#### FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE APPRAISAL TECHNICAL NOTE



Project Name:	Keymer Road, Burgess Hill
Job No:	14-205
Note Title:	Flood Risk and SuDS Appraisal Technical Note
Author:	NM
Checked:	GG
Approved:	GG
Date:	July 2020

#### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Odyssey has been commissioned by Thakeham Homes to provide Flood Risk and Drainage Appraisal technical support for the potential local plan allocation for residential development of Land at Keymer Road, Burgess Hill.

1.2 The 15.3-hectare site is listed as site SA13 *"Land East of Keymer Road and South of Folders Lane, Burgess Hill"* in the Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) Site Allocations Development Plan (2019), and is described as a *"housing allocation with on site open space and children's equipped playspace"*.

1.3 This Technical Note sets out the existing site conditions, assesses the potential sources of flood risk to the site and potential surface water drainage options. Constraints and opportunities are identified with regards to flood risk and drainage.

# 2.0 EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS

#### 2.1 Site Location

2.1.1 The site is located east off of Keymer Road, Burgess Hill, Sussex, approximately 1.2 kilometres (km) south-east of Burgess Hill town centre. The Ordnance Survey (OS) grid reference for the centre of the site is 532122 East, 117748 North. The postcode for the site is RH15 0BA.

2.1.2 The site is currently greenfield land and is bound by existing residential development to the north, south and west, and existing treeline to the east. A site location plan can be found in **Appendix A**, and a concept masterplan can be found in **Appendix B**.



### 2.2 Topography

2.2.1 There is currently no topographical survey for the site. LiDAR data was utilised to provide level information at the site. The acquired data shows the site slopes from the north-west and south of the site to the centre. The highest level on site is approximately 66mAOD (Above Ordnance Datum), in the north-west and south of the site, while the lowest point is approximately 54mAOD in the centre. For topographical data, refer to **Appendix C**.

#### 2.3 Geology and Hydrogeology

2.3.1 British Geological Survey (BGS) online maps (accessed July 2020) indicate that the site sits on a bedrock of Weald Clay Formation – Mudstone. There are records of superficial deposits on site, although it is noted that there are superficial deposits of *"Alluvium – Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel"*, and *"Head – Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel"* in the south and east of the site.

2.3.2 BGS records (accessed July 2020) also show the site underlain with the Wealden Group aquifer, described as *"rocks with essentially no groundwater"*, where *"very small yields of often poor quality water have been obtained from subordinate sandstones and limestones"*. For BGS records, refer to **Appendix D**.

2.3.3 There are no borehole records available on the BGS database within the site boundary. Borehole scans in the vicinity of the site have been utilised to provide a picture of the geology in the surrounding area.

2.3.4 Scan TQ31NW1 was taken approximately 650m north-west of the site, and shows the following layers:

- Ground level 0.30m below ground level (bgl) Topsoil layer described as *"ashes, track ballast and pieces of chalk"*
- 0.30m 0.53m bgl "Dark soil with pea ballast and large round ballast";
- 0.53m 0.69m bgl "Very dark soil with mixture of small stones and brick";
- 0.69m 2.46m bgl Weathered chalk, described as "soft to very soft";
- 2.46m 2.62m bgl "Very light orange silty clay";
- 2.62m 2.84m bgl "Light brown silty clay";
- 2.84m 3.12m bgl "Dark grey silty clay";
- 3.12m 3.43m bgl "Soft greenish silty clay";
- 3.43m 4.22m bgl "Firm light brown/grey mottled silt clay";

FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE APPRAISAL TECHNICAL NOTE



- 4.22m 4.52m bgl "Light brown/grey mottled clay";
- 4.52m 4.88m bgl "Light brown/grey mottled clay with pea sandstone and ballast";
- 4.88m 6.33m bgl "Firm light brown/grey mottled fissured silt clay"; and,
- 6.33m 7.00m bgl "Very soft light brown/grey mottled silty clay" and "stiff light brown/grey mottled fissured clay".

2.3.5 Scan TQ31NW7 was taken approximately 1.0km to the south of the site, and shows Weald Clay extending down the borehole, in various forms:

- Ground level 20.7m bgl "Old bore";
- 20.7m 24.7m bgl *"Blue clay"*;
- 24.7m 25.3m bgl *"Brown soil"*;
- 25.3m 54.9m bgl *"Blue clay";* and,
- 54.9m 56.1m bgl *"Blue clay and rock".*

2.3.6 Scan TQ31NW13 was taken approximately 850m to the north-east of the site, and shows the following layers:

- Ground level 0.30m bgl Topsoil layer
- 0.30m 2.75m bgl Weald Clay, described as "firm ochre and grey mottled, silty CLAY";
- 2.75m 4.80m bgl Completely to highly weathered Weald Clay, described as "very stiff ochre with grey mottling very silty CLAY";
- 4.80m 9.85m bgl Highly to moderately weathered Weald Clay, described as *"very stiff, dark blue grey, silty CLAY"*; and,
- 9.85m 11.45m bgl Highly to moderately weathered Weald Clay.

2.3.7 The site is shown to be located outside any of the Environment Agency (EA) Groundwater Source Protection Zones (SPZ). The development should still adhere to the EA's '*Approach to Groundwater Protection*' policy, to ensure that groundwater quality is maintained and improved where practicable across the site.

