


**Hensingham House,
Phase One and Two,
Cumbria**

**Flood Risk Statement and Drainage
Strategy**

September 2023



FAIRHURST

CONTROL SHEET

CLIENT: Thomas Milburn (Property) Ltd.

PROJECT TITLE: Hensingham House (Phase One), Cumbria

REPORT TITLE: Flood Risk Statement and Drainage Strategy

PROJECT REFERENCE: 138443

DOCUMENT NUMBER: D/I/D/138443/03

STATUS: FINAL

Issue & Approval Schedule		Name	Signature	Date
	Prepared by	J. Shelton	J. Shelton	08.06.2020
	Checked by	D. Nicholls	D. Nicholls	08.06.2020
	Approved by	M. Taka	M. Taka	08.06.2020

Revision Record	Rev.	Date	Status	Description	Signature	
	2	28.04.2023	FINAL	Updated to suit revised drainage layout	By	FM
					Check	AS
					Approve	SKT
	3	21.09.2023	FINAL	Updated to suit revised site layout	By	FM
					Check	AS
					Approve	SKT

This document has been prepared in accordance with procedure OP/P02 of the Fairhurst Quality and Environmental Management System. This document has been prepared in accordance with the instructions of the client, Thomas Milburn (Property) Ltd., for the client's sole and specific use. Any other persons who use any information contained herein do so at their own risk.

Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION	3
2.	LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK	4
3.	DEVELOPMENT SITE	11
4.	SOURCES OF FLOOD RISK INFORMATION	13
5.	POTENTIAL SOURCES OF FLOOD RISK	17
6	SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE	19
7.	FOUL WATER DRAINAGE.....	24
8.	CONCLUSIONS	25

Appendix A: Topographical Survey Results

Appendix B: Proposed Layout

Appendix C: United Utilities asset plans

Appendix D: Micro Drainage – Rural Runoff

Appendix E: Geo Investigate Report (May 2020)

Appendix F: Micro Drainage – Model Outputs

Appendix G: Proposed Drainage Layout

Appendix H: United Utilities Sewer Flood Record Response

1. Introduction

Fairhurst have been appointed to undertake a Flood Risk Statement and Drainage Strategy in support of the full planning application for a proposed residential development at Hensingham House, Hensingham. The location of the development site is provided in Figure 1. As the site is less than 1 ha in size and located entirely within Flood Zone 1 a full Flood Risk Assessment has not been carried out for the development.

The aim of this report is to evaluate the current proposals with regard to flood risk and identify potential flood risk to and from the development site. Fairhurst have carried out the following:

- i. Overview assessment of the redevelopment potential of the site with regards to the main sources of flood risk in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
- ii. An assessment of the surface water runoff.
- iii. An assessment of the foul water flows.




Figure 1 - Site Location

2. Legislative Framework

2.1 National Planning Policy

One of the key aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) is to ensure that flood risk is taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, and to direct development away from areas at highest risk. Where new development is, exceptionally, necessary in such areas, policy aims to make it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere and where possible, reducing flood risk overall.

A risk-based approach should be adopted at all levels of planning. Applying the source pathway-receptor model to planning for development in areas of flood risk requires:

- a strategic approach which avoids adding to the causes or “sources” of flood risk, by such means as avoiding inappropriate development in flood risk areas and minimising run-off from new development onto adjacent and other downstream property, and into the river systems;
- managing flood “pathways” to reduce the likelihood of flooding by ensuring that the design and location of the development maximises the use of SuDS, and takes account of its susceptibility to flooding, the performance and processes of river/coastal systems and appropriate flood defence infrastructure, and of the likely routes and storage of floodwater, and its influence on flood risk downstream; and
- reducing the adverse consequences of flooding on the “receptors” (i.e. people, property, infrastructure, habitats and statutory sites) by avoiding inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding.

A FRA should be carried out to the appropriate degree at all levels of the planning process, to assess the risks of all forms of flooding to and from development taking climate change into account. **The Sequential Test is not required for this development which is classified as a Non-Major development but located within Flood Zone 1.**

In areas at risk of river or sea flooding, preference should be given to locating new development in Flood Zone 1. If there is no reasonably available site in Flood Zone 1, the flood vulnerability of the proposed development can be taken into account in locating development in Flood Zone 2 and then Flood Zone 3. Within each Flood Zone new development should be directed to sites at the lowest probability of flooding from all sources.

Flood risk has been categorised as High, Medium and Low based on the probability of inundation. Extracts from Tables 1, 2 and 3 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change PPG are provided below, which highlights the likely response to planning applications within each Flood Zone.

Residential development is categorised as “more vulnerable” and therefore should only take place within Flood Zones 1, 2 or 3a provided suitable mitigation measures have been undertaken.

Table 1 - Extract from the Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance

Zone 1 Low Probability

Definition

This zone comprises land assessed as having a less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of river or sea flooding in any year (<0.1%).

Appropriate uses

All uses of land are appropriate in this zone.

Flood risk assessment requirements

For development proposals on sites comprising one hectare or above the vulnerability to flooding from other sources as well as from river and sea flooding, and the potential to increase flood risk elsewhere through the addition of hard surfaces and the effect of the new development on surface water run-off, should be incorporated in a flood risk assessment. This need only be brief unless the factors above or other local considerations require particular attention.

Policy aims

In this zone, developers and local authorities should seek opportunities to reduce the overall level of flood risk in the area and beyond through the layout and form of the development, and the appropriate application of sustainable drainage systems.

Zone 2 Medium Probability

Definition

This zone comprises land assessed as having between a 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 annual probability of river flooding (1% – 0.1%) or between a 1 in 200 and 1 in 1000 annual probability of sea flooding (0.5% – 0.1%) in any year.

Appropriate uses

Essential infrastructure and the water-compatible, less vulnerable and more vulnerable uses, as set out in table 2, are appropriate in this zone. The highly vulnerable uses are *only* appropriate in this zone if the Exception Test is passed.

Flood risk assessment requirements

All development proposals in this zone should be accompanied by a flood risk assessment.

Policy aims

In this zone, developers and local authorities should seek opportunities to reduce the overall level of flood risk in the area through the layout and form of the development, and the appropriate application of sustainable drainage techniques.

Zone 3a High Probability

Definition

This zone comprises land assessed as having a 1 in 100 or greater annual probability of river flooding (>1%) or a 1 in 200 or greater annual probability of flooding from the sea (>0.5%) in any year.

Appropriate uses

The water-compatible and less vulnerable uses of land (table 2) are appropriate in this zone. The highly vulnerable uses should not be permitted in this zone.

The more vulnerable uses and essential infrastructure should only be permitted in this zone if the Exception Test is passed. Essential infrastructure permitted in this zone should be designed and constructed to remain operational and safe for users in times of flood.

Flood risk assessment requirements

All development proposals in this zone should be accompanied by a flood risk assessment.

Policy aims

In this zone, developers and local authorities should seek opportunities to:

- reduce the overall level of flood risk in the area through the layout and form of the development and the appropriate application of sustainable drainage techniques;
- relocate existing development to land in zones with a lower probability of flooding; and create space for flooding to occur by restoring functional floodplain and flood flow pathways and by identifying, allocating and safeguarding open space for flood storage.

Zone 3b The Functional Floodplain

Definition

Local planning authorities should identify in their Strategic Flood Risk Assessments areas of functional floodplain and its boundaries accordingly, in agreement with the Environment Agency. The identification of functional floodplain should take account of local circumstances and not be defined solely on rigid probability parameters. But land which would flood with an annual probability of 1 in 20 (5%) or greater in any year, or is designed to flood in an extreme (0.1%) flood, should provide a starting point for consideration and discussions to identify the functional floodplain.

Appropriate uses

Only the water-compatible uses and the essential infrastructure listed in Table 2 that has to be there should be permitted in this zone. It should be designed and constructed to:

- remain operational and safe for users in times of flood;
- result in no net loss of floodplain storage;
- not impede water flows; and
- not increase flood risk elsewhere.

Essential infrastructure in this zone should pass the Exception Test.

Flood risk assessment requirements

All development proposals in this zone should be accompanied by a flood risk assessment.

Policy aims

In this zone, developers and local authorities should seek opportunities to:

- reduce the overall level of flood risk in the area through the layout and form of the development and the appropriate application of sustainable drainage techniques; and
- relocate existing development to land with a lower probability of flooding.

Where required an exception test must be passed in order for developments of that nature to be justified within the Flood Zone. For the Exception Test to be passed the following must be demonstrated:

- a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and
- b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.

The site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1 and as such the exception test is not required.

Table 2 - Flood risk vulnerability classification from the Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance

Essential infrastructure • Essential transport infrastructure (including mass evacuation routes) which has to cross the area at risk. • Essential utility infrastructure which has to be located in a flood risk area for operational reasons, including electricity generating power stations and grid and primary substations; and water treatment works that need to remain operational in times of flood. • Wind turbines
Highly vulnerable • Police stations, ambulance stations and fire stations and command centres and telecommunications installations required to be operational during flooding. • Emergency dispersal points. • Basement dwellings. • Caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use³. • Installations requiring hazardous substances consent. (Where there is a demonstrable need to locate such installations for bulk storage of materials with port or other similar

facilities, or such installations with energy infrastructure or carbon capture and storage installations, that require coastal or water-side locations, or need to be located in other high flood risk areas, in these instances the facilities should be classified as “essential infrastructure”).

