	24.733	0.033	0.5	0.0	Οŀ
180	min	Summer	24.729	0.029	0.4	0.0	Οŀ
240	min	Summer	24.726	0.026	0.3	0.0	Οŀ
360	min	Summer	24.722	0.022	0.2	0.0	Οŀ
480	min	Summer	24.720	0.020	0.2	0.0	Οŀ
600	min	Summer	24.718	0.018	0.2	0.0	Οŀ
720	min	Summer	24.717	0.017	0.1	0.0	Οŀ
960	min	Summer	24.716	0.016	0.1	0.0	Οŀ
1440	min	Summer	24.713	0.013	0.1	0.0	Οŀ
2160	min	Summer	24.711	0.011	0.1	0.0	Οŀ
2880	min	Summer	24.709	0.009	0.1	0.0	Οŀ
4320	min	Summer	24.708	0.008	0.0	0.0	Οŀ
5760	min	Summer	24.708	0.008	0.0	0.0	Οŀ
7200	min	Summer	24.707	0.007	0.0	0.0	Οŀ
8640	min	Summer	24.707	0.007	0.0	0.0	Οŀ
10080	min	Summer	24.706	0.006	0.0	0.0	Οŀ
15	min	Winter	24.753	0.053	1.3	0.1	Οŀ
30	min	Winter	24.746	0.046	1.0	0.0	Οŀ

Storm		Rain	Flood	əd	Discharge	Time-Peak		
	Even	t	(mm/hr)	Volum	e	Volume	(mins)	
				(m³)		(m³)		
15	min	Summer	33.683	0	.0	0.5	10	
30	min	Summer	21.722	0	.0	0.7	17	
60	min	Summer	13.524	0	.0	0.8	32	
120	min	Summer	8.238	0	.0	1.0	64	
180	min	Summer	6.132	0	.0	1.1	94	
240	min	Summer	4.966	0	.0	1.2	122	
360	min	Summer	3.663	0	.0	1.3	184	
480	min	Summer	2.946	0	.0	1.4	240	
600	min	Summer	2.487	0	.0	1.5	306	
720	min	Summer	2.166	0	.0	1.6	364	
960	min	Summer	1.742	0	.0	1.7	486	
1440	min	Summer	1.281	0	.0	1.8	714	
2160	min	Summer	0.942	0	.0	2.0	1084	
2880	min	Summer	0.758	0	.0	2.2	1452	
4320	min	Summer	0.557	0	.0	2.4	2144	
5760	min	Summer	0.448	0	.0	2.6	2720	
7200	min	Summer	0.378	0	.0	2.7	3648	
8640	min	Summer	0.329	0	.0	2.8	4344	
10080	min	Summer	0.293	0	.0	3.0	4992	
15	min	Winter	33.683	0	.0	0.6	10	
30	min	Winter	21.722	0	.0	0.7	18	
		©198	32-2016	XP S	olu	utions		

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 2
The Stables	Exisitng Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW Exisiting.SRCX	Checked by	Dialitage
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	

## Summary of Results for 1 year Return Period

Storm Event		Max Level (m)	Max Depth (m)	Max Control (1/s)	Max Volume (m³)	Status	
60	min	Winter	24.736	0.036	0.6	0.0	ОК
120	min	Winter	24.729	0.029	0.4	0.0	ΟK
180	min	Winter	24.724	0.024	0.3	0.0	ОК
240	min	Winter	24.722	0.022	0.2	0.0	ОК
360	min	Winter	24.719	0.019	0.2	0.0	ОК
480	min	Winter	24.717	0.017	0.1	0.0	ОК
600	min	Winter	24.716	0.016	0.1	0.0	ΟK
720	min	Winter	24.715	0.015	0.1	0.0	ΟK
960	min	Winter	24.713	0.013	0.1	0.0	ОК
1440	min	Winter	24.710	0.010	0.1	0.0	ОК
2160	min	Winter	24.709	0.009	0.0	0.0	ОК
2880	min	Winter	24.708	0.008	0.0	0.0	ΟK
4320	min	Winter	24.707	0.007	0.0	0.0	ΟK
5760	min	Winter	24.707	0.007	0.0	0.0	ОК
7200	min	Winter	24.706	0.006	0.0	0.0	ОК
8640	min	Winter	24.706	0.006	0.0	0.0	ОК
10080	min	Winter	24.705	0.005	0.0	0.0	ОК