2.3.8 The EA has recently updated their Groundwater Vulnerability Zones (GVZ) Map, this now includes six risk categories (Major Aquifer High, Major Aquifer Intermediate, Major Aquifer Low, Minor Aquifer High, Minor Aquifer Intermediate, and Minor Aquifer Low). The mapping summarises the overall risk to groundwater, considering groundwater vulnerability, the types of aquifer present (superficial and/or bedrock) and their designation status. The majority of the site is located in the *'Unproductive'* area, whilst there is a small area in the centre of the site at *"low"* risk.



2.3.9 It is noted that groundwater was not struck at any of the aforementioned borehole scans. It is therefore assumed that groundwater is at least 11.45m bgl on site.

2.3.10 Site specific groundwater monitoring should be conducted to determine the exact level of groundwater on site, as the borehole scans taken are too spread out and too far away from the site to make an accurate inference from. For BGS records, refer to **Appendix D**.

#### 2.4 Hydrology

2.4.1 The nearest EA designated Main River is located approximately 200m to the north-east of the site. For EA data, see **Appendix E**.

2.4.2 OS mapping and EA flood maps show an Ordinary Watercourse, which flows through the centre of the site.

#### 2.5 Existing Drainage Regime

2.5.1 Southern Water (SW) records show that there are no surface water sewers flowing across the site. A surface water sewer is located west of the site on Greenlands Drive flowing running in a north-westerly direction away from the site.

2.5.2 Southern Water records also show foul water sewers flowing along Folders Gardens and Woodwards Close to the north of the site, and Keymer Road to the west of the site. Refer to **Appendix F**.

2.5.3 It is anticipated that in its current state, surface water generated from the site discharges to the low point in the centre of the site, and into the Ordinary Watercourse before being conveyed away from the site. This surface water then flows into the Main River located 200m to the north-east of the site, before being channelled away from the site.

2.5.4 The developable area for this site is less than 50ha, meaning that the Institute of Hydrology (IoH) Report 124 Flood Estimation for Smaller Catchments (1994) method is suitable to estimate greenfield peak flow rates (50ha is used in the formula and linearly interpolates the flow rate value based on the ratio of the development area). This methodology is approved in the Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA) C753 Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) Guidance; the parameters used can be seen in **Table 2.1**.

FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE APPRAISAL TECHNICAL NOTE



Parameter	Value	Unit
SAAR	908	mm
Soil Index	0.450	-
Region	7	-
Urban	0.000	-

#### Table 2.1: Interim Code of Practice SuDS Parameters

2.5.5 **Table 2.2** summarises the estimated current greenfield discharge rates for the site. Calculations are provided in **Appendix G**.

#### Table 2.2 Existing Surface Water Discharge Rates

Return Period	Existing Greenfield Discharge Rates from site (I/s)	Existing Greenfield Discharge Rates per Hectare (I/s/ha)
QBAR	90.2	5.9
Q30	204.4	13.4
Q <sub>100</sub>	287.7	18.8

#### 3.0 SOURCES OF FLOOD RISK

#### 3.1 Fluvial Flooding

3.1.1 Fluvial flooding is caused by high flows in rivers or streams exceeding the capacity of the river channel and spilling into the floodplain, or in some cases non-designated floodplain, which can occur after a period of heavy rainfall.

3.1.2 The EA Flood Map for Planning (accessed July 2020) shows that the site is primarily located in Flood Zone 1, which comprises land assessed as *"having less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding (<0.1% Annual Exceedance Probability [AEP])"*.

3.1.3 The flood risk vulnerability classification of dwellings is deemed as *"more vulnerable"*. In accordance with the Planning Policy Guidance (PPG), development of this nature in Flood Zone 1 is acceptable.



3.1.4 There are no known historic records of the site being affected by fluvial flooding, and the MSDC Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) states one property is at risk of flooding from rivers and sea in the Burgess Hill area. The risk of flooding from fluvial sources is therefore considered to be very low. For EA flood map records, refer to **Appendix E**.

# 3.2 Surface Water Flooding

3.2.1 Surface water (pluvial) flooding usually occurs during high intensity rainfall, when the excess water cannot be absorbed into the ground. However, it can also occur with low intensity rainfall in areas where the land has a low permeability.

3.2.2 The EAs Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) shows a surface water flow route, associated with the Ordinary Watercourse, flowing through the site from north-east to south-west. This flow route contains areas at *'low'*, *'medium'* and *'high'* risk. These risk areas should be incorporated into the masterplan as public open space, to avoid locating any in areas of risk.

3.2.3 The MSDC SFRA contains a table which states 2,500 properties in Burgess Hill are at risk of surface water flooding. However, there are no known records of the site or immediate vicinity being affected by pluvial flooding. As a result, the risk of pluvial flooding is considered to be low.

# 3.3 Groundwater Flooding

3.3.1 Groundwater flooding is caused by the emergence of water originating from sub-surface permeable strata. A groundwater flood event results from a rise in groundwater level sufficient for the water table to intersect the ground surface and inundate low lying land. Periods of prolonged rainfall may also be a cause of groundwater flooding with aquifers and soils becoming saturated.

3.3.2 The MSDC SFRA discusses the existing levels of groundwater risk in the district, and states that 'the majority of the district is considered to have medium potential for groundwater flooding, however a small area within the South Downs National Park is considered to have high potential for flooding from this source'.

3.3.3 Nearby BGS borehole scans do not show records of groundwater, and the site is underlain on the Wealden Group aquifer, described as *"rocks with essentially no groundwater"*. Furthermore, in accordance with updated EA GVZ Mapping, the site is deemed to be at *"unproductive"* and *"low"* risk of groundwater.



