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## Section 1 -Introduction

Advance Construction (Scotland) Ltd, are lodging a formal planning application for Planning Permission in Principle to South Lanarkshire Council for development of land for 49No. Residential plots with associated soft and hard landscaping.

GM Civil And Structural Consulting Engineers Ltd, have been commissioned to advise on drainage and SUDS matters in support of the PPIP submission.

This report outlines the existing drainage circumstances for the site and identifies both in the form of drawings and calculation proposals for the foul and surface water drainage to serve the new residential development with associated car parking, discharges to the existing adopted sewer network, watercourse including appropriate SUDS measures.

Scottish Planning Policy 2014 -Planning and Flooding requires that the Planning Authorities are satisfied with drainage proposals for development and this may be achieved via Drainage Impact Assessments.

## Section 2 -Objectives

The purpose of this report is to assess the impact of surface water run-off from the proposed development and to demonstrate how the proposed drainage infrastructure impacts on the existing network. The objectives of the proposed drainage infrastructure include developing of natural catchments where possible, controlling pollution at source and reducing any negative effects on the existing drainage network.
The proposed drainage strategy complies with The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (S cotland) Regulations 2011.
The proposed surface water drainage network serving the 49-unit development incorporates sustainable urban drainage (SUDS) prior to discharging into the existing surface water network, just inside the western corner of our development site, which, in turn discharges to 300 mm Diameter Surface Water pipe on the northern boundary of our site. This existing surface water network discharges to an unnamed watercourse before entering the River Avon.

The proposed drainage strategy comprises of the following: -

- Road network via Roadside Filter Trench system and local Hydro Bio Cell bioretention system (SUDS) with no risk of groundwater pollution via infiltration
- In-curtilage Porous Block Paviour system (SUDS) with no risk of groundwater pollution via infiltration.
- End of line Attenuation Storage Tanks with Hydrobrake Limiting discharge to the 1:2yr Greenfield Run-Off Rate $7.01 / \mathrm{s}$
- Final Discharges to the existing surface water network.


## Section 3 -Drainage Systems

### 3.1 Current Public Drainage Systems

There is an existing 375 mm diameter combined water sewer just outside the eastern edge of our development site and runs from south to north and collects foul water from the residential and commercial properties within Strathaven Road. (Refer to Appendix A-Scottish W ater Record Plans)

There is both existing 300 mm diameter surface and 225 mm diameter foul water sewers inside the western part of our development site. The foul water sewer runs to an existing pump station near the north western edge of the development site. Both the surface and foul water networks appear to collect run-off from the existing residential development within Whinriggs. (Refer to Appendix AScottish Water Record Plans)

### 3.2 Current Private Drainage Systems Within the Site

From historical record plans, it has been ascertained that the site of the proposed 49no. Residential Dwellings had previously been associated as a railway line. Scottish Water Record Plans do not show any private apparatus within this site.

## Section 4 -P roposed Drainage Systems

### 4.1 Foul

An online Scottish Water Capacity Check had initially confirmed that there was currently sufficient capacity within the WWTW to service the development proposals, however, a Pre-Development Enquiry Application (PDE) will be required to be carried out to ascertain if there are any constraints within the existing network. (Refer to Appendix A-Scottish Water Record Plans)

The existing topography confirms the site gradient to be falling with the direction of flow from the proposed development site, therefore, a gravity connection for foul water flows to the existing Scottish Water foul drainage system can be achieved, prior to discharging to the existing foul water pump station.

A DIA will be required to be carried out to ascertain the existing capacity of the pump station to take additional flows from our development site.

### 4.2 Surface Water

Surface water from the overall development will be collected via surface water gravity sewers prior to discharging to the existing surface water network just inside the north western boundary of our site via SUDS measures. The drainage proposals have been prepared in line with the current masterplan and take cognisance of the minimum required floor levels and ensure that the sewers meet the requirements of Sewers for Scotland $4^{\text {th }}$ E dition.

Treatment of surface water run-off from the internal road network and parking will be via Filter Trench system and local Hydro Bio Cell bioretention system, which will collect, treat and attenuate all surface water run-off prior to discharging to the existing Scottish water network.