Storm		Rain	Flooded	Discharge	Time-Peak	
Event		(mm/hr)	Volume	Volume	(mins)	
				(m³)	(m³)	
60	min	Winter	13.524	0.0	0.9	32
120	min	Winter	8.238	0.0	1.1	62
180	min	Winter	6.132	0.0	1.2	94
240	min	Winter	4.966	0.0	1.3	116
360	min	Winter	3.663	0.0	1.5	186
480	min	Winter	2.946	0.0	1.6	226
600	min	Winter	2.487	0.0	1.7	302
720	min	Winter	2.166	0.0	1.7	368
960	min	Winter	1.742	0.0	1.9	480
1440	min	Winter	1.281	0.0	2.1	712
2160	min	Winter	0.942	0.0	2.3	1068
2880	min	Winter	0.758	0.0	2.4	1424
4320	min	Winter	0.557	0.0	2.7	2112
5760	min	Winter	0.448	0.0	2.9	2952
7200	min	Winter	0.378	0.0	3.0	3600
8640	min	Winter	0.329	0.0	3.2	4184
10080	min	Winter	0.293	0.0	3.3	5168

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 3
The Stables	Exisitng Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>
Oxfordshire		Micro
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW Exisiting.SRCX	Checked by	Diamaye
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	

	Rainfall Model		FSR	Winter Storms Yes
Return	Period (years)		1	Cv (Summer) 0.750
	Region	England	and Wales	Cv (Winter) 0.840
	M5-60 (mm)		21.000	Shortest Storm (mins) 15
	Ratio R		0.441	Longest Storm (mins) 10080
	Summer Storms		Yes	Climate Change % +0

## <u>Time Area Diagram</u>

Total Area (ha) 0.008

Time	(mins)	Area
From:	To:	(ha)

0 4 0.008

Infrastruct CS Ltd		Page 4
The Stables	Exisitng Site	
High Cogges, Witney	Carol Street	<u> </u>
Oxfordshire		Micco
Date 17/07/2017	Designed by RJW	
File 1909-SW Exisiting.SRCX	Checked by	Digiliada
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2016.1	

Storage is Online Cover Level (m) 25.900

#### <u>Pipe Structure</u>

Diameter (m) 0.150 Length (m) 5.000 Slope (1:X) 40.000 Invert Level (m) 24.700

## Pipe Outflow Control

Diameter (m) 0.100 Entry Loss Coefficient 0.500 Slope (1:X) 40.0 Coefficient of Contraction 0.600 Length (m) 5.000 Upstream Invert Level (m) 24.700 Roughness k (mm) 0.600



# Appendix F – LBC Surface Water Drainage Pro-forma

## Advice Note on contents of a Surface Water Drainage Statement

## London Borough of Camden

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Government has strengthened planning policy on the provision of sustainable drainage and new consultation arrangements for 'major' planning applications will come into force from 6 April 2015 as defined in the <u>Written</u> <u>Ministerial Statement</u> (18<sup>th</sup> Dec 2014).
- 1.2 The new requirements make Lead Local Flood Authorises statutory consultees with respect to flood risk and SuDS for all major applications. Previously the Environment Agency had that statutory responsibility for sites above 1ha in flood zone 1.
- 1.3 Therefore all 'major' planning applications submitted from 6 April 2015 are required demonstrate compliance with this policy and we'd encourage this is shown in a **Surface Water Drainage Statement**.
- 1.4 The purpose of this advice note is to set out what information should be included in such statements.