More vulnerable

- Hospitals.
- Residential institutions such as residential care homes, children’s homes, social services homes, prisons and hostels.
- Buildings used for dwelling houses, student halls of residence, drinking establishments, nightclubs and hotels.
- Non–residential uses for health services, nurseries and educational establishments.
- Landfill and sites used for waste management facilities for hazardous waste.
- Sites used for holiday or short-let caravans and camping, subject to a specific warning and evacuation plan.

Less vulnerable

- Police, ambulance and fire stations which are not required to be operational during flooding.
- Buildings used for shops, financial, professional and other services,
- Restaurants and cafes, hot food takeaways, offices, general industry, storage and distribution, non–residential institutions not included in “more vulnerable”, and assembly and leisure.
- Land and buildings used for agriculture and forestry.
- Waste treatment (except landfill and hazardous waste facilities).
- Minerals working and processing (except for sand and gravel working).
- Water treatment works which do not need to remain operational during times of flood.
- Sewage treatment works (if adequate measures to control pollution and manage sewage during flooding events are in place).

Water-compatible development

- Flood control infrastructure.
- Water transmission infrastructure and pumping stations.
- Sewage transmission infrastructure and pumping stations.
- Sand and gravel working.
- Docks, marinas and wharves.
- Navigation facilities.
- Ministry of Defence installations.

FAIRHURST

- Ship building, repairing and dismantling, dockside fish processing and refrigeration and compatible activities requiring a waterside location.
- Water-based recreation (**excluding sleeping accommodation**).
- Lifeguard and coastguard stations.
- Amenity open space, nature conservation and biodiversity, outdoor sports and recreation and essential facilities such as changing rooms.
- Essential ancillary sleeping or residential accommodation for staff required by uses in this category, subject to a **specific warning and evacuation plan**.

Table 3 - Flood risk vulnerability and flood zone 'compatibility'

Flood risk vulnerability classification (see table 2)		Essential infrastructure	Water compatible	Highly vulnerable	More vulnerable	Less vulnerable
Flood zone (see table 1)	Zone 1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Zone 2	✓	✓	Exception Test required	✓	✓
	Zone 3a	Exception Test required	✓	✗	Exception Test required	✓
	Zone 3b functional floodplain	Exception Test required	✓	✗	✗	✗
Extract from the Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance Key: ✓ Development is appropriate. ✗ Development should not be permitted.						

The proposed development is classified as a residential development. Thus the development is classified as being 'more vulnerable' and in accordance with the NPPF PPG and is located within Flood Zone 1. Thus neither the Sequential nor the Exceptions tests are required for the development.

2.2 Local Planning Policy

The Copeland Local Plan – Core Strategy and Development Management Policies was adopted in December 2013 and sets out the council's policies and proposals for development and land use in the local area. The Local Plan contains several key policies relating to flood risk:

Policy ENV1 – Flood Risk and Risk Management:

The Council will ensure that development in the Borough is not prejudiced by flood risk through:

- a. Permitting new build development only on sites located outside areas at risk of flooding, with the exception of some key sites in Whitehaven;*
- b. Ensuring that developments on important regeneration sites in Whitehaven Town Centre and Harbourside and Pow Beck Valley are designed to address the existing levels of flood risk without increasing flood risk elsewhere;*
- c. Ensuring that new development does not contribute to increased surface water run-off through measures such as Sustainable Drainage Systems, where these are practical. Where they are not this should be achieved by improvements to drainage capacity;*
- d. Supporting measures to address the constraints of existing drainage infrastructure capacity and avoiding development in areas where the existing drainage infrastructure is inadequate; and*
- e. Support for new flood defence measures to protect against both tidal and fluvial flooding in the Borough, including appropriate land management as part of a catchment wide approach.*

Individual development proposals will be assessed with regard to Development and Flood Risk under Policy DM24.

Policy DM24 – Development Proposals and Flood Risk:

Where a proposed development is likely to be at risk from flooding or increases risk of flooding elsewhere, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required to be submitted as part of the planning application.

Development will not be permitted where it is found that:

- a. There is an unacceptable risk of flooding; or*
- b. The development would increase the risk of flooding elsewhere; or*
- c. The development would cause interference with or loss of access to a watercourse and the benefits of the development do not outweigh the risks of flooding.*

Where a development requires the provision of additional flood defence and mitigation works, any costs, including maintenance, should be met by the developer.

3. Development Site

3.1 Existing Site Conditions

The development site comprises Hensingham House and land surrounding it, located off Egremont Road in Hensingham. Table 4 presents the key details of the site:

Table 4 - Key site details

Site location	Hensingham House, Hensingham
Site area (ha)	0.52
National grid reference	NX 98598 16737
Nearest Postcode	CA28 8QW
Existing land use	Residential
Local Planning Authority	Copeland Borough Council (CBC)
Lead Local Flood Authority	Cumbria County Council (CCC)

The site currently comprises the Hensingham House building, currently used for residential purposes. The site is bounded by residential developments to the north, east and south and open fields to the west. Access to the site is from Egremont Drive immediately east.

3.2 Site Topography

A topographical survey was carried out for the grounds surrounding Hensingham House in May 2020. The survey did not cover the full area of the site but does give enough indication of likely levels beyond the survey extents. Generally it was found that the grounds slope from east to west. High points are located north east of Hensingham House on the pathway of Egremont Road (~ 85.95m AOD). Low points are located south west of the main building, towards the open fields to the west (~ 84.55m AOD).

The topographical survey can be viewed in Appendix A.

3.3 Existing Watercourses

The nearest watercourse is small brook marked on OS mapping located c.80m north of the site. The watercourse appears to connect with the Pow Beck west of the site (based on the EA's flood risk mapping). Flow appears to travel from east to west past the site. LiDAR data shows that the banks of the watercourse sit approximately 15m lower than the development site.

Another watercourse, the Snebra Beck is located approximately 140m north of the site. The Snebra Beck flows westwards, eventually joining with the Pow Beck approximately 700m to the west.

There are no other watercourses relevant to the site.

3.4 Proposed Development

The proposed development is for the conversion of the existing Hensingham House building to provide 5 no. residential properties and the construction of an additional 4 no. residential properties on land immediately west of Hensingham House. The development also includes associated road access, parking space and green areas.

The proposed site layout plan is provided in Appendix B.

3.5 Historic Features

Historical mapping for the site and surrounding area has been examined from 1867 in order to identify changes which may be relevant to flood risk.

The earliest available mapping shows the site to be within the boundary of an agricultural field. The Snebra Beck is located to the north following a similar flow route as is shown in present day mapping. Some development is located north east of the site comprising Hensingham. A railway line is also mapped west of the site, following the same line as can be observed present day.

By 1879 a 'Hall' (later referred to as Hensingham Hall) is located within the footprint of the current Hensingham House building.

In 1899 a vicarage is marked immediately south of the site. In 1925 St John's Church is marked for the first time to the north of the vicarage. Land east of the site has also become more developed comprising residential developments with allotment gardens mapped from 1925.

From 1961 a building referred to as Hensingham House is located within the site footprint. It appears to be the same building previously referred as Hensingham Hall; however this could not be confirmed from the mapping alone.

The site remains unchanged until the most recent historical maps from 1979, with the surrounding area gradually becoming more developed over that time. The Hensingham Bypass immediately west of the site was constructed some time during the 1980s.

4. Sources of Flood Risk Information

4.1 Environment Agency (EA)

The EA flood map for planning shows the entire site to be located within Flood Zone 1 (Figure 2). This means that the site is not considered to be at risk from fluvial flooding during the 0.1% AEP (1 in 1000 year Annual Exceedance Probability) event. The nearest flood zone is located ~80m north west of the site boundary, associated with the tributary of the Pow Beck.




Figure 2 - Extract from the EA's Flood Map for Planning

FAIRHURST

The EA's risk from surface water map shows the entire site to be at a very low risk from surface water flooding (Figure 3). This means that the site is outside of the area of risk during the 0.1% AEP (1 in 1000 year) rainfall event.




Figure 3 - Extract from EA's Risk of Flooding from Surface Water map.

FAIRHURST

The EA's recorded flood outline map shows that the site is not located within an area that has been recorded to flood in the past (Figure 4). The nearest record of flooding is approximately 550m west of the site. Flooding was recorded along the banks of the Pow Beck in November 1999 when the channel capacity of the beck was exceeded.




Figure 4 - Extract from EA's Risk Recorded Flood Outlines map.

4.2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)

The Copeland Borough Council SFRA (August 2007) provides a summary of the main sources of flood risk in the council area. The SFRA describes the main source of flood risk in the council area to be tidal, with many settlements along the Copeland coastline located within the tidal surge limit. Fluvial flooding is described as the next biggest source of risk, followed by culvert related problems and sewer flooding.

The SFRA provides some information regarding the Snebra Beck, which is one of the nearest sources of fluvial flood risk to the site:

- Some settlements located along the banks of the Snebra Beck are at risk from fluvial flooding, particularly at Bleng Avenue and Ribton Moor;
- Area of flood risk at Ribton Moor pose a risk of life, with modelling showing the area to be within the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3B). Deep, fast moving flows are recorded during flood events; and
- Informal defences are located downstream of the confluence between Snebra Beck and Pow Beck, providing protection to nearby properties.

