

Good afternoon, Victor,

I'm writing to you with respect to the development at Church Lane Linthwaite, and the associated drainage Conditions, as per the attached document.

I understand that Condition 17 & 18 remain undischarged, due to ongoing queries from the LLFA. I've copied in Paul Farndale, should he wish to contact me directly for discussion, but can you please upload and issue the linked information to your appropriate central database.

The information mentioned below is found in the link :

<https://we.tl/t-NUvbWdeTel>

With respect to Condition 17, the last correspondence stated below, with our responses in RED:

**“Condition 17 – Attenuation Basin**

*We recommend that the design of the attenuation pond is also reviewed for aesthetics, amenity and biodiversity by our landscape architect, Emma Mills, and any other suitably qualified officers. **Landscape Item, related to Condition 32 and will be dismissed via that process***

*Consideration of a toddler rail via a health and safety risk assessment by principal designer has been produced and omitted. **Noted. Item Cleared***

*A statement on groundwater and potential effects on the pond has been provided. **Noted. Item Cleared***

*Fall protection barriers to the inlet and outlet headwalls has now been provided. **Noted. Item Cleared***

*A non-return valve should be considered as a pollution prevention measure should flows in the public combined sewer ever back up into the surface water system. This has not been provided. **The system is approved and being adopted by Yorkshire Water including the basin, they have legal responsibility for maintaining and operating the basin, including pollution control measures. The installation of a non return valve would be a design change that would need approval from Yorkshire Water***

*Safety cages preventing access to incoming and outgoing pipes should be re-assessed for blockage prevention. Flush grilles are prone to blockage and a horizontal section is advised to aid overspill. We also advise raising 150mm above the invert of the pipe to lower risk of blockage from small items. This is still to be provided.*

**The system is approved and being adopted by Yorkshire Water including the basin, they have legal responsibility for maintaining and operating the basin, including the headwalls. The detailed safety Cages have been approved by YW under the S104 process.**

*A safety bench, located at the point of normal water level, (recommended at 3.5m wide), was provided but has been removed from the latest drawings.*

**Removed, as that's an aspect of Ponds for Aquatic benching, to provide planting areas for aeration of the Pond permanent pool volume. It was not a safety feature**

*The area of overspill should be clearly shown on a plan. From this a narrative regarding spillways, erosion control and protection of any embankment, where applicable is still required.*

**The Outfall Headwall has a concrete apron to offer erosion protection, as shown on the plan and sections. This level of erosion protection has been accepted by Yorkshire Water as part of the S104 Technical Approval.**

*A check on latest microdrainage calculations should show a match with the water levels on the proposed plans for the basin. Please investigate.*

**Latest Microdrainage calculations and Drawings provided, to shown that they align.**

*A generic maintenance plan has been included in the submitted FRA. However, it is practice in Kirklees for LPA to ensure maintenance and management of SUDS features for the lifetime of the site including the period from installation to adoption by the statutory undertaker. Under CDM regs the*

*principal designer should oversee the health and safety of design (completed) and maintenance of that design, including access to an into attenuation systems. A risk assessment (completed) and method statement bespoke to the site is therefore expected. This should be presented as an itinerary and schedule of tasks. This should also include a section on the design and clearance of the forebay and general control of sedimentation, and methodology of draining down the pond. Waste management licences are likely to be required. “*

**The Principal Designer has been issued with and approved the required H&S Risk assessment. The forebay has been removed, as it was a function of the SUDS Pond and therefore is not necessary to be included in any maintenance schedule.**

### **Condition 18 – Flood Routing**

*Road contours have now been supplied but continue to show overland flow routes to a basin area in road 3. This is only acceptable if road three is isolated (use 10 properties as a marker). In initial discussions it was made clear on indicative plans that roads 2 and 1 should be used to contain overland flow into Kinder Avenue (where this has been experienced in the past), avoiding basins and new property curtilage. This has not happened. A swale has been shown prior to the southern plots backing onto sloping ground to protect these properties from surface run off. However, no levels have been shown for the swale, just a contour profile for the land suggesting low spots at the backs of properties and that they will be at risk. Flows should escape using the road network and/public open spaces, avoiding property curtilage. A detailed examination of levels is therefore required here to prove it is achievable.*

**We have received the levels of Road 3 to avoid a basin area, this was submitted and approved through the S38 process, with Road 3 sufficiently lifted to avoid creating this effect. Additional levels to the external works plan are shown for the Swales to demonstrate transfer of flows away from properties. The new level scheme also eliminates are Flooding for the 1 in 100 year storm event.**

Regards



creating balance in  
the built environment

**John Marshall**  
**Senior Civil Engineer**

☎ 0151 227 1462

☎ 07794 012060

✉ [johnmarshall@ajpltd.co.uk](mailto:johnmarshall@ajpltd.co.uk)

📍 1 Dale St, Liverpool, L2 2ET