## 2. Requirements

- 2.1 It is essential that the type of Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) for a site, along with **details of its extent and position**, is identified within the planning application to clearly demonstrate that the proposed SuDS can be accommodated within the development.
- 2.2 It will now not be acceptable to leave the design of SuDs to a later stage to be dealt with by planning conditions.
- 2.3 The <u>NPPF</u> paragraph 103 requires that developments do not increase flood risk elsewhere, and gives priority to the use of SuDS. Major developments must include SuDS for the management of run-off, unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. The proposed minimum standards of operation must be appropriate and as such, a **maintenance plan** should be included within the Surface Water Drainage Statement, clearly demonstrating that the SuDS have been designed to ensure that the maintenance and operation requirements are economically proportionate Planning Practice Guidance suggests that this should be considered by reference to the costs that would be incurred by consumers for the use of an effective drainage system connecting directly to a public sewer.
- 2.4 Camden Council will use planning conditions or obligations to ensure that there are clear arrangements in place for ongoing maintenance over the lifetime of the development.
- 2.5 Within Camden, SuDS systems must be designed in accordance with London Plan policy 5.13. This requires that developments should utilise sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) unless there are practical reasons for not doing so, and should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible in line with the following drainage hierarchy:

## UNCLASSIFIED

- 1 store rainwater for later use
- 2 use infiltration techniques, such as porous surfaces in non-clay areas
- 3 attenuate rainwater in ponds or open water features for gradual release
- 4 attenuate rainwater by storing in tanks or sealed water features for gradual release
- 5 discharge rainwater direct to a watercourse
- 6 discharge rainwater to a surface water sewer/drain
- 7 discharge rainwater to the combined sewer.
- 2.6 The hierarchy above seeks to ensure that surface water run-off is controlled as near to its source as possible to mimic natural drainage systems and retain water on or near to the site, in contrast to traditional drainage approaches, which tend to pipe water off-site as quickly as possible.
- 2.7 Before disposal of surface water to the public sewer is considered all other options set out in the drainage hierarchy should be exhausted. When no other practicable alternative exists to dispose of surface water other than the public sewer, the Water Company or its agents should confirm that there is adequate spare capacity in the existing system taking future development requirements into account.
- 2.8 Best practice guidance within the <u>non-statutory technical standards</u> for the design, maintenance and operation of sustainable drainage systems will also need to be followed. Runoff volumes from the development to any highway drain, sewer or surface water body in the 1 in 100 year, 6 hour rainfall event must be constrained to a value as close as is reasonably practicable to the **greenfield runoff volume** for the same event.
- 2.9 <u>Camden Development Policy 23</u> (Water) requires developments to reduce pressure on combined sewer network and the risk of flooding by limiting the rate of run-off through sustainable urban drainage systems. This policy also requires that developments in areas known to be at risk of surface water flooding are designed to cope with being flooded. <u>Camden's SFRA</u> surface water flood maps, updated SFRA figures 6 (LFRZs), and 4e (increased susceptibility to elevated groundwater), as well as the <u>Environment Agency</u> <u>updated flood maps for surface water (ufmfsw)</u>, should be referred to when determining whether developments are in an area at risk of flooding.
- 2.10 <u>Camden Planning Guidance 3</u> (CPG3) requires developments to achieve a greenfield run off rate once SuDS have been installed. Where it can be demonstrated that this is not feasible, a minimum 50% reduction in run off rate across the development is required. Further guidance on how to reduce the risk of flooding can be found in CPG3 paragraphs 11.4-11.8.
- 2.11 Where an application is part of a larger site which already has planning permission it is essential that the new proposal does not compromise the drainage scheme already approved.

## 3. Further information and guidance

- 3.1 Applicants are strongly advised to discuss their proposals with the Lead Local Flood Authority at the pre-application stage to ensure that an acceptable SuDS scheme is submitted.
- 3.2 For general clarification of these requirements please Camden's Local Planning Authority or Lead Local Flood Authority

## UNCLASSIFIED

## Surface Water Drainage Pro-forma for new developments

This pro-forma accompanies our advice note on surface water drainage. Developers should complete this form and submit it to the Local Planning Authority, referencing from where in their submission documents this information is taken. The pro-forma is supported by the <u>Defra/EA guidance on Rainfall Runoff Management</u> and uses the storage calculator on <u>www.UKsuds.com</u>. This pro-forma is based on current industry best practice and focuses on ensuring surface water drainage proposals meet national and local policy requirements. The pro-forma should be considered alongside other supporting SuDS Guidance.