The SFRA also describes there to be limited potential for groundwater flooding within the council area, with only 10 properties within the whole borough considered to be at risk.

The SFRA does not identify any flood risk information specific to the site.

4.3 Sewerage Company

United Utilities (UU), the sewerage operator in the region, is required by OFWAT to maintain a record of flooding incidents due to hydraulic capacity problems on the sewerage network. Properties are placed on the register following investigations to determine the cause and risk of flooding and are placed on the appropriate register depending on risk – not on the number of occurrences of flooding.

UU have been contacted to determine if they have any records of sewer flooding relevant to the site, they responded confirming that have no current records of sewer flooding within the vicinity of the site. The full response can be found in appendix C.

5. Potential Sources of Flood Risk

5.1 Fluvial (Rivers)

Extreme fluvial flood events have the potential to cause rapid inundation of properties whilst posing a threat to the welfare of occupants and potentially preventing emergency access to properties and essential infrastructure. The entire site is located within Flood Zone 1, meaning that it is not identified as being at risk from fluvial flooding up to the 0.1% AEP (1 in 1000 year) fluvial flood event.

The nearest flood zone is located approximately 80m north west of the site, associated with the tributary to the Pow Beck. 1m composite LiDAR data suggests a difference in elevation of at least 15m between the grounds surrounding Hensingham House and elevations at the flood zone boundary of the watercourse. Thus flood risk from this source is considered to be low.

Due to the difference in elevation between the site and nearest flood zone, it is considered unlikely that the site will become at risk from fluvial flooding in the future due to the effects of climate change.

5.2 Infrastructure Failure

The failure of conveyance infrastructure such as culverts and bridges could increase the risk of flooding to the site. Both the small tributary to the Pow Beck north west of the site and the Snebra Beck located further north are culverted in close proximity to the site. Blockage at either of these culverts could lead to a significant body of flow building up behind the blockage and extend onto the surrounding area.

EA 1m composite LiDAR data suggests a difference in elevation of approximately 15m between the northern boundary of the site and the banks of the watercourse immediately north. Based on this it is considered unlikely that a culvert blockage at either watercourse would cause water levels to rise so significantly that they provide a risk of flooding to the site as flows would more likely overtop the blockage and flow within the watercourse channel.

The nearest bridge is located over 200m North West of the site, allowing the Hensingham Bypass to cross over the Snebra Beck. It is considered unlikely that failure of this bridge will pose a significant risk of flooding to the site, due to the distance of the site from the bridge and difference in elevation between the site and the watercourse.

The nearest EA maintained flood defences are located approximately 2km North West of the site at Whitehaven Harbour. The CBC SFRA (August 2007) identifies that some informal flood defences exist downstream of the confluence between Snebra Beck and Pow Beck. Although the exact location of these defences is unknown; the confluence between the two watercourses is located approximately 800m west of the site. Given the distance from the site from all known flood defences, flood risk due to the failure of defence infrastructure is considered to be low.

5.3 Pluvial (Overland Flow)

The EA's surface water flood mapping shows the site to be at a very low risk from pluvial flooding. This means that no areas of the site are identified as being at risk during events up to the 0.1% AEP (1 in 1000 year) rainfall event.

The nearest area of risk is located immediately south west of the site associated with Egremont Road. It is assumed that any surface water reaching Egremont Drive will be conveyed into the associated highway drainage. The topographic survey shows eight road gullies in the adjacent highway.

5.4 Sewer Flooding

United Utilities have responded to the enquiry for historical sewer flooding information stating that they have no records of sewer flooding within the vicinity of the site. The full response can be found in appendix I.

United Utilities sewer plans (Appendix C) show Hensingham House to be in close proximity to the UU combined sewer that flows in a north easterly direction, it is assumed a connection to this sewer currently exists. There are also sewers immediately south of the site on Egremont Drive where an existing connection may occur. These are shown to convey flow southwards via Egremont Drive away from the site, two manholes associated with this sewer are shown on the topographic survey.

In the event of a sewer (private or public) exceedance event flows can be expected to pool at low lying spots within the adjacent areas. As there are existing connections within the site boundary it is possible that sewer exceedance could pose a risk of flooding to the development.

6 Surface Water Drainage

The development is located entirely within Flood Zone 1. In accordance with the NPPF, the drainage strategy will focus on the management of surface water to ensure that flood risk is not increased on or off site. The surface water strategy for the site has been developed in accordance with the Building Regulations Part H hierarchy.

6.1 Surface Water Runoff Rates

6.1.1 Existing rates

The site is approximately 0.52 ha based on the proposed layout (see Appendix B) across both Phase 1 and 2 of the development and 0.27 ha of the site will be impermeable. This Q_{bar} rate of the site is 1.9 l/s, the Micro drainage calculations for the Q_{bar} rural run off rates can be found in **Appendix E**.

6.1.2 Proposed rates

For developments on brownfield land, CCC (i.e. the LLFA for the site) state in their Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage – Practice Guidance that *“for developments which were previously developed, the peak runoff rate from the development to any drain, sewer or surface water body for the 1 in 1 year rainfall event and the 1 in 100 year rainfall event should be as close as reasonably practicable to the greenfield runoff rate from the development for the same rainfall event, but should never exceed the rate of discharge from the development prior to redevelopment for that event.”*

In line with this guidance, as the site is a combination of both brownfield and greenfield land, it is proposed that surface water from the proposed development should be restricted as close to the greenfield runoff rate for Q_{BAR} . The greenfield runoff rates for the area of the site which is to remain impermeable is 1.9l/s. Micro Drainage outputs for the rural runoff rates can be viewed in Appendix E.

To satisfy guidance from CCC it is proposed that surface water will be restricted as close to the greenfield Q_{BAR} rate as can feasibly be provided without an increased risk in blockage. It is proposed that surface water will be discharged at a maximum rate of 3.4 l/s. This is considered to be the lowest discharge rate that can be allowed without creating an increased risk of blockage occurring (due to the small hydro-brake orifice size that would be required to allow a lower maximum rate).

6.2 Proposed Surface Water Drainage

The Building Regulations Part H sets out a hierarchy for the choice of discharge point for a rainwater system. In order of priority, the possibilities are given as:

- An adequate soakaway or some other adequate infiltration system; or where that is not reasonably practicable,
- A watercourse; or where that is not reasonably practicable,

- A sewer.

6.2.1 Discharge Via Infiltration

FSR SOIL values range from 0.15 to 0.5 with 0.15 representing freely draining soils and 0.5 representing impeded drainage. Descriptors for the site area indicate a SOIL value of 0.45 for the site, indicating there is limited scope to discharge surface water into the ground.

In May 2020 Geoinvestigate Ltd. carried out a review of the natural drainage potential for SuDS schemes at the site. The review states *“the silty clay soils which are recorded to a depth of ca. 2m at or very close to the study site and the underlying siltstone or mudstone bedrock would all be expected to exhibit intrinsically low or very low permeability and it is therefore concluded that the use of natural drainage such as soakaways, permeable paving or infiltration trenches will not be feasible at this site”*. Thus the report concludes that *“natural recharge via infiltration into subsoils is extremely unlikely to be feasible at this site”*. A copy of the report is provided in Appendix F.

Given the SOIL value for the site and the main conclusions from the SuDS review it is considered that infiltration will not be suitable for removing surface water from the site. In order to confirm this it is recommended that site specific infiltration should be carried out for the site to confirm this as even partial infiltration can help to manage the volume of runoff that is drained elsewhere.

6.2.2 Discharge to a Watercourse

The nearest watercourse is Snebra Beck located approximately 80m North West of the site. For the Phase 2 development a direct connection to this watercourse would involve passing through a significant stretch of assumed private land. UU asset plans (Appendix C) indicate that there is already a sewer in close proximity to the site where it is assumed Phase 1 connects to the existing network. Due to the site layout and the developments proximity to the existing network, utilising the existing connections to the surrounding sewers would usually be considered more appropriate. However, comments from the council state that the sewer is under strain and there is no additional capacity therefore discharging via a watercourse for Phase 2 is the more feasible option even though it involves passing through private land.

6.2.3 Discharge to a Sewer

UU asset plans (Appendix C) indicate that there are sewers in close proximity to Hensingham House, it is assumed a connection exists to these sewers for Phase 1 however, at the time of writing no CCTV survey has been undertaken to confirm this.

For the Phase 2 development as mentioned above connecting to the existing network is not feasible so will have to be discharged via a watercourse.

6.2.4 Climate Change

To ensure that the proposed discharge rates can be achieved, it will be necessary to provide surface water attenuation within the development. The EA generally advises that a lifespan of 100 years should be used for developments. The Technical Guidance to the NPPF states that

for the time period 2085 to 2115, peak rainfall intensity should be increased by 20% to account for the possible impacts of climate change.

The latest Technical Guidance from the NPPF also states the importance of considering flooding implications in new developments, in relation to a 50% increase in peak rainfall intensity due to climate change. These implications are significant and have the potential to impact the site, neighbouring areas, or pose risks to people, it is necessary to explore measures that enhance attenuation, for a 50% climate change resilience level. This may include implementing additional mitigation measures, such as a higher freeboard, to ensure that the site and offsite developments remain safe even under the extreme 50% climate change scenario.

