# West Cumberland Hospital Phase 2 and Phase 3

# Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy

Curtins Ref: 071551-CUR-XX-RP-C-92001 Revision: V02 Issue Date: 01 April 2020

Client Name: CCL Solutions Client Address: Unit 18, The South Range, Hackthorpe Business Centre, Hackthorpe, Penrith, Cumbria, CA10 2HX Site Address: Homewood Road, Whitehaven Cumbria, CA28 8JG

Curtins Consulting Limited Units 24 & 25 Riverside Place K Village Lound Road Kendal LA9 7FH Tel: 01539 724 823 Email: kendal@curtins.com

CIVILS & STRUCTURES • TRANSPORT PLANNING • ENVIRONMENTAL • INFRASTRUCTURE • GEOTECHNICAL • CONSERVATION & HERITAGE • PRINCIPAL DESIGNE Birmingham • Bristol • Cambridge • Cardiff • Douglas • Dublin • Edinburgh • Glasgow • Kendal • Leeds • Liverpool • London • Manchester • Nottingham



# Curtins

# 071551-CUR-XX-RP-C-92001 West Cumberland Hospital Phase 2 and Phase 3



Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy

Rev	Description	Issued by	Checked	Date
V01	First Issue	CJS	AR	13/09/2019
V02	Updated site layout and drainage strategy	DM	CJS	31/03/2020

This report has been prepared for the sole benefit, use, and information for the client. The liability of Curtins Consulting Limited with respect to the information contained in the report will not extend to any third party.



# Table of Contents

Table of	Contents	ii
Tables		.iv
1.0 Int	troduction	. 1
1.1	Project Background	. 1
1.2	Scope of Assessment	. 1
1.3	Proposed Development	. 2
2.0 Ex	kisting Site Details	. 3
2.1	History and Current Use	. 3
2.2	Existing Watercourses	. 4
2.3	Existing Drainage	. 4
2.4	Topography	. 5
2.5	Geology and Hydrogeology	. 5
3.0 De	evelopment and Flood Risk	. 8
3.1	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance	. 8
3.2	Sequential Test	12
3.3	Exception Test	12
3.4	Local Planning Policy and Guidance	12
3.5	Site Specific NPPF Flood Risk Categorisation	14
3.6	Site Specific Flood Zone Compatibility	14
4.0 As	ssessment of Flood Risk	15
4.1	Sources of Flood Risk	15
4.2	Fluvial Flooding (Rivers and Streams)	15
4.3	Tidal Flooding (Coastal or Estuarine)	16
4.4	Reservoir Flooding	16
4.5	Canal Flooding	17
4.6	Groundwater Flooding	18
4.7	Public Sewers, Highway Drainage Flooding and Infrastructure Failure	19

071551-CUR-XX-RP-C-92001 West Cumberland Hospital Phase 2 and Phase 3



Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy

4.8	Surface Water Flooding to the site
1.2	Surface Water Flooding from the site
4.9	Historical Flooding
1.3	Summary of Flood Risk
5.0 Mi	tigation
5.1	Fluvial/Tidal Flood Mitigation
5.2	Reservoir Flooding Mitigation
5.3	Groundwater Flood Mitigation
5.4	Surface Water Flooding to the site Mitigation
5.5	Surface Water Flooding from the site Mitigation
6.0 Ou	utline Surface Water Drainage Strategy
6.1	Overview
6.2	Surface Water Disposal
6.3	Storage Volumes
6.4	Attenuation Methods
7.0 Ma	aintenance
7.1	Introduction
7.2	Components
1.4	Inspection, Manhole and Catchpit Chambers
1.5	Pipes
1.6	Drainage Channels and Gullies
1.7	Attenuation Tanks
8.0 Co	onclusions and Recommendations
9.0 Ap	pendices



# Figures

Figure 2.1: Site Location Plan	3
Figure 2.2: General Topography based on LiDAR DTM	5
Figure 3.1: DPD Policy DM11	13
Figure 3.2: DPD Policy DM24	13
Figure 4.1: Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)	16
Figure 4.2: Risk of Flooding from Reservoirs - Extent of Flooding	17
Figure 4.3: BGS Susceptibility to Groundwater Flooding	18
Figure 4.4: Risk of Flooding from Surface Water - Extent of Flooding	20
Figure 6.1: Storage Calculation	26
Figure 6.2: Pollution Hazard indices for land use classification (Table 26.2 the CIRIA SuDS manual 2015).	28
Figure 6.3: Indicative SuDS mitigation indices (Table 26.3 the CIRIA SuDS manual 2015)	28

# Tables

Table 2.1: Geological/Hydrogeological Succession	6
Table 2.2: Borehole Records	7
Table 5.1: (Extract Environment Agency Guidance) Peak Rainfall Intensity Allowance in small and	urban
catchments	23
Table 6.1: Pre and post development peak run off rates	25

# Appendices

- Appendix A Proposed Development Plans
- Appendix B Sewer Records
- Appendix C Surface Water Run-off Calculations
- Appendix D Drainage Strategy Drawing



## 1.0 Introduction

## 1.1 Project Background

In May 2019, Curtins were instructed by CCL Solutions to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy of the site at West Cumberland Hospital, CA28 8JG. The site is centred on NGR 298950, 516040.