## 1. Site Details

Site	
Address & post code or LPA reference	
Grid reference	
Is the existing site developed or Greenfield?	
Is the development in a LFRZ or in an area known to be at risk of surface or ground water flooding? If yes, please demonstrate how this is managed, in line with DP23?	
Total Site Area served by drainage system (excluding open space) (Ha)*	

\* The Greenfield runoff off rate from the development which is to be used for assessing the requirements for limiting discharge flow rates and attenuation storage from a site should be calculated for the area that forms the drainage network for the site whatever size of site and type of drainage technique. Please refer to the Rainfall Runoff Management document or CIRIA manual for detail on this.

## 2. Impermeable Area

	Existing	Proposed	Difference	Notes for developers
	_		(Proposed-Existing)	
Impermeable area (ha)				If the proposed amount of impermeable surface is greater, then runoff rates and volumes
				will increase. Section 6 must be filled in. If proposed impermeability is equal or less than
				existing, then section 6 can be skipped and section 7 filled in.
Drainage Method			N/A	If different from the existing, please fill in section 3. If existing drainage is by infiltration and
(infiltration/sewer/watercourse)				the proposed is not, discharge volumes may increase. Fill in section 6.

## 3. Proposing to Discharge Surface Water via

	Yes	No	Evidence that this is possible	Notes for developers
Existing and proposed				Please provide MicroDrainage calculations of existing and proposed run-off rates and
MicroDrainage calculations				volumes in accordance with a recognised methodology or the results of a full infiltration test
				(see line below) if infiltration is proposed.
Infiltration				e.g. soakage tests. Section 6 (infiltration) must be filled in if infiltration is proposed.
To watercourse				e.g. Is there a watercourse nearby?
To surface water sewer				Confirmation from sewer provider that sufficient capacity exists for this connection.
Combination of above				e.g. part infiltration part discharge to sewer or watercourse. Provide evidence above.
Has the drainage proposal				Evidence must be provided to demonstrate that the proposed Sustainable Drainage
had regard to the SuDS				strategy has had regard to the SuDS hierarchy as outlined in Section 2.5 above.
hierarchy?				
Layout plan showing where				Please provide plan reference numbers showing the details of the site layout showing
the sustainable drainage				where the sustainable drainage infrastructure will be located on the site. If the development
infrastructure will be				is to be constructed in phases this should be shown on a separate plan and confirmation
located on site.				should be provided that the sustainable drainage proposal for each phase can be
				constructed and can operate independently and is not reliant on any later phase of
				development.

4. Peak Discharge Rates – This is the maximum flow rate at which storm water runoff leaves the site during a particular storm event.

	Existing Rates (I/s)	Proposed Rates (I/s)	Difference (I/s) (Proposed- Existing)	% Difference (difference /existing x 100)	Notes for developers
Greenfield QBAR		N/A	N/A	N/A	QBAR is approx. 1 in 2 storm event. Provide this if Section 6 (QBAR) is proposed.
1 in 1					Proposed discharge rates (with mitigation) should aim to be equivalent to greenfield rates
1 in 30					for all corresponding storm events. As a minimum, peak discharge rates must be reduced
1in 100					by 50% from the existing sites for all corresponding rainial events.
1 in 100 plus	N/A				The proposed 1 in 100 +CC peak discharge rate (with mitigation) should aim to be
climate change					equivalent to greenfield rates. As a minimum, proposed 1 in 100 +CC peak discharge rate must be reduced by 50% from the existing 1 in 100 runoff rate sites.

**5.** Calculate additional volumes for storage –The total volume of water leaving the development site. New hard surfaces potentially restrict the amount of stormwater that can go to the ground, so this needs to be controlled so not to make flood risk worse to properties downstream.