In order to ensure no increase in risk as a result of the development, the oversized pipes used for storage has considered a 50% increase in climate change for 1% AEP. Taking into account the lifespan of the development and the anticipated increase in rainfall intensity due to climate change, an estimate for the surface water attenuation volume has been carried out for the development using the industry standard software, Micro Drainage. The Micro Drainage calculations can be found in appendix G.

6.3 SuDS

The SuDS Manual (CIRIA C753) details a wide range of drainage techniques some of which may be incorporated within the proposed drainage design.

- Some which may be suitable for the site include: Permeable paving.

The small size of the site means that there is limited space within the proposed layout to provide open SuDS such as basins or ponds. However it is proposed that permeable paving is used in the car parking spaces incorporated into the site. This will provide additional storage capacity and can allow some treatment of surface water to occur prior to it being discharged into UU sewers. The available information on ground conditions indicate that infiltration is not viable for the site. This strategy therefore recommends that permeable paving is lined and drains to the wider drainage system.

All SuDS installed will attenuate and store surface water runoff from the proposed development prior to discharging into the surface water sewer. The proposed drainage layout for the site can be seen on the Fairhurst drawing 138443/2002 – Proposed Drainage Layout (Appendix H).

The feasibility and suitability of each SuDS solution has been appraised as part of the drainage design development. Introducing SuDS onto the development will help to reduce the volume of storage needed. It is considered that the information provided demonstrates that a feasible solution is available. This will ensure that flood risk will not increase on, or off, site as a result of the proposed development.

6.4 Water Quality – Simple Index Approach

The Simple Index Approach has been used to help inform the proposed drainage layout for the site. The proposed development contains two key areas that will generate surface water runoff where new drainage is to be constructed: the roofs of the buildings and proposed car parking areas.

Based on the classifications in Table 26.2 from the CIRIA SuDS Manual the proposed roofs of the buildings are classified as a 'residential roof', which is designated as having a 'very low' pollution hazard level. The proposed car parking bays are classified as being an individual property driveways', which is designated as having a 'low' pollution hazard level.

Roof runoff from the proposed buildings will be discharged via pipework into the drainage system with no opportunity for treatment to be provided. As residential roof runoff is shown to have a 'very low' pollution hazard level in the SuDS Manual, there is considered to be a very low pollution risk from this source. As such, treatment to roof runoff prior to discharge is not deemed necessary.

Runoff from the proposed car parking spaces is considered to have a 'low' pollution hazard level, and is shown to have higher pollution hazard indices than the roof runoff from the proposed development. It is proposed that permeable paving will be used in the proposed car parking spaces to provide treatment of surface water prior to discharging into UU sewers.

Table 5 shows the mitigation indices that permeable paving provides against the main pollution hazard indices. The mitigation indices from permeable paving exceed the pollution hazard indices from the proposed car park for the indices considered within the Simple Index Approach. Thus the proposed drainage layout for the development is shown to satisfy the Simple Index Approach and will provide adequate treatment of surface water passing through the proposed site.

Table 5 - Simple Index Approach: Pollution hazard indices and proposed SuDS

POLLUTION HAZARD INDICES				
LAND USE	Pollution Hazard Level	Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	Metals	Hydro-carbons
ROOF RUNOFF	Very Low	0.2	0.2	0.05
CAR PARK, LOW TRAFFIC ROADS	Low	0.5	0.4	0.4
MITIGATION INDICES				



TYPE OF SUDS COMPONENT	TSS	Metals	Hydro-carbons
PERMEABLE PAVING	0.7	0.6	0.7

7. Foul Water Drainage

Foul flows from the proposed development are calculated to be 0.25 l/s for Phase 1 and 0.2 l/s for Phase 2, using the design flow of 0.05 litres/seconds/dwellings. This is in accordance with The Design and Construction Guidance ('The Code') 2022.

It is proposed that foul flows from the conversion will be discharged into UU sewers via existing sewer connections currently in place on site and the new development units will be connected via a new connection.

An updated pre development enquiry will need to be submitted to UU to confirm that there is capacity within their sewers to handle flows from the development. A pre-development enquiry has been carried out using the old site layout, the advice from UU is no longer valid as 12 months has elapsed since it was received. It did accept the foul water connection as was proposed in the initial enquiry.

8. Conclusions

This Flood Risk Statement and Drainage Strategy has been produced for the proposed development of Hensingham House, Hensingham. The proposed development is for the conversion of the existing Hensingham House into 5 no. residential properties and the construction of an additional 4 no. residential plots to the west of Hensingham House. The proposal also includes car parking areas, road access and green space. The report has been prepared in accordance within the NPPF, the Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practise Guidance, and the local planning policy documents.

The application boundary is located entirely within Flood Zone 1 in accordance with the flood map for planning and is shown to be at a very low risk from surface water flooding. It is identified that there may be a residual risk of sewer flooding from existing assets on site and in the surrounding area.

It is proposed that surface water from the Phase 2 development will be discharged into Snebra Beck to the north of the site. In line with local guidance, surface water rates will be restricted as close to the greenfield Q_{BAR} rate as can be achieved without presenting a risk from blockage. Attenuation via oversized pipes will be provided to ensure that the development can handle flows up to the 1 in 100 year rainfall event with a 50% allowance for climate change.


It is proposed that foul flows are discharged into UU assets via existing connections on site. An updated pre planning sewerage enquiry should be submitted to UU to confirm that there is capacity their assets to handle flows from the development.

It is concluded that the proposed development is appropriate for the site.

The logo for Fairhurst, featuring the word "FAIRHURST" in white, bold, uppercase letters on a black rectangular background. A red horizontal line is positioned directly beneath the black rectangle. The logo is flanked by blue horizontal bars on both the left and right sides.

Appendix A


Topographical Survey



Code	Description
GU	Gully
ST	Stop Tap
TP	Telegraph Pole
STN	Survey Station
EL	Electric
BT	British Telecon
RS	Road Sign
EP	Electric Pole
LC	Lighting Column
MH	Manhole
DS	Down Spout
IC	Inspection Cover

1. This site has been surveyed OS GB36(15) grid using a local scale factor of 1.000000 about STNS.
2. All levels are in metres unless stated otherwise.
3. Levels are to Ordnance Survey GB36(15) datum.
4. The services indicated are 'as found on site'.


Reproduced from Ordnance Survey Land-Line.Plus data with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery office.
© Crown Copyright 2019



01/09/19 20/08/19	Issued for information. Draft Issue	JAF JAF	
NO	Reimbursement Details	BT	YES CLIENT
Revisions		Approvals	
		Winnow Barn Syke Farm, Syke Road. Wigan, Cumbria, CA7 8AB Tel: 016973 49495 Mobile: 07712677809 E-Mail: JAF@SERV@aol.com	
Construction, Engineering and Surveying Services			
CLIENT NAME:		Tom Milburn	
PROJECT TITLE Site @ Wensingham, Whitehaven.			
DRAWING TITLE Topographical Survey			
DRAWN BY J. Fitzsimmons	CHECKED BY JAF	DATE 07/08/19	REVISION
SCALE 1:200 @ A0	DRAWING NO. CDL-002-001		

Appendix B

Proposed Layout



This drawing is copyright, reproduction of this drawing is only with consent from C.D.L. Figured dimensions are to be followed in preference to scaled dimensions, and all measurements to be checked on site, and to be taken from the actual work where possible. Any discrepancy must be notified immediately, and before proceeding. All drawings and associated specifications to be returned on request. DO NOT SCALE FROM THIS DRAWING

ARCHITECTURE

cdl

Planning & Design

Mob : 07786991404
The Studio 26 Corporation Rd
Carlisle
Cumbria CA3 8XB
E Mail : cdlarcdesign@gmail.com

Client :	THOMAS MILBURN PROPERTY LTD		
Drwg No :	DS/TMP/4/RD/23		
Date :	JULY 23	Checked By : DS	REVISION E
Scales :	Elevations :	Detail : ALL PHASES 1 - 4	
	Floor Plans :	Title : SITE PLAN DETAIL	
	Block Plan : 1 : 500		
	Location Plan :	Address : HENSINGHAM HOUSE, HENSINGHAM, WHITEHAVEN	
	Sections :	CUMBRIA . CA28 8QB	

The logo for Fairhurst, featuring the word "FAIRHURST" in white capital letters on a black rectangular background. This black rectangle is positioned on a blue horizontal bar. A red horizontal line is located directly beneath the black rectangle.

FAIRHURST

Appendix C

United Utilities Sewer Plans

Jack Shelton

1
Arngrove Court, Barrack Road
Newcastle Upon Tyne,
NE4 6DB

FAO:

How to contact us:

**United Utilities Water Limited
Property Searches
Haweswater House
Lingley Mere Business Park
Great Sankey
Warrington
WA5 3LP**

Telephone: 0370 7510101

E-mail: propertysearches@uuplc.co.uk

**Your Ref: Hensingham
Our Ref: UUPS-ORD-166133
Date: 02/06/2020**

Dear Sirs

Location: Hensingham

I acknowledge with thanks your request dated 01/06/2020 for information on the location of our services.

Please find enclosed plans showing the approximate position of United Utilities' apparatus known to be in the vicinity of this site.

The enclosed plans are being provided to you subject to the United Utilities terms and conditions for both the wastewater and water distribution plans which are shown attached.