3.3.4 There are no records of the site being affected by historic groundwater flooding. Considering the available information, the risk of flooding from groundwater is considered to be very low.

### 3.4 Sewer Flooding

3.4.1 Flooding can occur due to the failure of existing foul or surface water drainage infrastructure. If flows within the drainage system exceed the designed capacity or foreign matter causes blockages, overflow to the surface can occur leading to flooding.

3.4.2 There are no public sewers within the site boundary. The MSDC SFRA contains information on the risk of sewer flooding. It is stated that *"the data identified incidents in Bolney, Burgess Hill"* and other locations. It is further stated within the SFRA that *"Burgess Hill was previously known to have experienced regular sewer flooding"*. However, there are no records of the site itself being affected by flooding, and therefore the risk is considered to be low. For SW records, see **Appendix F**.

#### 4.0 SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE STRATEGY OPTIONS

### 4.1 Surface Water Drainage Strategy Requirements

4.1.1 Any surface water drainage strategy must demonstrate that the proposed development can be drained in a sustainable manner, commensurate with local and national policy. The National Planning Policy Framework requires flood risk to land and property is not increased as a result of new development.

4.1.2 A fundamental principle of sustainable development in terms of flood risk is the reduction of surface water runoff from new developments. Drainage calculations for this site have been carried out to ensure that any discharge is limited to equivalent greenfield rates or lower, in order to avoid increasing flood risk downstream.

# 4.2 Proposed Surface Water Management Strategy

4.2.1 Preliminary Micro Drainage calculations have been prepared, and can be found in **Appendix G**.

4.2.2 The current PPG sets out the following hierarchy for discharge of surface water, in descending order of preference:

#### FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE APPRAISAL TECHNICAL NOTE



- *"Into the ground (infiltration);*
- to a surface water body;
- to a surface water sewer;
- to a combined sewer."

4.2.3 The most preferred option of the drainage hierarchy is *"into the ground (infiltration)"*. The underlying geology of the site is Weald Clay Formation – Mudstone; which is known to be an impermeable bedrock. Furthermore, it is stated in the Mid Sussex SFRA *"due to the geology of the Burgess Hill area, poor permeability is likely to limit the effectiveness of SuDS that promote infiltration; however some infiltration may still be achieved"*.

4.2.4 Owing to this, infiltration is not considered a feasible option of surface water discharge, although on site soakage testing, in accordance with Building Research Establishment (BRE) 365 principles, should be conducted to confirm this.

4.2.5 The second-most preferred option of the drainage hierarchy is *"to a surface water body*". As previously mentioned, an Ordinary Watercourse flows through the centre of the site, from northeast to south-west. This watercourse is considered a suitable point to discharge runoff generated by the proposed development.

4.2.6 SuDS features should be incorporated into the development to help capture, attenuate and treat the surface water flows on site, before discharging into the Ordinary Watercourse. 'On parcel' measures such as permeable paving and cellular storage tanks could be designed to accept the runoff from impermeable areas on site, before discharging flows to attenuation basins (suitably designed and located at low points on the site).

4.2.7 These attenuation basins should be the final point of storage before flows are discharged at a controlled rate ( $Q_{BAR}$ ) to the ordinary watercourse running through the site.

4.2.8 The site should be split into catchments, based on the indicative site layout and the natural topography of the site. SuDS features would be suitably designed and implemented to drain each catchment, mimicking the existing drainage regime.

4.2.9 Attenuation basins should be designed in 3D from an early stage to ensure they provide an accurate picture of the footprint required to suitably drain the relevant catchments. It is recommended attenuation basins do not exceed 1.5m depth, and cater for 1 in 4 side slopes (to accord with both CIRIA, and Health and Safety recommendations).



4.2.10 Any SuDS features proposed for the site would be sized to attenuate flows from all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change storm. Flow controls would be fitted to the outfall of any SuDS features to ensure the discharge is restricted to the agreed flows. The overall discharge from the SuDS features to the Ordinary Watercourse would be equal to the Q<sub>BAR</sub> rate for the site (90.2 litres per second). This would ensure greenfield conditions are being maintained, and the flood risk on site and to downstream areas is not exacerbated by the proposed development during the design return period.

4.2.11 A Quick Storage Estimate (QSE) was conducted to understand, at a high-level, the volume of attenuation that would be needed for the proposed development. This was undertaken assuming an impermeable area of 65% of the total site area. Once a detailed site layout is obtained, more detailed drainage calculations can be undertaken to provide a more accurate understanding of the attenuation requirements for the proposed development. The results of the QSE can be seen below in **Figures 4.1** and **4.2**.

licito	CCD D-1-6-II		7		
Drainage	FSR Raintall	`	Cv (Summer)	0.750	
	Return Period (years)	100	Cv (Winter)	0.840	
Variables	Region Englan	d and Wales 🔍 🗸	Impermeable Area (ha)	9.945	
Results	Map M5-60 (	nm) 20.000	Maximum Allowable Discharge (1/s)	90.2	
Design	Ratio R	0.350	Infiltration Coefficient (m/hr)	0.00000	
boongin			Safety Factor	2.0	
Overview 2D			Climate Change (%)	40	
Overview 3D					
Vt					
			Analyse OK	Cancel	Help

#### Figure 4.1: Quick Storage Estimate Variables

FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE APPRAISAL TECHNICAL NOTE



#### Figure 4.2: Quick Storage Estimate Results

in the second	Results
Micro Drainage	Global Variables require approximate storage of between 5790 m <sup>3</sup> and 8285 m <sup>3</sup> . These values are estimates only and should not be used for design purposes.
Variables	
Results	
Design	
Overview 2D	
Overview 3D	
Vt	
	Analyze OK Cancel Hole

4.2.12 The attenuation volume required for the site is shown to be  $5790 - 8285m^3$ . To adopt a conservative approach, it should be assumed that  $8285m^3$  of storage would be required; although this figure may be reduced once accurate catchments for the site have been calculated.

