

From: Liz Fitzgerald

Sent: 01 February 2017 19:46

To: Mark Peacock

Subject: RE: Planning Application 6/2016/2688/FULL - Yodel Hatfield Business Park Frobisher Way Hatfield AL10 9TR

Dear Mark,

Thank you for your email enclosing the consultation response to planning application 6/2016/2688/FULL at Yodel Hatfield Business Park. We have reviewed the comments made and consider the request to be excessive given the nature of the works proposed.

The fundamental point that I believe there is some disagreement on is the scale and nature of the development, and what detail of FRA that necessitates. We agree that the red line boundary of the site is 6.76ha and therefore an FRA is required. However, the expansion of the impermeable area is 0.27ha and is for alterations to an existing car park. If the FRA was for development leading to an impermeable area increase of 6.76ha the potential risk would be much greater and would be reflected in the FRA. We therefore maintain that the submitted FRA is appropriate for the scale and nature of the proposals.

We further note that we have not found any records of flooding to the site and therefore there is no evidence to suggest that the existing pipe network is insufficient (and again note that it has been constructed specifically for surface water management and storage associated with this Business Park). To ensure that the existing system could take the flows, a hydraulic model of the entire existing system (both within and external to the Yodel site boundary) would need to be constructed, which would be prohibitively expensive given the scope of the proposed development. We do note that the proposed discharge rate would lead to an increase of 20l/s into the existing system, and whilst there is no reason to suspect this couldn't be incorporated into the existing system, we could reduce the runoff to 8l/s (2l/s from each area) in lieu of providing a full hydraulic model of the system. It is likely that orifice plates rather than hydrobrakes would be used in this case but there would be sufficient volume in the sub-base to accommodate the storage requirement.

We would request that the update to the existing maintenance plan and detailed engineering drawings for the site are conditioned, for submission of details before the parking can be used. Some aspects of the permeable paving design will be specified by the contractor, and whilst we can provide generic drawing details of controls and permeable paving but is subject to change and therefore unlikely to add information of note to the FRA.

For the topographical survey, where we do have spot heights from the drainage drawing in Appendix D of the FRA, which have set the cover and invert levels for the system which provide sufficient information regarding levels on the site for this FRA. Similarly, updating the maintenance plan before permission is granted seems a little out of sequence.

We further note that the offline ponds are in place for the site-wide scheme (i.e. the Business Park as a whole) and therefore their inclusion in this report is unnecessary. The position of the off-line storage in relation to the site can be seen in the aerial photo below.

I trust that the contents of this email have fully answered the concerns raised in regard to this application and would appreciate your response to confirm the way forward.

If you require anything further please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

Liz Fitzgerald

associate

Vincent and Gorbing

Sterling Court, Norton Road, Stevenage, Hertfordshire SG1 2JY

w: www.vincent-gorbing.co.uk