



Highways and Engineering Service – Economy and Environment

DRAINAGE CONSULTATION ON APPLICATION – 25/00100/DOC - LAND ADJACENT TO 962 EDENFIELD ROAD NORDEN ROCHDALE OL12 7TN

LLFA Consultation Response on behalf of Head of Highways and Engineering

Date of Response: 5th June 2025

LOCATION & PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Submission of details to comply with condition 7 (Surface Water and Foul Drainage), 8 (Phase 1 and Phase 2 SI), 10 (Construction Method Statement), 11 (Road Condition Survey) and 13 (Coal Mining Report) of planning permission 23/01256/FUL (Erection of one detached dwelling following demolition of existing brick structure)

Land Adjacent To 962 Edenfield Road Norden Rochdale OL12 7TN

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- DRAINAGE STRATEGY-CONDITION 5 (25/00100/DOC)
- Planning Officer Decision, dated 18th January 2024 (23/01256/FUL)

DRAINAGE & FLOOD OFFICER COMMENTS

1. It is proposed to discharge attenuated surface water to a combined public sewer which is the bottom rung of the SuDS hierarchy and is not acceptable in principle.
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. Infiltration has been discounted based on a desk top appraisal. This would need to be supported with site-based testing and assessment before discharge to combined sewers could be considered.

The site is predominantly greenfield and does not appear to be a wet swampy area. Therefore, the rain falling on the site is currently draining off to somewhere and this should be mimicked as much as possible.
4. It is unclear if the impermeable paving is lined or infiltrating to ground. If the latter then why can't the roof drainage be similarly managed.
5. The strategy advises there are no public sewers in the vicinity. However, Fig 1 shows a water course to the east. This area has been redeveloped for Baiting Close but the watercourse may have been culverted and there is an open

watercourse which issues further east. Investigation of the upstream route / catchment for this may provide an alternative option.

In addition, records show public SW sewers in Wolstenholme Lane which may extend further upstream. Furthermore, there appears to be a separate sewer system in Baitings Close. It is noted that all modern developments in the area have separate sewer systems and therefore it seems unlikely that Baitings Close would only have a single combined system.

Therefore, alternative SW outfall options may be feasible and should be investigated further.

6. No green surface-based SuDS source controls (eg tree pits, raingardens, hydro planters etc) have been incorporated. These would provide some mitigation of runoff volumes if discharge to combined sewer should prove to be the only viable option.

DRAINAGE & FLOOD OFFICER SUMMARY:

- I. The proposal to discharge surface water to a combined sewer is not acceptable in principle.
- II. Alternative options should be comprehensively investigated / assessed.
- III. The above points should be addressed before the condition is discharged.

Consultation by Keith Mealey

Drainage & Flooding Officer

 keith.mealey@rochdale.gov.uk