4.2.13 An allowance for urban creep would be included in the SuDS calculations for each catchment, by adding 10% of all roof areas into the total impermeable area.

4.2.14 Drawings would be produced showing exceedance routes; pathways and strategies for managing surface water in the event that the proposed drainage network is inundated and cannot accept any more surface water.

4.2.15 The Ordinary Watercourse and the associated surface water flow route running through the centre of the site should be maintained, and left undeveloped to ensure that the extent is not worsened, to protect dwellings and to avoid impacting the natural watercourse.

#### 4.3 Water Quality

4.3.1 Water quality is a key component of a SuDS system. Steps would be taken to ensure water quality on site and leaving the site is not negatively impacted by the proposed development. Table
4.1 details the Pollution Hazard Indices of the different land use classifications of the site, in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS Manual (2015) C753.



Land Use	Pollution Hazard Level	Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	Metals	Hydro- carbons
Residential roofs	Very Low	0.2	0.2	0.05
Individual property driveways, residential car parks, low traffic roads (e.g. cul-de-sacs, home zones and general access roads) and non-residential car parking with infrequent change (e.g. schools, offices) i.e. <300 traffic movements/day	Low	0.5	0.4	0.4

#### Table 4.1: Pollution Hazard Indices for Proposed Development

4.3.2 Based on **Table 4.1** above, the pollution hazard level for the proposed development is anticipated to be 'low'. All surface water generated by the proposed development would be directed through at least one SuDS feature, providing flows with suitable water quality treatment before they are discharged from the site to the Ordinary Watercourse. In the anticipation an attenuation basin and/or permeable paving would be implemented as part of the proposed development; the indicative SuDS mitigation indices for these features can be seen in **Table 4.2**.

#### Table 4.2: SuDS Mitigation Indices for Proposed SuDS Features

Type of SuDS Component	Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	Metals	Hydrocarbons
Permeable Paving	0.7	0.6	0.7
Attenuation Basin	0.7	0.7	0.5

4.3.3 Based on the above table, surface water generated by the proposed development would receive adequate water quality treatment before it is discharged to the Ordinary Watercourse.

#### 4.4 Foul Drainage Strategy

4.4.1 The foul water sewer company operating within the vicinity of the development proposal is SW.



4.4.2 Peak design foul discharges would be calculated based on the Sewers for Adoption 8<sup>th</sup> Edition Residential Domestic Flow Rate:

Residential domestic flow = 4000 litres/dwelling/day (peak)

4.4.3 It is proposed the foul flows from the site connect into the existing SW foul sewer system running along Keymer Road, at manhole reference 8802. This would be achieved through the implementation of a foul pumping station, which would pump the flows to the proposed connection point via a rising main.

4.4.4 If any upgrades to the network are required as a result of the proposed development, the cost for these works would be covered by SW as part of their updated improvement works funded by infrastructure charges. Subsequently, a Water Industry Act (WIA) Section 106 connection would be made to obtain permission from SW to connect to the public sewer. For SW records, refer to **Appendix F**.

#### 5.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Odyssey has been commissioned by Thakeham Homes to provide Flood Risk and Drainage Appraisal technical support for the proposed residential development of Land at Keymer Road, Burgess Hill.

5.2 The 15.3-hectare site is listed as site SA13 *"Land East of Keymer Road and South of Folders Lane, Burgess Hill"* in the Mid Sussex District Council Site Allocations Development Plan (2019), and has the description of a *"housing allocation with on site open space and children's equipped playspace"*. There is an indicative scope for 300 dwellings on the site.

5.3 A surface water drainage strategy would be designed to incorporate suitable SuDS measures, to ensure the site drains in a manner commensurate with local and national policy. Infiltration rates are not expected to be sufficient to propose infiltration as a method of surface water discharge. Infiltration potential should be confirmed via on site soakage testing, to ascertain site-specific infiltration rates.

5.4 It is anticipated the most feasible method of surface water discharge would be *"to a surface water body"*; the second most-preferred option of the drainage hierarchy as set out in the PPG. Surface water flows generated from the proposed development would pass through suitably designed SuDS features before discharging to the Ordinary Watercourse flowing through the centre of the site.



5.5 The proposed SuDS measures would ensure that surface water generated by the proposed development receives adequate water quality before discharging downstream, to reduce the risk of pollution to the Ordinary Watercourse. SuDS features are expected to consist of permeable paving and/or an attenuation basin, determined at the outline stage of the scheme and informed by soakage tests. Any discharge offsite would be limited to  $Q_{BAR}$  equivalent rates, to ensure that flood risk to downstream areas is not exacerbated by the proposed development during flood events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change event.

5.6 It is proposed that the foul flows from the site should connect into the existing Southern Water foul sewer system running along Keymer Road, at manhole reference 8802. This would be achieved through the implementation of a foul pumping station, which should send the flows to the proposed connection point via a rising main. Any necessary infrastructure upgrades would be covered by Southern Water as part of their updated costing scheme.