The surface water flows will be limited to the 1 in 2 -year Greenfield run-off rate of $7.01 / \mathrm{s}$ via Hydrobrake flow control device, prior to discharging to the existing surface water network.

The SUDS proposals for the current masterplan are discussed in more detail within Section 6.0 of this report.

## Section 5 -Development Site

The layout of the proposed development is included in the appendices to this report (Appendix B Proposed Drainage Strategy Layout). New separate foul and surface water sewers will be provided within the site with foul water flows from the 49 residential units discharging to existing 225 mm foul sewer, just inside the north western edge of our development boundary.

All surface water flows will be discharging directly to the existing surface water network, just inside our north western boundary of the site via the appropriate SUDS chain.

The surface water flows will be limited to the 1 in 2-year Greenfield run-off rate prior to discharging to the existing surface water network just inside the north western boundary of the site.

## Section 6 -Sustainable Drainage

The site is bounded to the north by existing residential properties.
The land beyond the south of the site is bound by residential properties.
The site is bound to the east by Strathaven Road.
The land beyond the west of the site is bound by predominantly green open space.
Preliminary visual inspection of the site identified varying topography.
Based on the findings reported within the site investigation works, we do not expect a near surface water table and, as such, the ground water flooding risk is considered to be low.

An approximate breakdown of the development site is as follows:-

$$
\text { Total Area }=2.7 \mathrm{ha}
$$

Soft Landscaping 1.78ha
Hard Surfaces 0.92ha
A review of the geographical data for the site summarises the hydrological characteristics of the region as follows:-

Table 1: Hydrological Design Criteria

| SAAR (Seasonal Annual Average <br> Rainfall) | 1024 mm <br> From the Wallingford Procedure <br> standard average annual rainfall <br> map. |
| :--- | :--- |
| M5 -60 (5-year Storm Event of 60 <br> Minute Duration) | limm <br> From the Wallingford Procedure <br> Map M5-60 min: rainfall depths <br> (in mm) of five-year return <br> period and 60-minute duration. |
| R (Rainfall Ratio) | 0.30 <br> From the Wallingford Procedure <br> Map of R atio r: ratio of sixty <br> minute to two-day rainfalls of <br> five-year return period. |
| Hydrological Region | 2 |
| SOIL Factor | 2.47 <br> Class 4 as derived from the <br> Winter Rain Acceptance <br> Potential Map. |

### 6.1 Planning and Agreement of Design Criteria

Discussions are being held with the local authority, Scottish Water and SEPA and will continue from preliminary through to detailed design.

The characteristics of SUDS components and site constraints were reviewed to ensure a complete understanding of hydraulic, water quality, amenity and ecological constraints and opportunities were developed.
As a result of the discussions, design criteria for the site were set as follows (refer table 2):
Table 2: Summary of SUDS Design Criteria

| Criteria | Design event | Design Objective |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Protection against flooding. |  |  |
| Protection against flooding from drainage system. | Site 10 / 3 -year event plus $55 \%$ uplift (for climate change). <br> Site 100 / 200 -year event plus $55 \%$ uplift (for climate change). | No flooding on site, excer where planned and approved. <br> Control risks to people and property. Finished floor levels = Max flood storage levels ( 1 in 200-year critical storm plus $55 \%$ uplift (or climate change) + 0.6 m freeboard. |
| Protection against flooding from overland flows. | Site 100 / 200-year event plus $55 \%$ uplift (for climate change), short duration events. | Planned flood routing and temporary storage accommodated on site. |
| Protection against flooding from adjacent land. | Adjacent catchment, <br> 100 / 200 -year event (plus 55\% uplift (for climate change). | Planned flood routing. |

### 6.1.1 Hydraulic Design Criteria

- The surface water discharge for all roads, driveways, and roofs for the 49 units will be discharging to the existing surface water network to the north western boundary, therefore a strict criterion was imposed such that run-off from the proposed development for a 1 in 200-year event $+55 \%$ for climate change should be restricted to the Greenfield site 1 in 2 -year run-off rate.
- The site is classed as Greenfield with sands \& granular overlying cohesive soils, therefore, no infiltration is expected to be achieved.
- Safe flood flow paths across the site for events greater than 30 years.
- All property to be set at least 0.6 m above the 200 -year flood levels plus $55 \%$ uplift (for climate change).
- Long-term storage is required to minimise the flood volumes discharged to the existing watercourse.
- Discharges from the site are limited to Greenfield flow rates.
- A $55 \%$ allowance on rainfall is required for climate change.
- Sewers to be designed to meet criteria for sewers for Scotland $4^{\text {th }}$ edition. All surface water runoff to be managed by appropriate SUDS chain.