If you are planning works anywhere in the North West, please read United Utilities' access statement before you start work to check how it will affect our network. <http://www.unitedutilities.com/work-near-asset.aspx>.

I trust the above meets with your requirements and look forward to hearing from you should you need anything further.

If you have any queries regarding this matter please [contact us](#).

Yours Faithfully,

Karen McCormack
Property Searches Manager


TERMS AND CONDITIONS - WASTEWATER AND WATER DISTRIBUTION PLANS

These provisions apply to the public sewerage, water distribution and telemetry systems (including sewers which are the subject of an agreement under Section 104 of the Water Industry Act 1991 and mains installed in accordance with the agreement for the self construction of water mains) (UUWL apparatus) of United Utilities Water Limited "(UUWL)".

TERMS AND CONDITIONS:

- This Map and any information supplied with it is issued subject to the provisions contained below, to the exclusion of all others and no party relies upon any representation, warranty, collateral contract or other assurance of any person (whether party to this agreement or not) that is not set out in this agreement or the documents referred to in it.
- This Map and any information supplied with it is provided for general guidance only and no representation, undertaking or warranty as to its accuracy, completeness or being up to date is given or implied.
- In particular, the position and depth of any UUWL apparatus shown on the Map are approximate only. UUWL strongly recommends that a comprehensive survey is undertaken in addition to reviewing this Map to determine and ensure the precise location of any UUWL apparatus. The exact location, positions and depths should be obtained by excavation trial holes.
- The location and position of private drains, private sewers and service pipes to properties are not normally shown on this Map but their presence must be anticipated and accounted for and you are strongly advised to carry out your own further enquiries and investigations in order to locate the same.
- The position and depth of UUWL apparatus is subject to change and therefore this Map is issued subject to any removal or change in location of the same. The onus is entirely upon you to confirm whether any changes to the Map have been made subsequent to issue and prior to any works being carried out.
- This Map and any information shown on it or provided with it must not be relied upon in the event of any development, construction or other works (including but not limited to any excavations) in the vicinity of UUWL apparatus or for the purpose of determining the suitability of a point of connection to the sewerage or other distribution systems.
- No person or legal entity, including any company shall be relieved from any liability howsoever and whensoever arising for any damage caused to UUWL apparatus by reason of the actual position and/or depths of UUWL apparatus being different from those shown on the Map and any information supplied with it.
- If any provision contained herein is or becomes legally invalid or unenforceable, it will be taken to be severed from the remaining provisions which shall be unaffected and continue in full force and affect.
- This agreement shall be governed by English law and all parties submit to the exclusive jurisdiction of the English courts, save that nothing will prevent UUWL from bringing proceedings in any other competent jurisdiction, whether concurrently or otherwise.

Wastewater Symbolology



All point assets follow the standard colour convention: **red** – combined **brown** - foul
blue – surface water **purple** - overflow

- | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Manhole | Side Entry Manhole |
| Head of System | Outfall |
| Extent of Survey | Screen Chamber |
| Rodding Eye | Inspection Chamber |
| Inlet | Bifurcation Chamber |
| Discharge Point | Lamp Hole |
| Vortex | T Junction / Saddle |
| Penstock | Catchpit |
| Washout Chamber | Valve Chamber |
| Valve | Vent Column |
| Air Valve | Vortex Chamber |
| Non Return Valve | Penstock Chamber |
| Soakaway | Network Storage Tank |
| Gully | Sewer Overflow |
| Cascade | Ww Treatment Works |
| Flow Meter | Ww Pumping Station |
| Hatch Box | Septic Tank |
| Oil Interceptor | Control Kiosk |
| Summit | |
| Drop Shaft | Change of Characteristic |
| Orifice Plate | |



SEWER RECORDS

Address or Site Reference


Hensingham,

Scale: 1:2500
Date: 02/06/2020

Printed by: Property Searches

The position of the underground apparatus shown on this plan is approximate only and is given in accordance with the best information currently available. United Utilities Water will not accept liability for any loss or damage caused by the actual position being different from those shown.

Crown copyright and database rights 2017
Ordnance Survey 100022432. Unauthorised
reproduction will infringe these copyrights.



Appendix D

Micro Drainage – Rural Runoff Rates

ICP SUDS Mean Annual Flood

Input

Return Period (years) 5 SAAR (mm) 999 Urban 0.000
Area (ha) 0.290 Soil 0.450 Region Number Region 10

Results 1/s

QBAR Rural 1.9
QBAR Urban 1.9

Q5 years 2.3

Q1 year 1.7
Q30 years 3.3
Q100 years 4.0

Appendix E

Geoinvestigate report – SuDS feasibility assessment (May 2020)

Our ref. G20165

Review of Natural Drainage Potential for SuDS Schemes

Proposed Residential Development at Georgian House, Egremont Road, Hensingham, CA28 8QB

Geoinvestigate has been asked to assess the drainage potential of the geology at the above site via a desk-based exercise with regard to the potential implementation of various Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) options.

It is currently proposed to construct a new residential development of some 31 dwellings at the site which currently comprises undeveloped grassed space in the suburbs of Whitehaven. Wooded areas lie adjacent to and beyond the northern and western boundaries of the proposed development site, residential properties and St. John's Church lie to the east of the site, and an extended grassed area lies to the south (with further residential properties beyond). The A595 (Hensingham Bypass) lies downslope and beyond the wooded area to the west of the site. The proposed development plan is understood not to have been finalised at this stage but an outline plan has been provided and is presented in Figure 1 below:

Figure 1: Outline Proposed Development Layout



DRAFT

ARCHITECTURE
cdi
Planning & Design

Mod - 07795991404
Tel - 01228 696 122
The Studio 26 Corporation Rd
Carlisle
Cumbria CA2 9XB
E Mail - cdiarchitect@gmail.com

CORBRAND DEVELOPMENTS LTD

Recorded Geology

BGS 1:5,000 Sheet number 28 (Whitehaven) shows the site to be underlain by Devensian Till with sandstone bedrock belonging to the Hensingham Formation (also referred to as the Stainmore Formation). A fault is shown to run in an east-west direction to the north of (but outside of) the site through the adjacent wooded area, a stream appears to roughly follow the line of this fault on the OS map and goes below ground to the west below the A595.

The Bedlam Gill Coal Seam is shown on the BGS map to outcrop in an approximate north-south orientation roughly along the eastern boundary of the study area, perhaps encroaching into the site. However, the Coal Authority's interactive online map viewer does not show this outcrop, nor any associated development high risk area but does show what may be the same coal seam further to the north beyond a more distant fault. While it is beyond the scope of this report, perhaps the potential for shallow historical coal mining might need to be further explored by means of a Coal Mining Risk Assessment (CMRA).

Borehole records

BGS borehole scans referenced: NX91NE101, NX91NE127, NX91NE112 and NX91NE103 are all recorded as being very close to, or possibly inside of, the western boundary of the site, and records NX91NE128 and NX91NE114 slightly further to the west and south respectively but still relatively close to the site.

Table 1: Summary of BGS Borehole Records

Borehole:	NX91NE101	NX91NE127	NX91NE112	NX91NE103	NX91NE128	NX91NE114
Surface:	0.50m Topsoil	0.30m Topsoil	0.90m Topsoil	0.45m Topsoil	0.30m Topsoil	0.80m Topsoil
Subsoil:	Slightly sandy silty CLAY to 2.20m	Slightly sandy silty CLAY to 1.90m	Slightly sandy silty CLAY to 1.80m, silty CLAY to 2.50m	Silty CLAY to 2.10m	Silty CLAY to 1.20m	Silty, initially sandy, CLAY to 2.00m. Silty SAND to 2.90m
Rock:	Weathered siltstone into silty mudstone 4.30m. Mostly Sandstone below 13.64m.	Silty clay noted to probably be completely weathered siltstone 1.90m to 2.60m.	Highly weathered silty mudstone to 3.45m.	Variably weathered bands of silty mudstone and mudstone to 7.54m, mostly sandstone below.	Highly weathered mudstone to 2.15m, siltstone to 2.30m.	Highly weathered siltstone and silty mudstone to 3.45m.
Other Notes:	COAL 15.24m-15.51m below a band of mudstone. Perched groundwater ca. 1.9-4.0m during early drilling, GW at 13m in deeper sandstone.	Trial pit. Halted at 2.60m.	Trial pit. Halted at 3.45m.	Thin COAL 7.54m-7.75m. Groundwater at 1.6m on 19/7/85 and 11.45m on 20/7/85.	Trial pit. Halted at 2.30m.	Borehole halted at 3.45m.
Implications on Drainage:	Clay soils to between 1.90m and 2.50m likely to be extremely low permeability. Underlying siltstone and mudstone likely low and extremely low permeability respectively.				Similar to others, though a lesser depth of clay subsoils over the bedrock. Further from site.	0.90m thick silty sand band present in this more distant borehole unlikely to be sufficient for soakaways etc.

Summary

The silty clay soils which are recorded to a depth of ca. 2m at or very close to the study site and the underlying siltstone or mudstone bedrock would all be expected to exhibit intrinsically low or very low permeability and it is therefore concluded that the use of natural drainage such as soakaways, permeable paving or infiltration trenches will not be feasible at this site.

Other SuDs features might be incorporated into the development such as green roofs, storage ponds and other attenuation/retention features such as tanks and swales placed to slow runoff from the site prior to discharge into local sewers, but the use of natural recharge via infiltration into subsoils is extremely unlikely to be feasible at this site.

