

1410144				
KNOWI	$\vdash \vdash \land$	$M \vdash 0$	KAN	II ⊢I(.H

SUMMARY: FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE PROOF OF EVIDENCE, PAUL JENKIN

**GLEESON LAND** 

24 OCTOBER 2023



Abley Letchford Partnership Limited 3 Tealgate Charnham Park Hungerford RG17 0YT

> T: 01488 684390 E: contact@alpce.co.uk W: www.alpce.co.uk

#### **Quality Management:**

Prepared by:	Paul Jenkin
Authorised by:	Paul Jenkin
Date:	24 October 2023
Document Reference:	A423-R006

COPYRIGHT © ABLEY LETCHFORD PARTNERSHIP LIMITED
The material presented in this report is confidential. This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of GLEESON LAND within the terms of the contract and shall not be distributed or made available to any other company or person without the knowledge and written consent of Abley Letchford Partnership Limited.

Any such party relies on the report at their own risk.

## KNOWLE LANE, CRANLEIGH SUMMARY: FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE PROOF OF EVIDENCE, PAUL JENKIN



#### **Contents**

1.0 Summary: Flood Risk and Drainage Proof of Evidence, Paul Jenkin ......i



# 1.0 Summary: Flood Risk and Drainage Proof of Evidence, Paul Jenkin

- 1.1. I am Paul Jenkin BEng(Hons), MSc, CEng, C.WEM, FCIWEM and am currently employed by Abley Letchford Partnership (ALP) as Director of Flood Risk Management. I have 29 years' experience in the assessment and management of flood risk and have worked on many projects of similar scale and complexity to the Appeal Proposals. I was involved with the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy produced by ALP to support the planning application (WA/2023/00294).
- 1.2. I confirm that this evidence is my own true opinion and I have set out which areas are within my area of expertise and which are not. I have prepared this evidence in accordance with the professional standards of CIWEM and their Code of Conduct.
- 1.3. In respect of flood risk and drainage the Council have raised no objections.
- 1.4. Surrey County Council acting as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have reviewed and approved the surface water drainage strategy, subject to a number of planning conditions and their responses are provided in CD2/3c and CD2/3d.
- 1.5. Thames Water have been consulted in respect of foul water disposal and have raised no objections.
- 1.6. There are therefore no reasons for refusal based on flood risk and drainage.
- 1.7. The Knowle Lane Residents Group have been granted rule 6 status and in their Statement of Case raise matters relating to flooding and drainage. I address these issues within my proof of evidence.
- 1.8. Flood Risk and Drainage forms no part of the Council's case and from this I infer that they are in full agreement with the FRA and its conclusions.
- 1.9. The LLFA are satisfied with the approach to surface water drainage subject to a number of planning conditions.
- 1.10. Thames Water have no objections to the proposals and are content that sufficient foul water capacity exists, subject to detailed design of the facilities and reinforcement.
- 1.11. The Appeal Site is at low risk from all sources of flooding.
- 1.12. The proposed surface water drainage strategy would not increase flood risk.
- 1.13. The proposed foul water strategy would not increase flood risk.
- 1.14. All the normal standards and guidance have been followed in developing these drainage strategies.
- 1.15. The Knowle Lane Residents Group have raised some concerns, but these are all dealt with through the additional information on connectivity and the agreed strategies above.
- 1.16. I do not think the criticisms of the LLFA are valid. The overall consultation with the LLFA ran for about6 months and they raised a number of objections in the first instance which were addressed throughthe provision of additional information and clarifications.

### KNOWLE LANE, CRANLEIGH SUMMARY: FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE PROOF OF EVIDENCE, PAUL JENKIN



- 1.17. The Group's Statement of Case seems to be substantially based on their being insufficient detail or insufficient confidence on the data. Being an Outline Application, both the level of detail and confidence will improve as the detailed design is delivered in the later stages and this is the normal approach.
- 1.18. In my opinion there are no grounds to reject this appeal on flood risk, surface water drainage or foul water drainage.