### 6.1.2 Water Quality Design Criteria

The development is a small low-risk residential site (49 houses) within which, the proposed drainage network will discharge to the existing surface water network to the north western boundary of the site.
The SUDS Manual (CIRIA C753, 2015) recommends a risk-based approach to levels of treatment for residential areas. Table 3 shows the recommended levels of treatment based on land use characteristic and sensitivity of the receiving water. The SUDS Manual (CIRIA C753, 2015) states the minimum level of treatment for residential developments is two levels.

Treatment level guidance is adapted for use in Scotland by SEPA Regulatory Method WAT-RM$08^{1}$ (SEPA 2019), which takes a more detailed approach to development size and risk (Table 5). Regulatory Method WAT RM-08 stipulates that a residential development of less than 50 dwellings requires one level of treatment for discharge to a normal sensitivity watercourse.
The low trafficked roads (less than 300 movements per day) will not require any roadside treatment trenches as the 1 level of treatment required will be provided via Filter Trench system and local Hydro Bio Cell bioretention system.
The highly trafficked roads (more than 300 movements per day) will require roadside treatment trenches to be provided to ensure an additional level of treatment is provided prior to discharging to the existing Scottish Water Network.

Table 3 :Number of treatment stages by land type and receiving water sensitivity (Source: The SUDS Manual), CIRIA C753, 2015.

| Receiving water <br> sensitivity | Low | Medium | High |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Runoff catchment <br> characteristic | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Roofs only | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Residential roads, <br> parking areas, <br> commercial zones | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Refuse collection/ <br> industrial areas/ <br> loading bays/lorry <br> parks/highways |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ SEPA Regulatory Method WAT-RM-08 v5.2 August 2014 cited; this has been superseded by Version: v6.4 (J uly 2019) to correspond with the simple index approach (CIRIA C753, 2015).

Table 4: SEPA method to select appropriate levels of SUDS based upon catchment risk (Source: SEPA Regulatory Method WAT-RM-08 v5.2 August 2014).

|  | Number of houses / car park spaces |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Receiving Water Type | <25 | 25-50 | >50-100 | 100-1000 | >1000 |
| Normal sensitivity watercourse | 1 level | 1 level | 2 levels | 2 levels | 2 levels |
| Low sensitivity watercourse | 1 level | 1 level | 1 level | 2 levels | 2 levels |
| Transitional waters | Minimal | Minimal | Minimal | Minimal | Section $4.5$ |
| Coastal waters | None | None | None | None | Section $4.5$ |
| GBR applies | Standing planning advice <br> Local Authority checks source control design |  |  |  |  |
| GBR applies | SEPA provides site-specific planning advice <br> LA checks source control design |  |  |  |  |
| GBR applies | SEPA provides site-specific planning advice <br> LA checks source control design. Scottish Water checks pond/basin design if Sewers for Scotland 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Licence required | SEPA provides site-specific planning advice LA. Scottish Water. SEPA may check design |  |  |  |  |

The proposal for two levels of treatment is further reinforced by SUDS for Roads (Pittner and Allerton, 2009) which stipulates within Section 2.4.1.
"2.4.1 It is generally accepted that roads require two levels of treatment, although for smaller developments, residential roads may require only one level, depending on the sensitivity of the receiving watercourse. In addition, major trunk roads and motorways may merit three levels of treatment depending on traffic volumes and receiving watercourse sensitivity."

Discussions with SEPA identified that "This is a small development relative to catchment size".
Consequently, the proposed drainage design incorporates road gullies to provide effective pre-treatment prior to a SUDS technique.

### 6.1.3 Amenity Design Criteria

There is limited space for surface water drainage which has high amenity value within residential development zones themselves. It is therefore important to develop a drainage solution that is fully integrated with, and complimentary to, the public open space areas, and that is visually attractive and safe for the public to enjoy.