Kind regards,

Jack Harper BSc(Hons) MSc CSci MEnvSc
Contaminated Land Division Manager

Geoinvestigate Ltd.

www.geoinvestigate.co.uk

Tel. (01642) 713779 / 07795 845729



Appendix F

Micro Drainage – Model Outputs

W A Fairhurst & Partners		Page 1	
1 Arngrove Court Barrack Road Newcastle upon Tyne NE4 6DB		HENSINGHAM HOUSE PHASE 2	
Date 21/09/2023 10:59 File 138443 MD 23.09.08 V3.MDX		Designed by fmoore Checked by AS	
Micro Drainage		Network 2020.1.3	

STORM SEWER DESIGN by the Modified Rational Method

Design Criteria for Storm

Pipe Sizes STANDARD Manhole Sizes STANDARD

FSR Rainfall Model - England and Wales

Return Period (years)	2	PIMP (%)	100
M5-60 (mm)	17.100	Add Flow / Climate Change (%)	0
Ratio R	0.252	Minimum Backdrop Height (m)	0.200
Maximum Rainfall (mm/hr)	50	Maximum Backdrop Height (m)	1.500
Maximum Time of Concentration (mins)	30	Min Design Depth for Optimisation (m)	1.200
Foul Sewage (l/s/ha)	0.000	Min Vel for Auto Design only (m/s)	1.00
Volumetric Runoff Coeff.	0.750	Min Slope for Optimisation (1:X)	500

Designed with Level Soffits

Time Area Diagram for Storm

Time (mins)	Area (ha)	Time (mins)	Area (ha)
0-4	0.148	4-8	0.062

Total Area Contributing (ha) = 0.210

Total Pipe Volume (m³) = 42.418

Network Design Table for Storm

« - Indicates pipe capacity < flow

PN	Length (m)	Fall (m)	Slope (1:X)	I.Area (ha)	T.E. (mins)	Base Flow (l/s)	k (mm)	HYD SECT	DIA (mm)	Section Type	Auto Design
S1.000	24.899	0.050	498.0	0.026	5.00	0.0	0.600	o	750	Pipe/Conduit	
S1.001	14.183	0.073	194.3	0.012	0.00	0.0	0.600	o	750	Pipe/Conduit	
S1.002	20.575	0.041	501.8	0.031	0.00	0.0	0.600	o	750	Pipe/Conduit	

Network Results Table

PN	Rain (mm/hr)	T.C. (mins)	US/IL (m)	Σ I.Area (ha)	Σ Base Flow (l/s)	Foul (l/s)	Add Flow (l/s)	Vel (m/s)	Cap (l/s)	Flow (l/s)
S1.000	46.26	5.33	83.371	0.026	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.25	551.0	3.3
S1.001	45.89	5.45	83.321	0.038	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.00	885.4	4.8
S1.002	45.05	5.73	83.248	0.070	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.24	548.9	8.5

©1982-2020 Innovyze

W A Fairhurst & Partners				Page 3		
1 Arngrove Court Barrack Road Newcastle upon Tyne NE4 6DB			HENSINGHAM HOUSE PHASE 2			
Date 21/09/2023 10:59 File 138443 MD 23.09.08 V3.MDX			Designed by fmoore Checked by AS			
Micro Drainage			Network 2020.1.3			
Area Summary for Storm						
Pipe Number	PIMP Type	PIMP Name	PIMP (%)	Gross Area (ha)	Imp. Area (ha)	Pipe Total (ha)
1.000	User	-	100	0.026	0.026	0.026
1.001	User	-	100	0.012	0.012	0.012
1.002	User	-	100	0.031	0.031	0.031
1.003	User	-	100	0.014	0.014	0.014
	User	-	100	0.006	0.006	0.020
	User	-	100	0.016	0.016	0.037
	User	-	100	0.003	0.003	0.040
2.000	-	-	100	0.000	0.000	0.000
3.000	-	-	100	0.000	0.000	0.000
1.004	-	-	100	0.000	0.000	0.000
1.005	User	-	100	0.006	0.006	0.006
	User	-	100	0.057	0.057	0.063
	User	-	100	0.033	0.033	0.096
	User	-	100	0.004	0.004	0.100
1.006	-	-	100	0.000	0.000	0.000
1.007	-	-	100	0.000	0.000	0.000
1.008	-	-	100	0.000	0.000	0.000
				Total	Total	Total
				0.210	0.210	0.210
Free Flowing Outfall Details for Storm						
Outfall Pipe Number	Outfall Name	C. Level (m)	I. Level (m)	Min I. Level (m)	D, L (mm)	W (mm)
S1.008	S	73.951	72.951	0.000	0	0
Simulation Criteria for Storm						
Volumetric Runoff Coeff	0.750	Additional Flow - % of Total Flow		0.000		
Areal Reduction Factor	1.000	MADD Factor * 10m³/ha Storage		2.000		
Hot Start (mins)	0	Inlet Coeffiecient		0.800		
Hot Start Level (mm)	0	Flow per Person per Day (l/per/day)		0.000		
Manhole Headloss Coeff (Global)	0.500	Run Time (mins)		60		
Foul Sewage per hectare (l/s)	0.000	Output Interval (mins)		1		
Number of Input Hydrographs 0 Number of Offline Controls 0 Number of Time/Area Diagrams 0						
Number of Online Controls 1 Number of Storage Structures 2 Number of Real Time Controls 0						
Synthetic Rainfall Details						
Rainfall Model FSR		Region England and Wales				
Return Period (years) 30 M5-60 (mm)		17.100				
©1982-2020 Innovyze						

W A Fairhurst & Partners		Page 4
1 Arngrove Court Barrack Road Newcastle upon Tyne NE4 6DB	HENSINGHAM HOUSE PHASE 2	
Date 21/09/2023 10:59 File 138443 MD 23.09.08 V3.MDX	Designed by fmoore Checked by AS	
Micro Drainage	Network 2020.1.3	
<u>Synthetic Rainfall Details</u> Ratio R 0.252 Cv (Winter) 0.840 Profile Type Summer Storm Duration (mins) 30 Cv (Summer) 0.750		
©1982-2020 Innovyze		

W A Fairhurst & Partners			Page 5																																																																									
1 Arngrove Court Barrack Road Newcastle upon Tyne NE4 6DB		HENSINGHAM HOUSE PHASE 2																																																																										
Date 21/09/2023 10:59 File 138443 MD 23.09.08 V3.MDX		Designed by fmoore Checked by AS																																																																										
Micro Drainage		Network 2020.1.3																																																																										
Online Controls for Storm																																																																												
Hydro-Brake® Optimum Manhole: S5, DS/PN: S1.005, Volume (m³): 11.4																																																																												
Unit Reference MD-SHE-0075-3400-2000-3400 Design Head (m)2.000 Design Flow (l/s)3.4 Flush-Flo™Calculated ObjectiveMinimise upstream storage ApplicationSurface Sump AvailableYes Diameter (mm)75 Invert Level (m)83.141 Minimum Outlet Pipe Diameter (mm)100 Suggested Manhole Diameter (mm)1200																																																																												
<table><tr><td>Control Points</td><td>Head (m)</td><td>Flow (l/s)</td><td>Control Points</td><td>Head (m)</td><td>Flow (l/s)</td></tr><tr><td>Design Point (Calculated)</td><td>2.000</td><td>3.4</td><td>Kick-Flo®</td><td>0.671</td><td>2.1</td></tr><tr><td>Flush-Flo™</td><td>0.330</td><td>2.6</td><td>Mean Flow over Head Range</td><td>-</td><td>2.6</td></tr></table>					Control Points	Head (m)	Flow (l/s)	Control Points	Head (m)	Flow (l/s)	Design Point (Calculated)	2.000	3.4	Kick-Flo®	0.671	2.1	Flush-Flo™	0.330	2.6	Mean Flow over Head Range	-	2.6																																																						
Control Points	Head (m)	Flow (l/s)	Control Points	Head (m)	Flow (l/s)																																																																							
Design Point (Calculated)	2.000	3.4	Kick-Flo®	0.671	2.1																																																																							
Flush-Flo™	0.330	2.6	Mean Flow over Head Range	-	2.6																																																																							
The hydrological calculations have been based on the Head/Discharge relationship for the Hydro-Brake® Optimum as specified. Should another type of control device other than a Hydro-Brake Optimum® be utilised then these storage routing calculations will be invalidated																																																																												
<table><tr><td>Depth (m)</td><td>Flow (l/s)</td><td>Depth (m)</td><td>Flow (l/s)</td><td>Depth (m)</td><td>Flow (l/s)</td><td>Depth (m)</td><td>Flow (l/s)</td></tr><tr><td>0.100</td><td>2.1</td><td>1.200</td><td>2.7</td><td>3.000</td><td>4.1</td><td>7.000</td><td>6.1</td></tr><tr><td>0.200</td><td>2.4</td><td>1.400</td><td>2.9</td><td>3.500</td><td>4.4</td><td>7.500</td><td>6.3</td></tr><tr><td>0.300</td><td>2.6</td><td>1.600</td><td>3.1</td><td>4.000</td><td>4.7</td><td>8.000</td><td>6.5</td></tr><tr><td>0.400</td><td>2.5</td><td>1.800</td><td>3.2</td><td>4.500</td><td>5.0</td><td>8.500</td><td>6.7</td></tr><tr><td>0.500</td><td>2.5</td><td>2.000</td><td>3.4</td><td>5.000</td><td>5.2</td><td>9.000</td><td>6.9</td></tr><tr><td>0.600</td><td>2.3</td><td>2.200</td><td>3.5</td><td>5.500</td><td>5.4</td><td>9.500</td><td>7.0</td></tr><tr><td>0.800</td><td>2.2</td><td>2.400</td><td>3.7</td><td>6.000</td><td>5.7</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>1.000</td><td>2.5</td><td>2.600</td><td>3.8</td><td>6.500</td><td>5.9</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>					Depth (m)	Flow (l/s)	Depth (m)	Flow (l/s)	Depth (m)	Flow (l/s)	Depth (m)	Flow (l/s)	0.100	2.1	1.200	2.7	3.000	4.1	7.000	6.1	0.200	2.4	1.400	2.9	3.500	4.4	7.500	6.3	0.300	2.6	1.600	3.1	4.000	4.7	8.000	6.5	0.400	2.5	1.800	3.2	4.500	5.0	8.500	6.7	0.500	2.5	2.000	3.4	5.000	5.2	9.000	6.9	0.600	2.3	2.200	3.5	5.500	5.4	9.500	7.0	0.800	2.2	2.400	3.7	6.000	5.7			1.000	2.5	2.600	3.8	6.500	5.9		
Depth (m)	Flow (l/s)	Depth (m)	Flow (l/s)	Depth (m)	Flow (l/s)	Depth (m)	Flow (l/s)																																																																					
0.100	2.1	1.200	2.7	3.000	4.1	7.000	6.1																																																																					
0.200	2.4	1.400	2.9	3.500	4.4	7.500	6.3																																																																					
0.300	2.6	1.600	3.1	4.000	4.7	8.000	6.5																																																																					
0.400	2.5	1.800	3.2	4.500	5.0	8.500	6.7																																																																					
0.500	2.5	2.000	3.4	5.000	5.2	9.000	6.9																																																																					
0.600	2.3	2.200	3.5	5.500	5.4	9.500	7.0																																																																					
0.800	2.2	2.400	3.7	6.000	5.7																																																																							
1.000	2.5	2.600	3.8	6.500	5.9																																																																							
©1982-2020 Innovyze																																																																												

