

From: [LLFA Planning](#)
Sent: 14 June 2023 07:45
To: [Ursula Fay](#)
Cc: [Sam Gibbs-Jones](#); [LLFA Planning](#)
Subject: P/OUT/2023/01166 - PLN23-020/3 - Mixed use development of up to 1,700 dwellings including affordable housing and care provision; 10,000sqm of employment space in the form of a business park; village centre with associated retail, commercial, community and

Dorset Council, Flood Risk Management Team
Place Services, County Hall, Dorchester



LLFAPlanning@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk

Lead FRM Officer: Alister Trendell
Direct Dial: 01305 221836

Date: 14 June 2023

Internal LLFA Consultation – Surface Water (SW) Management

Our Ref: PLN23-020/3

Proposal: Mixed use development of up to 1,700 dwellings including affordable housing and care provision; 10,000sqm of employment space in the form of a business park; village centre with associated retail, commercial, community and health faculties; open space including the provision of suitable alternative natural green space (SANG); biodiversity enhancements; solar array, and new roads, access arrangements and associated infrastructure (Outline Application with all matters reserved apart from access off Hillbury Road)

Your Ref: P/OUT/2023/01166

Location: Land To The South Of Ringwood Road Alderholt

Grid Ref: 411942, 111800

To: Ursula Fay

We write in response to the above consultation, sent to us as relevant Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), and statutory consultee for Surface Water (SW) management in respect of major development (as defined within Article 2(1) of the Town & Country Planning, Development Management Procedure, England Order 2015) and legislated for under The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, schedule 4, paragraph (ze). Given that the proposal under consideration relates to

development of 10 or more residences, we acknowledge that it qualifies as major development.

This is a follow up to my response dated 5 April 2023 in which I recommended a holding objection. I can provide the following comments:

The following additional document has been submitted in support of this application:

- Letter response, by Campbell Reith, Ref 13577-CRH-Alderholt-20230524.docx, and dated 24 May 2023.

In my previous response of 5 April 2023, I raised 4 issues that required additional information.

Item 1

The applicant has added a note to the surface water drainage drawing that existing watercourses/ditches are to be accommodated within the proposed drainage strategy. In addition, they have stated that the masterplan is only indicative at this stage. It is acknowledged that the masterplan and housing layout is only indicative at this stage, however a detailed building layout has been provided which shows buildings over the existing drainage lines with no alternative flow paths shown. It is my experience that although a masterplan may only be indicative at outline application stage, the applicant's aspirations in terms of site layout and housing density tend to get fixed with the masterplan, thereby making amendments to it (with potential reduction in housing units to accommodate overland flow paths) difficult to implement. Therefore, at this outline/indicative stage, an indicative flow route through the new development should be shown on the surface water drainage drawing and on the masterplan. This is not currently shown, and therefore management of the surface water runoff from the upstream catchment has not been provided for.

Item 2

Although the indicative attenuation volume requirements look to be approximately expected for a development of this size, the calculations for the QBAR rate should be submitted. We typically find a QBAR rate of approximately 4l/s/ha for the Dorset area. The indicative values provided are in excess of this figure.

Item 3 (climate change allowance) has been addressed.

Item 4

Similar to item 2 above regarding the upstream catchment. It is not expected that the flow from the external catchment will be attenuated, but how will it be managed/routed to bypass the proposed attenuation basin?

I object to the proposed development due to:

- a. The flood risk to part of the proposed development from an upstream catchment.** (Item 1 above - Insufficient assessment of the flood risk from the upstream catchment, and how this will be managed, has been undertaken as part of the Flood Risk Assessment).

- b. **The potential increase in flood risk from the site affecting third-party land.**
(Items 2 & 4 above - Insufficient information has been provided regarding SW management from the development. As such, we are unable to ascertain, to our satisfaction, the appropriateness of any SW management in accordance with the Ministerial statement 'Sustainable Drainage System' 2014, chapter 14 of the NPPF and Planning Policy Guidance (PPG). As relevant LLFA in this matter we are unable to confirm that the applicant has met DEFRA's technical guidance or relevant local and national policies concerning drainage).

Yours Sincerely,

**Alister Trendell,
Flood Risk Engineer.**