### 6.2 SUDS Selection

SUDS characteristics were reviewed to allow appropriate selection of surface water drainage components for the site. The main constraints / opportunities driving SUDS selection are summarised In Table 5 below:

Table 5: Site Constraints and Opportunities Driving SUDS Selection

| Characteristic | Constraint/Opportunity |
| :---: | :---: |
| Development Type | - Residential development proposed; therefore, solution requires consideration and provision for construction site runoff management; sediment management and water quality protection required before discharge to existing surface water sewer network. |
| Soils | - It is noted that the site soils are a combination of cohesive and granular soils and as such will have variable permeability. Testing would be required to locate suitable areas for infiltration to ground. |
| Groundwater | - No shallow groundwater. |
| Space Available | - Limited amount of green space, drainage opportunities around periphery of the site. <br> - No space available for swales adjacent to access roads. |
| Site <br> Topographical Characteristics | - Area comprises varying sloping terrain. |
| Ownership / <br> Maintenance | - Scottish Water adopted foul and surface water pipe networks currently running across the north western boundary of the site in a south to north direction. All proposed internal surface and foul sewers to be designed to Sewers for Scotland 4th edition as they are likely to be adopted. None of the permeable surface drainage within the curtilage of each plot will be adopted. |
| Cost | - Pipe and storage systems designed to minimise capital maintenance costs. |
| Public Safety | - Health \& S afety risks reduced by appropriate design and location of components. <br> - Public education and awareness raising required for surface water drainage systems. |

To take full account of all site constraints and opportunities, together with the benefits offered by a range of SUDS components, a SUDS scheme was designed taking account of Minimum Water Quality Management Requirements For discharges to Receiving Surface Waters and Groundwater (Table 6) and The Simple Index Approach, the results of which, are shown within Table 7 below.

Table 6: Minimum Water Quality Management Requirements For Discharges To Receiving surface Waters And Groundwater

| Land use | Pollution hazard level | Requirements for discharge to surface waters, including toasts and estuaries ${ }^{2}$ | Requirements for discharge to groundwater |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential roofs | Very low | Removal of gross solids and sediments only |  |
| Individual property driveways, roofs (excluding residential). residential car pariks, low traffic roads (eg cul de sacs, home zones, general access roads), non-residential car parking with infrequent change (eg schools, offices) | Low | Simple index approach ${ }^{3}$ <br> Note: extra measures may be required for discharges to protected resources |  |
| Commercial yard and delivery areas, non-residential car parking with frequent change (eg hospitals, retail), all roads except low traffic roads and trunk roads/motorways | Medium | Simple index approach ${ }^{3}$ Note: exira measures may be required for discherges to protected resources ${ }^{1}$ | Simple index approach? <br> Note: extra measures may be required for dischiarges to protected resources1 <br> In England and Wales, Risk Screening ${ }^{4}$ must be undertaken first to determine whether consultation with the environmental regulator is required. <br> In Northern Ireland, the need for risk screening should be agreed with the environmental regulator. |
| Trunk roads and motorways | Hight | Follow the guidance and risk assessment process set out in HA (2009) |  |
| Sites with heavy pollution (eg haulage yards, lorry parks, highly frequented lorry approaches to industrial estates, waste siles), sites where chemicals and fuels (other than domestic fuel oil) are to be delivered, handled, stored, used or manufactured, industrial sites | High | Discharges may require an environmental ticence or permits, Obtain pre-permitting advice from the environimental regulator. Risk assessment is likely to be required ${ }^{\text {F }}$ : |  |

## Notes

The minimum water quality management requirements for discharges to receiving surface waters and groundwater are presented here. (For Northem Ireland, this guidance should be considered as interim untii such Dime as Northern Ireland pubhishes its own. egisiation/policy/guicance.
1 These are notrequired in Scolland and Northern Ireland. For England and Wales, see Step 3 of the simple ingex approach (Section 26.7.7).
Protected surface water resources will include those designated for drinking water abstraction or for ofher Environmental protection reasons. Protected groundwater resources are represented by SPZ1s in England and Wales.
2 In Scoiland, the Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scoiland) Regulations (CAR) 2011 Gervalal Binding Rules, Rule 10 (d) (iv) effectively provides an exemption from requiring SuDS for coastal discharges. Hawever, control of any contaminants likely to be present in surface water runott is suli required, but can de debvered useng alternative methoda such as propnetary treatment products. As the term 'SuDS' in this manual inctudes proprietary treatment products, this exemption is not valid in this context

