



Highways and Engineering Service – Economy and Environment

DRAINAGE CONSULTATION ON APPLICATION – 25/00380 KENYON LANE MIDDLETON

LLFA Consultation Response on behalf of Head of Highways and Engineering

Date of Response: 22nd May 2025

LOCATION & PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Discharge of conditions 9 (drainage), 10 (drainage management of planning permission 22/01223/FUL | Land To Rear Of 19-47 Kenyon Lane, Middleton

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- Desk Study with Walkover Survey 7653 Rev 1 - (Ph 1 SI Report)
- Drainage Site Plan & Details 9758-ADS-XX-00-DR-C-501 Rev P3
- UU Consultation Response DC/25/1058 19/05/25
- InfoDrainage Calcs 05/03/25

DRAINAGE & FLOOD OFFICER COMMENTS

1. No drainage strategy report / document has been provided. The strategy is unclear on the drainage layout.
2. The aim should be to discharge surface run off as high up the following hierarchy of drainage options as reasonably practicable: The ordered drainage techniques to be assessed with the aim to reduce or omit lower techniques:
 - Control at Source (Infiltration / Recycling)
 - On Site Treatment (Basins, Swales, Rain gardens, Tree pits)
 - Local Treatment (Adoptable Ponds, Basins, Swales etc)
 - Regional Treatment (ditto usually to a larger scale)
 - Discharge to Watercourses / Bodies
 - Discharge to SW Sewers
 - Discharge to Combined Sewers
3. The proposal appears to be discharging roof drainage into areas of permeable paving. It is assumed there would be diffuser units at the discharge points.
4. The access road is permeable paving with an “encapsulated” underdrain. It is not clear what is meant by “encapsulated”.
5. The system has been modelled in InfoDrainage. It is not clear how the connection between the roof drainage and underdrain is represented in the model.
6. It is not clear if the permeable areas are infiltrating to ground or what infiltration rates are being used.
7. There is no site-based assessment of infiltration potential.
8. It is not clear if the connection from the underdrain to the combined sewer is intended as a primary route or an exceedance overflow route. If it is an exceedance route with the primary being via infiltration, then this is potentially acceptable. The connection will need to avoid receiving discharge from garden areas etc as UU may not accept land drainage into their systems. UU have also queried this in their response.

9. The calculations appear to indicate surcharging on the 2 year event and flooding on the 30 year event which is not acceptable in principle. It is noted that UU have raised a similar query.
10. There are potentially several specialist details incorporated and associated detail drawings should be submitted for review.

DRAINAGE & FLOOD OFFICER SUMMARY:

- i. The strategy should be clarified and supported with a report which explains the philosophy and modelling approach.
- ii. Site based assessment of infiltration should undertaken.
- iii. The system should be designed for no surcharge for a 1yr event (2yr if being adopted) and no flooding for a 30yr event.
- iv. The above points should be resolved before the condition 9 can be discharged.
- v. Condition 9 needs to be resolved, in principle, before condition 10 can be reviewed / considered.

Consultation by Keith Mealey

Drainage & Flooding Officer

 **Mob 0787 2500 722** / Office 01706 924657

 keith.mealey@rochdale.gov.uk