W A Fairhurst & Partners		Page 6	
1 Arngrove Court Barrack Road Newcastle upon Tyne NE4 6DB		HENSINGHAM HOUSE PHASE 2	
Date 21/09/2023 10:59 File 138443 MD 23.09.08 V3.MDX		Designed by fmoore Checked by AS	
Micro Drainage		Network 2020.1.3	

1 year Return Period Summary of Critical Results by Maximum Level (Rank 1) for Storm

Simulation Criteria

Areal Reduction Factor	1.000	Additional Flow - % of Total Flow	0.000
Hot Start (mins)	0	MADD Factor * 10m³/ha Storage	2.000
Hot Start Level (mm)	0	Inlet Coeffiecient	0.800
Manhole Headloss Coeff (Global)	0.500	Flow per Person per Day (l/per/day)	0.000
Foul Sewage per hectare (l/s)	0.000		

Number of Input Hydrographs	0	Number of Offline Controls	0	Number of Time/Area Diagrams	0
Number of Online Controls	1	Number of Storage Structures	2	Number of Real Time Controls	0

Synthetic Rainfall Details

Rainfall Model	FSR	Ratio R	0.261
Region England and Wales Cv (Summer)			0.750
M5-60 (mm)	16.400 Cv (Winter)		0.840

Margin for Flood Risk Warning (mm)	300.0
Analysis Timestep	2.5 Second Increment (Extended)
DTS Status	ON
DVD Status	ON
Inertia Status	OFF

Profile(s)	Winter
Duration(s) (mins)	15, 30, 60, 120, 180, 240, 360, 480, 600, 720, 960, 1440
Return Period(s) (years)	1, 30, 100
Climate Change (%)	0, 0, 50

PN	US/MH Name	Storm	Return Period	Climate Change	First (X) Surchage	First (Y) Flood	First (Z) Overflow	Overflow Act.	Water Level (m)
S1.000	S1	120 Winter	1	+0%	100/30 Winter				83.483
S1.001	S2	120 Winter	1	+0%	100/30 Winter				83.483
S1.002	S3	120 Winter	1	+0%	100/30 Winter				83.483
S1.003	S4	120 Winter	1	+0%	100/30 Winter				83.483
S2.000	S5	15 Winter	1	+0%	100/60 Winter				84.500
S3.000	S6	15 Winter	1	+0%	100/60 Winter				84.500
S1.004	S5	120 Winter	1	+0%	30/180 Winter				83.484
S1.005	S5	120 Winter	1	+0%	1/15 Winter				83.484
S1.006	S6	120 Winter	1	+0%					83.000
S1.007	S10	120 Winter	1	+0%					82.364
S1.008	S11	120 Winter	1	+0%					78.833

W A Fairhurst & Partners								Page 7	
1 Arngrove Court Barrack Road Newcastle upon Tyne NE4 6DB				HENSINGHAM HOUSE PHASE 2					
Date 21/09/2023 10:59 File 138443 MD 23.09.08 V3.MDX				Designed by fmoore Checked by AS					
Micro Drainage				Network 2020.1.3					
1 year Return Period Summary of Critical Results by Maximum Level (Rank 1) for <u>Storm</u>									
PN	US/MH Name	Surcharged Depth (m)	Flooded Volume (m³)	Flow / Cap.	Overflow (l/s)	Half Drain Time (mins)	Pipe Flow (l/s)	Status	Level Exceeded
S1.000	S1	-0.638	0.000	0.00			0.9	OK	
S1.001	S2	-0.588	0.000	0.00			1.1	OK	
S1.002	S3	-0.515	0.000	0.00			1.6	OK	
S1.003	S4	-0.474	0.000	0.01			2.0	OK	
S2.000	S5	-0.150	0.000	0.00			0.0	OK	
S3.000	S6	-0.150	0.000	0.00			0.0	OK	
S1.004	S5	-0.440	0.000	0.01			2.2	OK	
S1.005	S5	0.193	0.000	0.19			2.5	SURCHARGED	
S1.006	S6	-0.128	0.000	0.05			2.5	OK	
S1.007	S10	-0.129	0.000	0.05			2.5	OK	
S1.008	S11	-0.135	0.000	0.02			2.5	OK	
©1982-2020 Innovyze									

W A Fairhurst & Partners		Page 9
1 Arngrove Court Barrack Road Newcastle upon Tyne NE4 6DB	HENSINGHAM HOUSE PHASE 2	
Date 21/09/2023 10:59 File 138443 MD 23.09.08 V3.MDX	Designed by fmoore Checked by AS	
Micro Drainage	Network 2020.1.3	


30 year Return Period Summary of Critical Results by Maximum Level (Rank 1)
for Storm

		Surcharged	Flooded			Half Drain	Pipe		
PN	US/MH Name	Depth (m)	Volume (m³)	Flow / Cap.	Overflow (l/s)	Time (mins)	Flow (l/s)	Status	Level Exceeded
S1.000	S1	-0.188	0.000	0.00			1.5	OK	
S1.001	S2	-0.138	0.000	0.00			1.6	OK	
S1.002	S3	-0.065	0.000	0.00			1.6	OK	
S1.003	S4	-0.024	0.000	0.01			2.1	OK	
S2.000	S5	-0.150	0.000	0.00			0.0	OK	
S3.000	S6	-0.150	0.000	0.00			0.0	OK	
S1.004	S5	0.009	0.000	0.01			2.3	SURCHARGED	
S1.005	S5	0.642	0.000	0.19			2.5	SURCHARGED	
S1.006	S6	-0.128	0.000	0.05			2.5	OK	
S1.007	S10	-0.129	0.000	0.05			2.5	OK	
S1.008	S11	-0.135	0.000	0.02			2.5	OK	

W A Fairhurst & Partners						Page 11			
1 Arngrove Court Barrack Road Newcastle upon Tyne NE4 6DB				HENSINGHAM HOUSE PHASE 2					
Date 21/09/2023 10:59				Designed by fmoore					
File 138443 MD 23.09.08 V3.MDX				Checked by AS					
Micro Drainage				Network 2020.1.3					
<u>100 year Return Period Summary of Critical Results by Maximum Level (Rank 1)</u> <u>for Storm</u>									
PN	US/MH Name	Depth (m)	Surcharged Volume (m³)	Flooded Flow / Cap.	Overflow (l/s)	Half Drain Time (mins)	Pipe Flow (l/s)	Status	Level Exceeded
S1.000	S1	0.879	0.000	0.01			3.0	SURCHARGED	
S1.001	S2	0.929	0.000	0.01			4.4	SURCHARGED	
S1.002	S3	1.003	0.000	0.02			7.9	FLOOD RISK	
S1.003	S4	1.044	0.000	0.04			12.4	FLOOD RISK	
S2.000	S5	0.338	0.000	0.03		152	1.8	FLOOD RISK	
S3.000	S6	0.337	0.000	0.06		148	3.2	FLOOD RISK	
S1.004	S5	1.078	0.000	0.01			4.2	FLOOD RISK	
S1.005	S5	1.713	0.000	0.24			3.3	FLOOD RISK	
S1.006	S6	-0.125	0.000	0.07			3.3	OK	
S1.007	S10	-0.126	0.000	0.06			3.3	OK	
S1.008	S11	-0.133	0.000	0.03			3.3	OK	
©1982-2020 Innovyze									

Appendix G

Proposed Drainage Layout



DRAINAGE SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING IS SUBJECT TO:

- APPROVALS FROM ALL RELEVANT AUTHORITIES TO DISCHARGE AND CONNECT TO ADOPTED SEWERS;
- EXISTING SERVICES AND EASEMENTS;
- EXISTING DRAINAGE INVERT LEVELS;
- ABOVE GROUND (INTERNAL) DRAINAGE DESIGN.