Table 7: Simple Index Approach Results
Residential Roofing


Individual Driveways


Low Trafficked Roads (Less Than 300 Movements Per Day)


The drainage solution proposed for the site is as follows (Appendix B -Proposed Drainage Strategy Layout):

The roofs, driveways and low trafficked roads are to be utilised for 1 level of treatment via SUDS by utilising, porous block paviours, R oadside Filter Trench system and local Hydro Bio Cell bioretention system, which, will provide pollution control and some flow attenuation.

All surface water flows will be limited to the 1 in 2-year Greenfield Run-off rate of $7.0 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{s}$ via a hydrobrake flow control device in manhole downstream of the attenuation storage tanks, which, are providing a storage volume of 550 m 3 .

## Initial System Design

### 6.3.1 Protection from Increased Flow Rate and Volume of Run-Off Greenfield Run-Off Rate Analysis

(Based on a unit area (1.0 ha) of development site)
The proposed Residential development area has an impermeable to permeable ratio of $34: 66$, which for 1.0 ha of development site would equate to 0.34 ha of impermeable hard surface and 0.66 ha of permeable landscaping / garden surfaces.

Taking a basic run -off coefficient from the permeable surfaces / areas at say 10 per cent then the permeable areas of the development site can be accounted for in a 34:66 ratio development therefore $34 \%$ of the development areas as effectively impermeable.

Therefore 0.34 ha is fully impermeable for each 1.0 ha of gross development area.
The peak surface water run -off flow figures and therefore the subsequent attenuation volume calculations will be calculated using the Wallingford procedure -Design Act Analysis of urban storm drainage -volume 4 -modified rational method.

Therefore, the basic data for use with this modified rational method is as follows:

- M5-60 rainfall $=17 \mathrm{~mm}$
- r ratio = approx 0.30
- Volumetric run -off coefficient $=0.75$


## A.D. 6 Determination of the Required Limiting 10 Per Cent Pre-Development Peak Discharge Flow

For $r=0.30$, Z 1 factor for $\mathrm{M} 5-60=1.00$, so from Table A2, Z2 ratio factor 1.03, where $\mathrm{Z1}$ to Z2 are Wallingford procedure scaling factors.
The development site area of approx 2.7 ha in this case is relatively small for the area reduction factor (ARL) to have any significant bearing on any calculated peak flows particularly when considering that the ARL would relate to both pre and post development calculations so take ARL $=1.0$ in this case. Where Qp is the discharge flow (in litres per second), then the required limiting pre-development peak discharge flow $=10 \%$ of Qp for M5 - 60 storm where $\mathrm{Qp}=3.61 \mathrm{Cv} \mathrm{AI}$, so pre -development peak discharge flow.
$=0.361 \mathrm{CV}$ AI
Where $A=A r e a ~ o f ~ c a t c h m e n t s ~(i n ~ h a) ~ a n d ~$
$\mathrm{Cv}=$ Volumetric run off coefficient
R ain Intensity I
M5 - $60 \times \mathrm{Z1} \times \mathrm{Z2} \times 60 / \mathrm{D}$
$=17 \times 1.0 \times 1.03 \times 60 / 60$
$=17.51 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{hr}$
For proposed development area limiting pre-development peak discharge flow.
$=0.361 \mathrm{Cv}$ AI
Limiting development area peak flow
$=0.361 \times 0.75 \times 1 \times 17.51$
$=4.74 \mathrm{I} / \mathrm{s} / \mathrm{ha}$
Therefore, the pre -development run -off from the proposed 2.7 ha development should be limited to a maximum discharge of $2.7 \times 4.74=12.80 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{s}$.
Post-development limiting discharge for water quantity / flooding control.
$=13 \mathrm{I} / \mathrm{s}$ (However post development flow restricted to $7.0 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{s}$ )