5.7 This Technical Note has set out existing site conditions, assessed the potential sources of flood risk to the site and potential surface water drainage options, and identified constraints and opportunities with regards to flood risk and drainage. This report demonstrates no major issues from a flood risk or drainage perspective that would pose a constraint to the allocation of the proposed development.

# APPENDIX A

Site Location Plan



APPENDIX B

Concept Masterplan



© CSA Landscapes Ltd. Do not scale from this drawing. Refer to figured dimensions only.

	Polders Lane east to Ditching Common	0       20       40       60         Image: Site Boundary and draft (Policy number SA13): A       Proposed developable         Image: Proposed developable       Up to 265 dwellings @ 3         Movement and Infrastructure       Proposed vehicular accord         Image: Proposed spine streets       Proposed spine streets         Image: Proposed spine streets       Proposed green infrastructure and Public         Image: Proposed green infrastricture       Proposed green infrastricture         Image: Proposed green infrastricture       Proposed green infrastricture         Image: Proposed free, hedgerd       Proposed free, hedgerd         Image: Proposed locations for accord       Proposed locations for accord         Image: Proposed recreational free planting       Proposed recreational free planting         Image: Proposed recreational free planting       Proposed recreational free planting         Image: Proposed recreational free planting       Proposed recreational free planting         Image: Proposed recreational free planting       Proposed recreational free planting         Image: Proposed recreational free planting       Proposed recreational free planting         Image: Proposed recreational free planting       Image: Planting         Image: Proposed recreational free planting       Image: Planting         Image: Plantid plant plantistic free plantid busing       I	t allocation upprox. 15.17ha area: 7.50ha sdph cess points eets and private c open Space ucture and area: 7.50ha solution contes survey) thion Orders (TPO) ow and thicket istainable Drainage bject to drainage input) children's play routes cs and existing bus stops Park ruscape Value .2018)
Possible and should form an integral part of the Site's network of new open spaces		B 28/04/20 BS Propose A 21/01/20 SM Spine str Rev Date By Descript CCSSA e n v i r o n m e n t a l Dixies Barns, High Street, Ashwell, Hertfordshire SG7 5N t 01462 743647	d planting amended eet amended ion
Grade II The Well Cottage	*SUBJECT TO FURTHER ADVICE	e ashwell@csaenvironme w csaenvironmental.co.u Project Land East of Key of Folders Lane, Title Concept Master Client Persimmon Hon & Thakeham Scale 1:2000 @ A2 Date Nov 2019 Drawing No. CSA/4007/104	ntal.co.uk k mer Road & South Burgess Hill rplan nes Thames Valley Drawn SM Checked CA Rev B

APPENDIX C

Topographical Data



APPENDIX D

**British Geological Survey Records** 

# 14-205 Bedrock Geology





Contains OS data © Crown Copyright and database right 2019

GeoIndex Onshore Data Sources: NERC, Natural England, English Heritage and Ordnance Survey

# Map Key

Bedrock geology 1:50,000 scale

- HORSHAM STONE MEMBER SANDSTONE
- WEALD CLAY FORMATION SANDSTONE
- LOWER GREENSAND GROUP SANDSTONE, SILTY
- WEALD CLAY FORMATION SILICATE-CLAYSTONE
- GAULT FORMATION MUDSTONE
- WEALD CLAY FORMATION MUDSTONE
- UPPER TUNBRIDGE WELLS SAND SILTSTONE, MUDSTONE AND SANDSTONE
- WEALD CLAY FORMATION CLAY-IRONSTONE
- WEST MELBURY MARLY CHALK FORMATION CHALK
- UPPER GREENSAND FORMATION SILTSTONE AND SANDSTONE
- **FOLKESTONE FORMATION SANDSTONE**
- WEALD CLAY FORMATION LIMESTONE

**Selection Results** 

# 14-205 Superficial Deps





Contains OS data © Crown Copyright and database right 2019

GeoIndex Onshore Data Sources: NERC, Natural England, English Heritage and Ordnance Survey

# Map Key

Superficial deposits 1:50,000 scale

- ALLUVIUM CLAY, SILT, SAND AND GRAVEL
- HEAD CLAY, SILT, SAND AND GRAVEL
- RIVER TERRACE DEPOSITS, 2 (ADUR) SAND AND GRAVEL

**Selection Results** 

# 14-205 Hydrogeology





Contains OS data © Crown Copyright and database right 2019

GeoIndex Onshore Data Sources: NERC, Natural England, English Heritage and Ordnance Survey

# Map Key

#### Hydrogeology 1:625,000 scale

- Aquifers with significant intergranular flow
- Highly productive aquifer
- Moderately productive aquifer
- Low productivity aquifer
  - Aquifers in which flow is virtually all through fractures and other discontinuities
- Highly productive aquifer
- Moderately productive aquifer
- Low productivity aquifer
- Rocks with essentially no groundwater

**Selection Results** 



TOBINW 7 3235.1665 318/78 Court Gardens Farm, Ditchling. (Disused) Surface +220. Bore 68. Lining tubes: 65 × 4 in. R.W.L. +180. Suction +155%. Harper, Dec. 1933. Deepened. Lining tubes: 165 × 4 in; 76 × 3 in. R.W.L. +185. Harper, July 1934. R.W.L. +217. Yield 4,000 g.p.d. Mar. 1940. WC .... 184 184 1 , 019 PONE . **R**Y 1. 68 Blue clay 81 13 Brown "Soil" [Sic] Weald Clay 83 2 Blue clay 94 180 Blue day of rock 184 Q 4 BNtish Geological Survey British Geologica**;** Sune LONDON, S.W. 7. (24738C). Wt 260301095 11/36 5 000

