

Hi Richard,

Thank you again for your email. I have chased up Partner Construction on the outstanding drainage information and they have come back with the following response:

"The original approved drawings showed the boundary to the gardens and around the perimeter to be a 1.8 metre high close boarded fence. It is now proposed to introduce gravel boards as part of the site drainage scheme. I feel this firstly needs to be clarified as it is naturally picking up discrepancies between the approved drawings as the use of gravel board may then alter the boundary types which were shown on the approved drawings. Unfortunately the IDB Diversion drawing doesn't help as it has been drafted for the purposes of the pipeline, not necessarily a planning drawing for the whole site which would contain more information.

The gravel boards are not part of the drainage scheme what so ever. They were requested by the client as a minor change throughout as they are easier to maintain and prevent the bottom of the fences rotting away as quickly hence needing replacement. It was only suggested that these gravel boards would prevent overland run-off from going onto the adjacent land and encourage it to filter through the ground instead.

In regard to the whole site i.e. all the boundaries, I am not convinced in the absence of detailed information, a gravel board approach would overcome any excess discharge onto land outside of the site. for example, I do not know what is happening to surface water as a result of the land gradient and if the land can absorb a sufficient amount of surface water before reaching the boundary of the site to keep any excess to a minimum. Furthermore, there is no information showing how surface water is mitigated if the land is saturated or frozen therefore restricting any absorption rates.

The unsurfaced areas on the development which doesn't drain directly to a sewer system has been dramatically reduced compared the to the existing situation as all the field originally went to ground over time. Because the site has had to be lifted by a metre it means that this standing water will be moved to the outside of the site. This boundary is lower than the new levels on the site and is also lower than the existing development adjacent so will not directly cause flooding of these properties. At worst case the water would collect on the low point which is roughly over the existing culvert and will therefore filter through the backfill to the trench. I provided a drawing showing the falls in this area.

I thought the scheme may have involved French drains as an appropriate means of drainage. That said I am not discounting the gravel board approach but I feel the option needs further investigation/demonstrating to ensure the scheme would not result in excess flows beyond the site boundary, thus creating problems for neighbours and your Client in the future."

Because this site wasn't a site where infiltration would be very effective French drains where not considered a viable option. It is however proposed that gravel strips be implemented behind the gravel boards to get the water down from the surface and allow it to filter through the ground slowly without causing a problem to surrounding properties. As said however this run-off is reduced considerably from that what currently existed prior to development.

Does this address your concerns?

Thanks,

Stephen
STEPHEN COURCIER
Associate: Chartered Town Planner