### 6.3.2 Treatment Volume Required

Determine unit treatment volume Vt using the alternative approximate (Wallingford) method.
Reference to the Wallingford procedure vol. 3 maps would indicate that the M5-60 rainfall depths is approximately 17 mm and the winter rain acceptance potential (WRAP) classification of the general soil on the site is class 4.

$$
\text { Vt } \left.\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \text { ha }\right)=9(\text { soil } / 2) D+(1 \text { soil / } 2) \mathrm{DI}\right)
$$

Where from the Wallingford procedure vol 1 section 7.4, SOIL is the soil index for WRAP class 4 soil,

$$
\text { S oil }=0.47
$$

$$
D=M 5-60 \text { rainfall depth }=17 \mathrm{~mm} \text { and }
$$

$$
\text { I = Impervious Fraction = } 0.34
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Vt}\left(\mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{ha}\right) & =9 \mathrm{D}(\text { Soil } / 2+(1-\text { Soil } / 2) \mathrm{I}) \\
& =9 \times 17(0.47 / 2)+(1-0.47 / 2) \mathrm{I}) \\
& =35.96+117.05
\end{aligned}
$$

For $\mathrm{I}=0.34$
$\mathrm{Vt}\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{ha}\right)=35.96+117.05 \times 0.34$

$$
=52.02 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{ha}
$$

For site catchments' area $=2.7$ ha
Total design treatment volume TVt
$=\mathrm{Vt} \mathrm{m} \times$ total site catchments' area
$=2.7 \times 52.02$
$=140.46 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$
Total design treatment volume TVt
$=$ Say $140 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$
The above gives a clear indication that facilities designed to deal with water quantity control will require to be much larger than those designed to deal solely with water quality treatment.

### 6.4 Maintenance Schedules

Regular inspection and maintenance of a sustainable urban drainage system (SUDS) will ensure that it is fit for purpose and operates as designed in the long term. Access to key structural items (for example inlets / outlets) will enable effective inspection and maintenance.

Inspection and maintenance responsibilities for the SUDS and the surrounding area should be placed with a responsible organisation. Most maintenance activities can be incorporated within a landscape maintenance schedule. Recommended inspection and maintenance activities for the Formpave Porous Block System is provided in Table 8. (adapted from The SUDS Manual C753, CIRIA 2015).

Table 8. Formpave Porous Block System Inspection Requirements and Maintenance Schedule for Residential Developments (Adapted from CIRIA 2015).

| Maintenance <br> schedule | Action | Frequency |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Regular maintenance | Sweeping surface to remove debris and <br> contamination | $1-2$ times a year, typically Spring <br> and after leaf fall in Autumn |
| Occasional maintenance | Removal of weeds | As required |
| Remedial Actions | Remediate areas of rutting and <br> depressions. <br> Replace broken/damaged blocks <br> Rehabilitate surface with sweeping and <br> reapplication of 2-4mm clean gritstone | As required |
| Monitoring required |  |  |
|  | Initial inspection <br> Inspection for poor performance and <br> silting | Annually |
| Inspect ancillary drainage components | Annually |  |
| i.e.gullies ,outfall pipes etc. |  |  |

### 6.4.1 Lined Treatment Trench Maintenance Schedule

The proposed maintenance schedule for the lined treatment trench is provided in Table 8 in accordance with CIRIA C697 the SUDS Manual (CIRIA 2007, p245, S9-7).

Table 9: Treatment Trench Maintenance Schedule (Source CIRIA 2007).

| Maintenance schedule | Required action | Frequency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regular maintenance | Litter and debris removal from trench surface, access chambers and pre-treatment devices | Monthly (or as required) |
|  | Removal and washing of exposed stones on the trench surface | Annual (bi-annual the first year) or when silt is evident on the surface |
|  | Trimming of any roots that mey be causing blockages | Annualifemi-annual the first year) |
|  | Remove weeds on the trench surface | Monthly (at start, then as required) |
| Occasional maintenance | Removal of sediment from pre-treatment devices | Six monthly |
|  | Remove tree roots or trees that grow close to the trench | As required |
|  | At locations with high pollution loads, remove surface geotextile and replace, and wash or replace fitter media | Five yearly |
| Remedial actions | Clear perforated pipework of blockages | As required |
|  | Rehabilitate infiltration or filtration surfaces | As required |
|  | Replace geotextiles and clean and replace filter media, if clogging occurs | As required |
|  | Excavate trench walls to expose clean soils if infiltration performance reduces to unacceptable levels | As required |
|  | Inspect inlets, outlets and inspection points for blockages, clogging, standing water and structural damage | Monthly |
| Monitoring | Inspect pre-treatment systems, inlets, trench surfaces and perforated pipework for silt accumulation. Establish appropriate silt removal frequencies | Half yearly |