Do not scale from this drawing.

SAFETY HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION

IN ADDITION TO THE HAZARD/RISKS NORMALLY ASSOCIATED WITH THE TYPES OF WORK DETAILED ON THIS DRAWING, NOTE THE FOLLOWING RISKS AND INFORMATION.

RISKS LISTED HERE ARE NOT EXHAUSTIVE. REFER TO DESIGN ASSESSMENT FORM.

CONSTRUCTION

- WORKING ADJACENT TO LIVE ROADWAY.
- EXCAVATION.
- RESTRICTED AND OPERATIONAL SITE.
- PUBLIC INTERFACE.
- WORKING IN A LIVE SEWERAGE SYSTEM.
- DISRUPTION TO DRAINAGE.
- BURIED SERVICES – CONTRACTOR TO CARRY OUT SCAN PRIOR TO SITE OPERATIONS.

FOR INFORMATION RELATING TO USE, CLEANING AND MAINTENANCE SEE THE HEALTH AND SAFETY FILE

IT IS ASSUMED THAT ALL WORKS WILL BE CARRIED OUT BY A COMPETENT CONTRACTOR WORKING, WHERE APPROPRIATE, TO AN APPROVED METHOD STATEMENT.

NOTES

1. This drawing is based on the following received information:
CDL Architecture Site Plan Detail – DS/TMP/2/RD/23 – Rev E

2. This drawing is to be read in conjunction with the following FAIRHURST drawings:
• 138443/1002 – Proposed Site Levels
• 138443/2003 – Drainage Construction Details Sheet 1
• 138443/2005 – Manhole Schedules
• 138443/2006 – Drainage Notes

3. Topographical data is based off LIDAR data downloaded from the EA.
4. Outfall into Snebri Beck subject to confirmation and acceptance from the EA.
Outfall should be subject to exception from flood risk activity permit.

KEY

- Site boundary (Phase 1 and 2)
- Proposed surface water sewer
- Proposed foul water sewer
- Existing combined water sewer
- x-x-x-x-x-x-x- Sewer to be grouted
- Proposed permeable paving

Rev.	Date	Description	Drawn	Checked	Approved
D	21/09/23	UPDATE TO SUIT UPDATE SITE LAYOUT. CL, IL AND PIPE DIAMETERS UPDATED.	FM	SNK	JG
C	28/04/23	DRAINAGE STRATEGY UPDATED TO SUIT REVISED SITE LAYOUT	FM	SNK	JG
B	19/02/21	DRAINAGE REVISED IN LINE WITH UPDATED SITE LAYOUT RECEIVED 26.01.2021.	AC	AL	MT
A	15/06/20	MINOR TITLEBOX AMENDMENTS.	JH	MT	MT

Client: THOMAS MILBURN PROPERTY LTD.

Project Title: HENSINGHAM HOUSE PHASE ONE AND TWO

Drawing Title: HENSINGHAM HOUSE PROPOSED DRAINAGE LAYOUT

FAIRHURST

1 Amgrove Court, Barrack Road, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, NE4 6DB
Tel: 0191 221 0505 Fax: 0844 381 4412

Scale at A1: 1:250

Status: Planning

Drawn: JF

Checked: DN

Approved: MT

Date: 08/06/20

Date: 08/06/20

Date: 08/06/20

Drawing No.: 138443/2002

Revision: D

The logo for Fairhurst, featuring the word "FAIRHURST" in white capital letters on a black rectangular background. This black rectangle is positioned on a blue horizontal bar. A red horizontal line is located directly beneath the black rectangle.

FAIRHURST

Appendix H

United Utilities Sewer Flood Record Response

Frank Moore

From: Wastewater Developer Services
Sent: 10 June 2020 07:37
To: Jack Shelton
Cc: Wastewater Developer Services
Subject: FW: 138443 - Historical sewer flooding CA28 8QW - UU Reference: 4200031872
Attachments: Overview.png

Good morning, Jack

Hensingham House off Egremont Road, Hensingham CA28 8QW
UU Reference: 4200031872

I can confirm that we do have current records of sewer flooding on our DG5 register within the vicinity of the proposed development. The DG5 register is a register of properties that have flooded as a result of hydraulic inadequacy of the public sewer network.

Please note that United Utilities Water Limited (UW) can only record and check flooding events which are reported to us and we have to comply with our Regulators instructions on the qualification of flooding events to place on the register.

Our response does not include:

- any sewer flooding events caused by blockages or collapses which are the result of third party actions, natural events or other actions over which UW has no control and not a facet of sewer capacity; or
- any historical sewer flooding events that have been removed from the register as a result of investment in our infrastructure.

As with all development sites, we recommend you liaise with our water and wastewater engineers by contacting our Developer Services team so the details of your development proposal can be considered further. Details can be found at the following link.

<https://www.unitedutilities.com/services/builders-developers/>

Should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Many thanks.

Regards,



Josephine Wong
Wastewater Developer Engineer
Developer Services & Metering
Customer Services
[unitedutilities.com](https://www.unitedutilities.com)

If you have received a great service today why not tell us?
Visit: [unitedutilities.com/wow](https://www.unitedutilities.com/wow)

Did you know we now have a live chat facility available to you Mon to Friday 8 -5pm. You just click on the orange live chat box on our webpage and one of our advisors will be ready to chat to you and help you with your enquiry <https://www.unitedutilities.com/builders-developers/> or you can email us at WastewaterDeveloperServices@uuplc.co.uk


Coronavirus | Prevent the spread



Wash your
hands



Disinfect
common surfaces



Practise social
distancing



FEVER +
COUGH

Stay home if you
have symptoms

[Click for our message to customers](#)

From: Jack Shelton
Sent: 04 June 2020 19:43
To: EIRRequests
Subject: 138443 - Historical sewer flooding

Dear Sir/Ma'am,

I am investigating flood risk for a site at Hensingham House off Egremont Road, Hensingham. The postcode for the site is CA28 8QW and the grid reference is NX 98598 16737. I have also attached a site boundary.

Please could you inform if United Utilities have any records of sewer flooding at the site or in the surrounding area?

If there is a charge associated within this information, please can you inform before processing the request.

Kind Regards,

Jack

Jack Shelton
Graduate Engineer Water Services

FAIRHURST
engineering solutions, delivering results

1 Arngrove Court,
Barrack Road,
Newcastle upon Tyne, NE4 6DB
Tel: 0191 2210505
Website: www.fairhurst.co.uk

Why not take a look at our Practice Profile to see the diverse range of skills we can offer. Just click

 Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

For Fairhurst's coronavirus COVID-19 Business Continuity Statement please refer to our website or [CLICK HERE](#).

This email message and accompanying data are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential information and/or copyright material. Unauthorised use, copying or disclosure of any of it is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this email message in error, please notify us immediately and erase all copies of this message and attachments.

Where this e-mail is unrelated to the business of Fairhurst, the opinions expressed within this e-mail are the opinions of the sender and do not necessarily constitute those of Fairhurst.

Fairhurst scans and monitors incoming and outgoing mail in accordance with its Email Policy. This email has been scanned for viruses but Fairhurst accept no liability for any virus which may be attached.

A full list of partners is available for inspection at any of the firm's offices.

EMGateway3.uuplc.co.uk made the following annotations

The information contained in this e-mail is intended only for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain legally privileged or confidential information or otherwise be exempt from disclosure. If you have received this Message in error or there are any problems, please notify the sender immediately and delete the message from your computer. You must not use, disclose, copy or alter this message for any unauthorised purpose. Neither United Utilities Group PLC nor any of its subsidiaries will be liable for any direct, special, indirect or consequential damages as a result of any virus being passed on, or arising from the alteration of the contents of this message by a third party.

United Utilities Group PLC, Haweswater House, Lingley Mere
Business Park, Lingley Green Avenue, Great Sankey,
Warrington, WA5 3LP
Registered in England and Wales. Registered No 6559020

www.unitedutilities.com
www.unitedutilities.com/subsidiaries

CIVIL ENGINEERING • STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING • TRANSPORTATION • ROADS & BRIDGES
PORTS & HARBOURS • GEOTECHNICAL & ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING • PLANNING &
DEVELOPMENT • WATER SERVICES • CDM COORDINATOR SERVICES

www.fairhurst.co.uk

Aberdeen	Leeds
Birmingham	London
Bristol	Manchester
Dundee	Newcastle upon Tyne
Edinburgh	Sevenoaks
Elgin	Sheffield
Glasgow	Taunton
Inverness	Watford

FAIRHURST