The report provides information on the nature of flood risk at the site and follows Government guidance with regards to development and flood risk and is based on currently available information.

Proposals contained or forming part of this report represent the design intent and may be subject to alteration or adjustment in completing the detailed design for this project. Where such adjustments are undertaken as part of the detailed design and are deemed a material deviation from the intent contained in this document, prior approval shall be obtained from the relevant authority in advance of commencing such works.

Where the proposed works to which this report refers are undertaken more than twelve months following the issue of this report, Curtins shall reserve the right to re-validate the findings and conclusions by undertaking appropriate further investigations at no cost to Curtins.

## 1.2 Scope of Assessment

The assessment is to be undertaken in accordance with the standing advice and requirements of the Environment Agency (EA) for Flood Risk Assessments as outlined in the Communities and Local Governments Planning Policy Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The total redline site area is approximately 2.7 hectares (ha). Following scrutiny of the Environment Agency flood zone maps it has been identified that the existing site lies entirely within an area classified as Flood Zone 1 (FZ1) indicating that the probability of flooding from rivers or sea is low (less than 0.1% annual probability of river or sea flooding). Since the site is larger than 1 ha in Flood Zone 1, a Flood Risk Assessment is required to accompany a planning application to assess mechanisms of potential flood risk and taking into consideration the management of surface water run-off.

In July 2018, the Government made changes to the National Planning Policy Framework which made Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) a requirement for the determination of planning applications for 'major' developments. The requirements of a sustainable drainage system is set out in the government's Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems.

An Outline Drainage Strategy will therefore be required as part of the Outline Planning Application for the development, as the site is considered to be 'major' development by the Town and Country Planning Order 2015 as total floor space will exceed 1,000m<sup>2</sup>.



The assessment will:

- Investigate all potential risks of flooding to the site,
- Consider the impact the development may have elsewhere with regards to flooding,
- Consider proposals to mitigate any potential risk of flooding determined to be present; and
- Consider detailed drainage proposals to mitigate flood risk from the site.

This report reviews the following information:

- Environment Agency flood maps for rivers and sea flooding.
- UK Government Long Term Flood Risk Information for surface water flooding and reservoir flooding.
- Copeland Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), dated August 2007.
- Copeland Borough Council Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, submitted document including the Council's proposed minor modifications, dated October 2012.
- Topographic Survey by Atlantic Geomatics, ref 3650P01-P06 Rev A, dated July / August 2019.
- Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment by Curtins, dated August 2019.
- Ground Investigation Report by AECOM dated 2010.
- United Utilities Sewer Records.

#### **1.3 Proposed Development**

The area of proposed development is split into two areas divided by the ring road that services the hospital. The two areas include a larger northern area, and a smaller southern area. Both areas currently comprise several buildings associated with West Cumberland Hospital, areas of hardstanding inclusive of car parks and foot paths, as well as areas of soft standing.

It is understood that the proposed development within the northern area is to include the demolition of existing and construction of a new larger hospital wing and the refurbishment of existing buildings with associated carparking and communal soft landscaped areas. At this point, the proposals for the southern section of the site are for the demolition of the existing buildings to allow for potential future development, however this information is currently unavailable and will form part of Phase 3 to start at a later date. The proposed development plans are contained within Appendix A.



# 2.0 Existing Site Details

## 2.1 History and Current Use

The site is currently occupied by the West Cumberland Hospital. Development on the site comprises several buildings associated with the Hospital, areas of hardstanding inclusive of car parks and foot paths, as well as areas of soft landscaping. Development on the site is largely is largely restricted to the original timeframe between 1959 and 1964, with a number of small piecemeal additions undertaken over the ensuing years.

The site is bounded by a mixture of residential and light industrial development to the north. Further to the north east the land use is in mainly a combination of arable farming and grazing. To the east, land use is primarily farmland. To the south and west, residential development and the A595 highway, the main road along the west coast of the county. Figure 2-1 shows the existing hospital site in its entirety along with the immediate surroundings.



Figure 2.1: Site Location Plan



## 2.2 Existing Watercourses

No above ground watercourses have been identified within the proposed site

The following watercourses have been identified within the vicinity of the proposed site:

- An unnamed watercourse (main river) lies approximately 0.8km to the north and according to the Environment Agency mapping issues in open channel at the junction of Main Street and Egremont Road (NGR 298582mE 516787mN. This watercourse then flows generally west to join Pow Beck west of the railway (NGR 297925mE 516326mN)
- The Main River, Snebra Beck lies approximately 0.95km to the north of the site and crosses Egremont Road and the A595 main highway as it flows west to join Pow Beck to the west of the railway (NGR 297748mE 516582mN).
- The Main River, Pow Beck, lies approximately 0.95km to the west of the site and flows in a generally northern direction to discharge into Whitehaven Marina
- An unnamed watercourse is located approximately 0.6km to the southeast of the site, the head
  of which lies at NGR 299492mE 515635mN. The watercourse flows generally to the southwest
  to join a section of Pow Beck which flows south towards St Bees, and discharges to the seat at
  Sea Mill Lane, NGR 296923mE 510789mN.
- The Main River, River Keekle lies approximately 1.5km to the east of the site. The River Keekle flows generally south, to join the River Ehen at Wood End, NGR 301189mE 512894mN to then flow south through Egremont.