	Greenfield runoff volume	Existing Volume (m <sup>3</sup> )	Proposed Volume (m <sup>3</sup> )	Difference (m <sup>3</sup> ) (Proposed-Existing)	Notes for developers
	(m <sup>3</sup> )				
1 in 1					Proposed discharge volumes (with mitigation) should be constrained to a value as close as is
1 in 30					reasonably practicable to the greenfield runoff volume wherever practicable and as a
1in 100 6 hour					minimum should be no greater than existing volumes for all corresponding storm events. Any
					increase in volume increases flood risk elsewhere. Where volumes are increased section 6
					must be filled in.
1 in 100 6 hour plus					The proposed 1 in 100 +CC discharge volume should be constrained to a value as close as
climate change					is reasonably practicable to the greenfield runoff volume wherever practicable. As a
					minimum, to mitigate for climate change the proposed 1 in 100 +CC volume discharge from
					site must be no greater than the existing 1 in 100 storm event. If not, flood risk increases
1					under climate change.

**6.** Calculate attenuation storage – Attenuation storage is provided to enable the rate of runoff from the site into the receiving watercourse to be limited to an acceptable rate to protect against erosion and flooding downstream. The attenuation storage volume is a function of the degree of development relative to the greenfield discharge rate.

	Notes for developers
Storage Attenuation volume (Flow rate control) required to	Volume of water to attenuate on site if discharging at a greenfield run off rate.
meet greenfield run off rates (m <sup>3</sup> )	Can't be used where discharge volumes are increasing
Storage Attenuation volume (Flow rate control) required to	Volume of water to attenuate on site if discharging at a 50% reduction from
reduce rates by 50% (m <sup>3</sup> )	existing rates. Can't be used where discharge volumes are increasing
Storage Attenuation volume (Flow rate control) required to	Volume of water to attenuate on site if discharging at a rate different from the
meet [OTHER RUN OFF RATE (as close to greenfield rate as	above – please state in 1 <sup>st</sup> column what rate this volume corresponds to. On
possible] (m <sup>3</sup> )	previously developed sites, runoff rates should not be more than three times the
	calculated greenfield rate. Can't be used where discharge volumes are
	increasing
Storage Attenuation volume (Flow rate control) required to	Volume of water to attenuate on site if discharging at existing rates. Can't be
retain rates as existing (m <sup>3</sup> )	used where discharge volumes are increasing
Percentage of attenuation volume stored above ground,	Percentage of attenuation volume which will be held above ground in
	swales/ponds/basins/green roofs etc. If 0, please demonstrate why.

## 7. How is Storm Water stored on site?

Storage is required for the additional volume from site but also for holding back water to slow down the rate from the site. This is known as attenuation storage and long term storage. The idea is that the additional volume does not get into the watercourses, or if it does it is at an exceptionally low rate. You can either infiltrate the stored water back to ground, or if this isn't possible hold it back with on site storage. Firstly, can infiltration work on site?

		Notes for developers
	State the Site's Geology and known Source	Avoid infiltrating in made ground. Infiltration rates are highly variable
Infiltration	Protection Zones (SPZ)	and refer to Environment Agency website to identify and source
		protection zones (SPZ)
	Are infiltration rates suitable?	Infiltration rates should be no lower than $1 \times 10^{-6}$ m/s.
	State the distance between a proposed infiltration	Need 1m (min) between the base of the infiltration device & the water
	device base and the ground water (GW) level	table to protect Groundwater quality & ensure GW doesn't enter
		infiltration devices. Avoid infiltration where this isn't possible.

	Were infiltration rates obtained by desk study or infiltration test?	Infiltration rates can be estimated from desk studies at most stages of the planning system if a back up attenuation scheme is provided
	Is the site contaminated? If yes, consider advice from others on whether infiltration can happen.	Advice on contaminated Land in Camden can be found on our supporting documents <u>webpage</u> Water should not be infiltrated through land that is contaminated. The Environment Agency may provide bespoke advice in planning consultations for contaminated sites that should be considered.
In light of the above, is infiltration feasible?	Yes/No? If the answer is No, please identify how the storm water will be stored prior to release	If infiltration is not feasible how will the additional volume be stored?. The applicant should then consider the following options in the next section.