TQ 3236 1665 318/78 Court Gardens Farm, Ditchling. (Disused)  $\neg \phi 3$ Surface +220. Bore 68. Lining tubes: 65 x 4 in. R.W.L. +180. Harper, Dec. 1933. Suction Deepened. Lining tubes: 165 × 4 in; 76 × 3 in. R.W.L. +186. Harper, July 1934. R.W.L. +217. Yield 4,000 g.p.d. Mar. 1940. WC ... 184 184 Old bone 68 Blue clay 81 13 Brown " Soil" [sic] weald clay 83 2 Blue clay L Blue day & Poch 180 94 184 4

The second second and a second s

Atz Court Gar	Ditchling		Ref	740	
Town or Village	County	Six-inch q	uarter si	<b>T</b> .C	<b>F</b> <sup>1</sup>
Pract site	British Goological Survey			tracing	froi
I eval of ground and	in parish of $\frac{1}{2}$	l an <del>c</del> faco a	) map	is very o	lesira
Shaftft. d	liameter ft. Bore $68$ ft. Diameter of bore : at top.	ins	ate now	ttom	
Details of permanen	nt lining tubes (internal diameters preferred) 65 ft. of 4" T	ube.			_
		-1	ųς	413	7
Water struck at de	pths of (feet)				,
Rest-level of water	below top of well 40 feet. Suction at feet.	Yield	on	no da	ays'
gallons j	per	sing water	level to		
below top. Time	e of recoveryhrs. Amount normally pumped daily	{	g.p.h. for.		ho
Sunk by Harr	by of analysis if available). $J_{e}$ $K_{e}$ $H_{e}$ $J_{e}$ Muggeridge	Date o	f well De	cember	, 19
Information from		Eriteh	Ganlanical St		
(For Survey use only).	. ос н., ц., ц., це wes	THIC	KNESS	DE	РТН
GEOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION.	(and any additional remarks).	Feet.	Inches.	Feet.	Inch
	Silted h ft.				
	N1105U 4 1 Ve				
					*-*-*******
	Deepened, the 1934 record.				
					· ·
Bitish Geological Survey	British Geological Survey	Dritsh	leological Si		********
	DATA Bank				-
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
•					
,*					
Eilish Geological Survey	British Geological Survey	6111511	Geological S	10)	
	-				
1		ŧ1	· I	1	

**RECORD** of WELL or BORING Court Gardens, Ditchling at (bouse or farm). ... Sussex Six-inch ma Town, Village, &c. County Popular Edition Sheet Exact site (unless a tracing from a map is supplied, give distance and direction from parish church, cross-roads, or other object shown on maps). of one-inch map. Square Surface level of ground\_\_\_\_\_\_ft. above Ordnance Datum. Well or Bore commenced at\_\_\_\_\_ Sunk\_\_\_\_\_ft., diameter\_\_\_\_\_ft. Bored. Details of lining tubes (internal diameters preferred) Total depth of borehole 184 ft.; old bore 68 ft. additional bore 116 ft.: water level 34 ft. from surface. ""'x 4"; 76 x 3" and additional bore 116 ft .: water level 34 ft. from surface Water struck at depths of (feet) Rest-level of water below top of well or bore 34 ft. Fumping level\_\_\_\_\_ft. Time of recovery\_\_\_\_ hours. ....galls. per... \_\_\_\_, (ii) normal\_\_\_ Suction at\_\_\_\_ ft. depth. Yield: (i) on test. galls. per... Ouality (attach copy of analysis if available). Date of boring July, 1934 J. Muggeridge Made by Harper & Eede, Ltd. for Mr. Information from C.B. Wedd, Esq. DEPTH. THICKNESS. (For Survey use only). GEOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION. NATURE OF STRATA. Feet. Inches. Feet. Inches (and any additional remarks) 68 Old bore 81 13 Blue clay 2 83 Brown "soil" sic Weals 97 180 Blue clay da 184 Blue clay and rock Ry. 9509/30 25th 1940 [Court Garden Guernsey Farm March fite plan obtained . O. D. + 250. 6 m 39 pussex S. W Reat level 2/1. down. field 4000 g.p. day. the. Visited. Now Mr. Widdicabe Site concerted Bore with again in middle of field - no pump how Disused. Hay be brought it's use for callle as trouble with small diameter mains pipe. Has been passed and for cattle only. AD-+ 220. 20.5.59 ask. From Grin Sussen 39 For Survey use only. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY AND MUSEUM, M, of H. notified. Site marked Date SOUTH KENSINGTON, G.S.M. (24738C) Wt 25930/295 5,000 11/38 H, J, R & L, Ld Op 616 on 1" map. received. LONDON, S.W.7. 1/18

