

Wednesday 29 May 2019

Ms Sarah Chester  
Aldfeld House  
Main Street  
Church Fenton  
LS24 9RF

Dear Ms Chester,

### **Church Fenton Neighbourhood Development Plan**

Many thanks for your letter in respect of the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Areas to the north of Church Fenton are within the Board's district and the Board wishes to state that where possible the risk of flooding should be reduced and that, as far as is practicable, surface water arising from any developed site should be managed in a sustainable manner to mimic the surface water flows arising from the site prior to the proposed development. This should be considered whether the surface water arrangements from the site are to connect to a public or private asset (watercourse or sewer) before out-falling into a watercourse or, to outfall directly into a watercourse within the Board's area. Any approved development should not adversely affect the surface water drainage of the area and amenity of adjacent properties.

Please also note that the Board's prior consent is required for any development including fences or planting within 9.00m of the bank top of any watercourse within or forming the boundary of the site. Any proposals to culvert, bridge, fill in or make a discharge to the watercourse will also require the Board's prior consent, including any connection, or change in the rate of discharge, entering either a Board a maintained watercourse or an ordinary watercourse (directly or indirectly via a third party asset). Full details of the Boards Consent process can be found on the Boards website:- <http://www.yorkconsort.gov.uk/index.html>

For your information, for the Board to support discharge to a watercourse the Board would usually want an applicant to demonstrate that they have first considered infiltration and other sustainable drainage options, retaining the water on site wherever possible, and why those options have been discounted. The suitability of soakaways, as a means of surface water disposal, should be ascertained in accordance with BRE Digest 365 or other approved methodology.



drainage and a proven connection to the watercourse from the site.

The following criteria would then be considered:

- Any proposal to discharge surface water to a watercourse from the redevelopment of a brownfield site should first establish the extent of any existing discharge to that watercourse.
- Peak run-off from a brownfield site should be attenuated to 70% of any existing discharge rate (existing rate taken as 140lit/sec/ha or the established rate whichever is the lesser for the connected impermeable area).
- Discharge from “greenfield sites” taken as 1.4 lit/sec/ha (1:1yr storm).
- Storage volume should accommodate a 1:30 yr event with no surface flooding and no overland discharge off the site in a 1:100yr event.
- A 20% allowance for climate change should be included in all calculations.
- A range of durations should be used to establish the worst-case scenario.

Without evidence of an existing, current and viable connection to a watercourse the Board would usually resist discharge to the asset as this would represent a new flow and has the potential to increase the risk of flooding or land or property elsewhere.

I hope the above information is of assistance but if you require anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

*Bill Symons*

Bill Symons

Clerk to the Board

Email: [Planning@yorkconsort.gov.uk](mailto:Planning@yorkconsort.gov.uk)



William Symons Clerk to the Board

Derwent House, Crockey Hill, York, YO19 4SR ☎ Tel 01904 720785 🌐 [www.yorkconsort.gov.uk](http://www.yorkconsort.gov.uk)