## Storage requirements

The developer must confirm that either of the two methods for dealing with the amount of water that needs to be stored on site.

**Option 1 Simple** – Store both the additional volume and attenuation volume in order to make a final discharge from site at the greenfield run off rate. This is preferred if no infiltration can be made on site. This very simply satisfies the runoff rates and volume criteria.

**Option 2 Complex** – If some of the additional volume of water can be infiltrated back into the ground, the remainder can be discharged at a very low rate of 2 l/sec/hectare. A combined storage calculation using the partial permissible rate of 2 l/sec/hectare and the attenuation rate used to slow the runoff from site.

	Notes for developers
Please confirm what option has been chosen and how much	The developer at this stage should have an idea of the site
storage is required on site.	characteristics and be able to explain what the storage requirements
- · ·	are on site and how it will be achieved.

## 8. Please confirm

	Notes for developers
Which Drainage Systems measures have been used,	SUDS can be adapted for most situations even where infiltration
including green roofs?	isn't feasible e.g. impermeable liners beneath some SUDS devices
	allows treatment but not infiltration. See CIRIA SUDS Manual C697.
Drainage system can contain in the 1 in 30 storm event	This a requirement for sewers for adoption & is good practice even
without flooding	where drainage system is not adopted.
Will the drainage system contain the 1 in 100 +CC storm	National standards require that the drainage system is designed so
event? If no please demonstrate how buildings and utility	that flooding does not occur during a 1 in 100 year rainfall event in
plants will be protected.	any part of: a building (including a basement); or in any utility plant
	susceptible to water (e.g. pumping station or electricity substation)
	within the development.
Any flooding between the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 plus climate	Sately: not causing property flooding or posing a hazard to site
change storm events will be safely contained on site.	users i.e. no deeper than 300mm on roads/tootpaths. Flood waters
	must drain away at section of rates. Existing rates can be used
How will exceedance events be catered on site without	Safely: not causing property flooding or posing a bazard to site
increasing flood risks (both on site and outside the	users i e no deeper than 300mm on roads/footnaths. Flood waters
development)?	must drain away at section 6 rates. Existing rates can be used
	where runoff volumes are not increased
	Exceedance events are defined as those larger than the 1 in 100
	+CC event.
How are rates being restricted (vortex control, orifice etc)	Detail of how the flow control systems have been designed to avoid
	pipe blockages and ease of maintenance should be provided.
Please confirm the owners/adopters of the entire drainage	If these are multiple owners then a drawing illustrating exactly what
systems throughout the development. Please list all the	features will be within each owner's remit must be submitted with
owners.	this Proforma.
How is the entire drainage system to be maintained?	If the features are to be maintained directly by the owners as stated
	in answer to the above question please answer yes to this question
	and submit the relevant maintenance schedule for each feature. If it
	is to be maintained by others than above please give details of each
	reature and the maintenance schedule.
	Clear details of the maintenance proposals of all elements of the
	proposed drainage system must be provided. Details must
	comparisonally proportionate. Poorly maintained drainage can lead to
	increased flooding problems in the future
	incleased hooding problems in the future.
**9. Evidence** Please identify where the details quoted in the sections above were taken from. i.e. Plans, reports etc. Please also provide relevant drawings that need to accompany your proforma, in particular exceedance routes and ownership and location of SuDS (maintenance access strips etc

Pro-forma Section	Document reference where details quoted above are taken from	Page Number
Section 2		
Section 3		
Section 4		
Section 5		
Section 6		
Section 7		
Section 8		
The above form should be completed using evidence from the Flood Risk Assessment and site plans. It should serve as a summary sheet of the drainage proposals and should clearly show that the proposed rate and volume as a result of development will not be increasing. If there is an increase in rate or volume, the rate or volume section should be completed to set out how the additional rate/volume is being dealt with. This form is completed using factual information from the Flood Risk Assessment and Site Plans and can be used as a summary of the surface water drainage strategy on this site.		
Form Completed By Qualification of person responsible for signing off this pro-forma		
Company On behalf of (Client's details) Date:		