itish Geo	Contract No	DREI:OLE LC Approx: Location 532 550 E 118 655 N	ың т )G	$\begin{array}{c c} & & & & \\ \hline \hline & & \\ \hline \hline & & \\ \hline & & \\ \hline \hline & & \\ \hline \hline \\ \hline & & \\ \hline \hline \\ \hline & & \\ \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline$
	Description of Strata British Geological Survey	Depth Legend Jelow British Geol (G.t.s(m))	O.D. Level (m)	Sampling "t\"/ and Coring Britsh Geological Survey
Ī	TOPSOIL	0.30	49.60	0.35
	Firm ochre and grey mottled, silty CLAY. (completely weathered Weald Clay)			
itish Ged	logical Survey British Geologic	al Suntry		Einish Geological Survey
		2.75	-47.15	2,30
	Very stiff ochre with grey mottling very silty CLAY. (completely to highly weathered Weal Clay).	d		3.60 Britsh Geological Survey 46
ilish Ged	Very stiff, dark blue grey, silty CLAY with mudstone horizons. British Geologica (highly to moderately weathered Weald Clay).	4.80	45,10	4.80-5.30 en Geo 5.030 urvey 116 
	British Geological Survey	X and the second		• 7.00-7.40 Britsh Geologic II Survey 7.70 45 • 8.30-9.00
ilish Geo	ogical Survey British Geologica	al Sun X X 9.85	40.05	9.40 S
	Remarks (Observations	of Ground Water etc.)		
	Type of Sample British Gawogical Survey Is S.P.T. Undisturbed	to assist bori British Geological Survey	ng.	British Geological Survey
	Ic. C.P.T. X Vane			

Client <u>Rest. Sussc</u> Method of Boring <u>PerCu</u> Diameter of Borchole20	C.C ssion 4 mm				Chainage. Ground L		m./	4.0.D.
British Geological Survey	of Strata	Legand British Geol	Depth Below GL.(m)	O.D. Level (m)		Sampling and Coring Britis	"N"/ sh Geological	Survey
Very stiff, dark bl CLAY, with mudstone 45 mm thick. (highly to moderate Weald Clay).	uc grey, silty horizons up to ly weathered		11.45	38,30	3	11.00	177	
sh Geological Survey	British Geologica	l Surrey			Brit	sh Geological Survey		
			•					
British Geological Survey		British Geol	Igical Survey	÷		Britis	h Geological	Survey
			4					
	<i></i>							
sh Geological Survey	British Geologica	I Survey			l n	sh Geological Survey		2
								1
	1974 1974							
British Geological Survey	Χ.	British Geol	gical Survey			Briti	h Geological	Survey
9.69	a							
sh Geological Survey	British Geologica	l Sumey			17	sh Geological Survey		
	2						6	n 9
	Remarks (Observations of	Ground Wa	ter etc.)		I			<u> </u>
Type of Sample British Geological Survey		British Geol	ogical Survey			Briti	sh Geological	Survey
Is S.P.T. Undisturbed	Water added	to assis	t bori	ng.				2

APPENDIX E

**Environment Agency Data** 



# Flood map for planning

Your reference **14-205** 

Location (easting/northing) ( 532109/117823

Created **13 Jul 2020 15:48** 

Your selected location is in flood zone 1, an area with a low probability of flooding.

# This means:

- you don't need to do a flood risk assessment if your development is smaller than 1 hectare and not affected by other sources of flooding
- you may need to do a flood risk assessment if your development is larger than 1 hectare or affected by other sources of flooding or in an area with critical drainage problems

#### Notes

The flood map for planning shows river and sea flooding data only. It doesn't include other sources of flooding. It is for use in development planning and flood risk assessments.

This information relates to the selected location and is not specific to any property within it. The map is updated regularly and is correct at the time of printing.

The Open Government Licence sets out the terms and conditions for using government data. https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/



© Environment Agency copyright and / or database rights 2018. All rights reserved. © Crown Copyright and database right 2018. Ordnance Survey licence number 100024198.