## Section 7 -Foul Flows

The previous site consisted of a railway cutting and as such no foul flows existed.
Post development (based on "S ewers for Scotland" 4000 litres/dwelling/day)

The proposed development consists of 49 units.
$Q=\underline{4000 \times 49}=2.27$ litres $/ \mathrm{sec}$ (Peak)
$24 \times 60 \times 60$

## Section 8 -Flooding

### 8.1 Historic Information

The design of new developments must take into consideration the latest Planning Policies (SPP and PAN 69) as well as Scottish Water and SEPA guidelines. The purposes of this report is to outline how flood prevention in accordance with these guidelines has been considered for the development.
The SEPA flood map shows no flooding within the portion of land that is proposed for development.

### 8.2 Fluvial / Tidal Flooding

The development is not within the zone of influence of fluvial or tidal flow.
Figure 8.2.1 Extract From SEPA Flood Map


The above findings are reinforced by the SEPA flood map, which, has no record of any river or tidal flooding within the development area.

### 8.3 Ground Water Flooding

The intrusive site investigation has been undertaken, and, does not indicate near surface water table and, as such, the ground water flooding risk is low.

### 8.4 Pluvial Flooding

The existing average site levels are approximately between 157 m to 147 m .
In conclusion, we have considered potential sources of flooding and concluded that the site is not at risk from either fluvial or pluvial flooding due to the only are being developed is on the higher ground.

## Section 9 -C ontaminated Water Arising During Construction

This should be addressed by the contractor's method statement; however, any possible contaminated water should be contained within the site boundaries. During the construction process it is likely that the running surface, will consist of a material, which has some free draining properties thus allowing any spillage to be contained. Prior to construction of the final layout the running surface material would be removed off-site including any small pockets of possible contamination.

## Section 10 -Conclusions

The objectives of source control of surface water and limiting the impact on the sewerage network have been achieved with the drainage proposals for this development. The treatment associated with surface water run-off from the roofs, driveways / parking courts and lightly trafficked roads with porous block paviour system and various roadside treatment trenches provides an appropriate SUDS chain for the development proposed.

Attenuation of storm events up to and including 200 years $+55 \%$ for Climate Change is also accommodated within the drainage network and SUDS chain with NO FLOODING, ensuring no detrimental impact on the existing surface water network, a flood storage volume of 550 m 3 is provided end of line.

## References

Pittner, C. and Allerton, G., 2009. SUDS for roads. Edinburgh: WSP Development and Transport.
Scottish Environment P rotection Agency (SEPA). Regulatory Method (WAT-RM -08) - Sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS or SUD Systems). SEPA, 2019.

CIRIA. 2015. The SUDS Manual. Report C753. CIRIA, London.

## Appendix A

Scottish Water Record Plans




## Appendix B Drainage Strategy Layout
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## Appendix C PDS Flow Surface W ater Calculations
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## Appendix D Scottish Water Online Capacity Check

## No sites found

Sorry your search criteria of 'ML9 3QX' has not returned any sites, however the postcode is supplied by a Water Treatment Works and Waste Water Treatment Works. Please consider submitting a Pre Development Enquiry (PDE) to get a full response.

Start PDE

The postcode selected is served by: DAER WTW 1956 NS 978092

This Water Treatment Works has a capacity of:
12621, as of 22-06-2021

The capacity was calculated on: 22-06-2021

The postcode selected is served by: STONEHOUSE WWTW 1928 NS764471

This Waste Water Treatment Works has a capacity of:
174, as of 31-03-2021

The capacity was calculated on: 31-03-2021

