

Reference: 17/00997

27 April 2017

**PROJECT
CENTRE**

Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

Town Hall

St Ives Road

Maidenhead

SL6 1RF

Unit 2 Holford Yard

London

WC1X 9HD

T: +44(0)330 0080 855

RBWM.sudsDC@projectcentre.co.uk

Dear Simon,

Subject: 17/00997 Details required by condition 6 (sustainable drainage) of planning permission 15/02107 for the re-location of Phoenix gym club including building, access, car parking and landscaping.

As part of responding to the above planning application, we have reviewed the following documents:

- Drainage Statement – New Phoenix Gymnastics Club Maidenhead (22 December 2016)
- OGAFCA 3D analysis of Phoenix Gym SUDS submission for Condition 6

Based on the review of the above mentioned documents, we would like further information on the items mentioned below:

Drainage Statement:

1. Please provide the existing levels and the proposed levels on site.

Although the approach to provide drainage for the Proposed Development may be suitable for this site we would like to see the following recommendation to be taken into consideration and resubmit the documents accordingly.

Drainage Statement:

1. Reference on climate change is not to the latest guidance. (Latest published on 19th February 2016)
2. A comparison between the proposed design of the ditch on (ref.667769 sketch 22/12/16) and OGAFCA 3D model have shown that there is a difference in dimension. Hence the dimensions of the ditch in question have to be clarified.
3. At the attenuation stage a detention pond with weir flow control to the road side ditch along Fifield Rd could potentially prevent water from overflowing the manholes and flooding the car park. It would also be beneficial to achieve a two stage treatment of the surface water both from the permeable pavements and the hardstanding areas. Has a detention pond been considered as a part of design?

Drainage Strategy (667769-DWG-SBU-C-100)

1. Road Gullies collecting surface water from proposed road bypass the proposed SuDS features and therefore the 2 stages of treatment, changes required.
2. Direction of flow is not visible on the drawing.
3. Maximum spacing between access points have to be demonstrated to comply with Building Regulations Part H (Table 10).
4. Demonstrate the reason for diameter change at surface water pipe numbered 2.002 and 2.003.
5. Design needs to demonstrate it complies with Sewer for Adoption 7th Edition Section C6 (SFA).
6. Proposed design should aim to comply with SFA 7th Edition Sections B4.5 and C4.5.
7. General Legend conflicts with the pipe labels on the drawings.
8. The red line indicator representing the slopes within the drawing are misleading or is the topography stepped?

If you have any queries or would like to discuss any of the points raised please don't hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely,

Remsha Mohammed-Remla

Principal Flood Consultant