Extent of flooding from surface water

High OMedium Low Very low

**APPENDIX F** 

Southern Water Records



# SEWER RECORDS PAGE 2 OF 2

Cover	Invert	Size	Material	Shape		Node	Cover	Invert	Size	Material	Shape		Node	Cover	Invert	Size	Material	Shape	Node	Cover	Invert	Size	Material	Shape
60.18 60.67	58.63	150 150 150 150	VC VC VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC		6153Y 6154X 6161X 6162X	48.85 52.2	47.63 50.96	300 150 150 150	VC VC VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC	*												
54.52	52.32	150 150 150	VC VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC		6163X 6801X 6802X	51.26 51.7	50.22 50.77	150 150 150	VC VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC													
54.374	52.864	150 300 UNK	VC PP VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC		6803X 6804X 6805X 6805X	50.47 49.82 50.51	49.28 49.82 49.87	300 300 150	VC VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC													
55.57 54.51	54.27 53.1	150 150 225	VC VC VC PP	CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC		6807X 6808X 6809X			150 UNK UNK	VC VC UNK UNK	CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC													
53.94 54.913	51.44 54.213	150 300 100	VC PP VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC		6811X 6812X 681DX	52.509 54.02 50.84	50.63 51.7 49.36	150 150 150	VC VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC													
		100 100 100 150		CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC		682DX 6851X 6852X 6853X	51.38 51.28 52.51	50.55 50.23 51 19	150 150 300 225		CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC													
53.89 54.41	51.99 53.1	225 150 UNK	VC VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC		6854X 6855X 6856X	52.64 50.27 49.62	51.17 49.45 48.82	225 300 300	VC VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC													
59.18 59.95 53.22	57.47 58.05 51.86	150 150 150	VC VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC		6901X 6902X 6951X	57.38	55.77 55.36	UNK UNK 150	UNK UNK VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC													
		100 UNK UNK	PF VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC		7001X 7002X 7003X	65.21 66.36 63.38	63.17 63.69 60.96	150 150 150		CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC													
59.82	58.34	100 UNK 150	PF VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC		7004X 7051X 7052X	66.38 65.19 63.28	64.47 62.82 60.66	150 150 150		CIRC CIRC CIRC													
56.12 52.18 52.33	54.91 50.92 51.38	150 150 150 150		CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC		7102X 7103X 7103X 7104X	03.33		220 150 UNK UNK	VC VC UNK UNK	CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC													
53.05 57.69	51.75 54.95	150 225 150		CIRC CIRC CIRC		710DX 7801X 7802X	57.72 60.15	55 57.7	225 150 150		CIRC CIRC CIRC													
ວວ. <del>0</del> 6 55.04	54.02	UNK UNK 150	VC VC VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC		7852X 7852X 7952X 8101X	59.99 55.02 58.42 64.02	58.78 54 56.91 62.17	150 150 150 150	VC VC VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC													
58.41 59.63 58.62	55.65 56.94 56.01	150 150 150	PF VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC		8103X 812DX 813DX		5	100 100 100	VC VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC													
58.16 58.27 58.27 59.52	55.75	150 150 150	VC VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC	*	814DX 8801X 8802X 9001Y	59.75 59.45	57.81 58.07	100 150 150	VC VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC													
58.58 58.24 49.17	55.8 55.4 47.68	150 150 150		CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC		9002X 9101X 9102X	64.02 63.48	60.73 60.69	150 150 150	UNK VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC													
53.25 53.25 58.39	53.25 51.13	150 150 150	VC VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC	* * *	9103X 9104X 9105X			UNK UNK UNK	UNK UNK UNK	CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC													
58.13 58.13		150 150 150 150		CIRC CIRC CIRC CIRC	*	911DX 914DX	59.99		150 150	VC UNK	CIRC CIRC CIRC													
49 49.03 48.85	47.57 47.61 47.63	300 300 225	VC VC VC	CIRC CIRC CIRC	*																			
	LINE ST	YLES / COLOU	JRS AK AIk	MATERIALS	Manhole (SW)		-O <sup>wo</sup> Washout	LEGEND - SE	NERS	r (s) —	WIW Wastewater In	ment works												
	¥ ¥ Red	Foul Syphon Sev Foul Vacuum Ma Foul Rising Main Combined	wer BAC Bo BRC Bri ain BRE Bri CC Co CI Ca CO Co	nded Asbestos Cernen ck (Common) ck (Engineering) ncrete Box Culvert st Iron ncrete (In-Situ)	Manhole (F&C)	sw)	Wo     Washout     Re     Rodding	(F&C) ye (SW) ye (F&C) point (SW)	Char Char Char Char Char Reflu	nge In sewer (s)	Marine treatme Outfall headwo VT Vent Vent Column	works s k			Γ	Drawr	bv:	okunevf						
	S S	S Combined Sypho Combined Rising Lateral Drain Building Over Ag	on Sewer CP Co g Main CSB Co CSU Co DI Du greement Area GRC Gla GRP Gla	ncrete (Pre-Cast) ncrete Segments (bolt ncrete Segments (unb ctile Iron ass Reinforced Concre ass Reinforced Plastic	e Bind shaft (F&C)	le (SW)	Gauging C Intercept ST Storm Ta ST Storm Ta	chamber (SW)	Flap Flap Casc Casc Casc Valve Valve Close	varve B cade %O- de e e ed Valve	Blank end Head of Public Micro Pumping SHAPES (S	ewer tation				Title:	361907	7 1 Folders Gardens	Burg		<b>y</b>	Sout	thern	
	Purple	Treated Effluent     Sludge     Sewer Catchmer     Section 104 Area	MAC Ma MAR Ma nt PE Pol PF Pitu a PP Pol	sonry in regular Cours sonry in random Cours yethylene ch Fibre ypropylene	Elector station (S Elector station (F8 wo Watertight door (S wo Watertight door (S	W) &C) \$W) =&C)	VC Vortex ch     Vortex ch     Vortex ch     Label ellip     Dummv/5	amber (SW) amber (F&C) se 24 manhole	Air V HB Hatcl HB Hatcl HB Direc	/alve // h box (SW) // h box (F&C) // ction arrow //	A Arched R B Barrel S C Circular T E Egg U H Horseshoe X	actangular quare apazoidal Shape ther SYSTEM			-	Datar			5				vater	
	Light Blue — — —	- Surface Water	PVC Pol RPM Re Ising Main SI Sp	yvinyl Chloride inforced Plastic Matrix un Iron	FC Flushing ch. Mn-e	(SW)	-( Outfall	chamber	t <sup>EM</sup> Empl	tying valve 1st d	igit: hundred metre eastin	ororeivi identifier				Date:		28/11/2019						

# APPENDIX G

Preliminary Micro Drainage Calculations

Odyssey Markides LLP		Page 1
Tuscany House	Land at Keymer Road	
White Hart Lane	Burgess Hill	
Basingstoke RG21 4AF	14-205 - QBAR	Mirco
Date 13/07/2020 11:27	Designed by NM	Dcainago
File 14-205.SRCX	Checked by GG	Diamage
Micro Drainage	Source Control 2020.1	

ICP SUDS Mean Annual Flood

Input

Return	Period	(ye	ears)	100		Soil	0.4	50
	Ar	ea	(ha)	15.300		Urban	0.00	00
	SA	AR	(mm)	900	Region	Number	Region	7

#### Results 1/s

QBAR Rural 90.2 QBAR Urban 90.2 Q100 years 287.7 Q1 year 76.7 Q30 years 204.4 Q100 years 287.7