## 2.3 Existing Drainage

The public sewer records have been obtained for the development site, and are enclosed in Appendix B.

The records indicate that there are no public sewers within the site boundary, with the exception of both foul and surface water sewers lying just within the site boundary on Homewood Road.

The records indicate that the immediate areas northwest, west, south are well served by a predominantly separate foul and surface water networks:

- There is a 225mm diameter surface water sewer flowing southwest then west along Home Wood Road.
- There is a 150mm diameter foul sewer flowing to the northwest of Homewood Road, which then encroaches into the site before continuing west along Homewood Road.

The site is currently operational and is positively drained and the topographic survey has identified an extensive system of gulleys, rainwater pipes, manholes and inspection chambers. Whilst manhole and CCTV surveys have not been undertaken at the time of undertaking this assessment, it is clear that the onsite drainage discharges to the public sewer network.



## 2.4 Topography

As referred to above, a topographic survey has been undertaken and covers the key areas where redevelopment is proposed within the red line boundary.

A broader figure, showing the general topography of the site and surrounding is presented in Figure 2-2 below, derived from the Environment Agency 1m resolution Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) Digital Terrain Model (DTM).



Figure 2.2: General Topography based on LiDAR DTM

The site slopes downwards from northeast to southeast. The contours indicate the north-eastern part be less steep, with an average gradient of 0.061m/m (1 in 16), with gradient increasing in the south-western area, 0.082m/m (1 in 12).

## 2.5 Geology and Hydrogeology

A study of the Envirocheck records, British Geological Survey (BGS) 1:50,000 mapping records (Bedrock and Superficial Editions) for Whitehaven (Sheet 028) (Ref.2) indicates the following geological and hydrogeological succession underlying the site.



#### Table 2.1: Geological/Hydrogeological Succession

Geology	Associated Hydrogeological Classification
Till, Devensian <sup>1</sup>	Secondary Undifferentiated <sup>2</sup>
Hensingham Grit <sup>3</sup>	Secondary A Aquifer <sup>4</sup>
Stainmore Formation <sup>5</sup>	Secondary A Aquifer <sup>4</sup>

Notes:

- 1. Diamicton. Superficial Deposits formed up to 2 million years ago in the Quaternary Period. Local environment previously dominated by ice age conditions.
- 2. Assigned in cases where it has not been possible to attribute either category A or B to a rock type
- 3. Sandstone. Sedimentary Bedrock formed approximately 328 to 329 million years ago in the carboniferous Period. Local environment previously dominated by rivers.
- 4. Permeable layers capable of supporting water supplies at a local rather than strategic scale, and in some cases forming an important source of base flow to rivers. These are generally aquifers formerly classified as minor aquifers.
- 5. Mudstone, Siltstone and Sandstone. Sedimentary Bedrock formed approximately 319 to 329 million years ago in the Carboniferous Period. Local environment previously dominated by swamps, estuaries and deltas.

The British Geological Society (BGS) identifies that superficial deposits of the Devensian Till underlies the entirety of the site. The solid geology comprises the Hensingham Grit which underlies a large proportion of the site. The south western areas of the site is underlain by the Stainmore Formation.

There are no known faults underlying the site directly, however there are numerous faults in the nearby vicinity. The orientation of the faults varies greatly however generally strike in an NW-SE orientation

Details from freely available borehole logs taken from the BGS within close proximity to the site are summarised in Table 2-2 below.



#### Table 2.2: Borehole Records

Reference	Location (NGR)	Details (depth to top of strata/details/thickness)
NX91NE50/52	298730,515980	0.40m bgl, Topsoil 3.75m bgl, Broken sandstone and sandy clay. 4.50m bgl, Grey sandstone. Borehole completed at 4.50m bgl.
NX91NE/80	299061, 516308	<ul> <li>0.00m bgl, Firm to stiff brown sandy boulder clay.</li> <li>1.50m bgl, Stiff brown sandy boulder clay.</li> <li>3.20m bgl, Soft brown sandy clay and grey shale.</li> <li>5.00m bgl, Dark grey weathered shale.</li> <li>5.00m Borehole completed</li> </ul>
NX91NE/381	299890,515910	<ul> <li>0.00m bgl, Sandy gravelly cobbly clay.</li> <li>6.70m bgl, Sand and gravel with cobbles and boulders.</li> <li>8.35m bgl, Dark reddish brown sandstone.</li> <li>18.00m bgl, Dark red sandy clayey siltstone.</li> <li>Borehole continues to 120m bgl prior to termination.</li> </ul>

The north eastern spur of the site is within a zone of low vulnerability due to the underlying Secondary Superficial Aquifer in respect to groundwater vulnerability. The large proportion of the site is considered high vulnerability due to the underlying Secondary Superficial Aquifer.

There are no groundwater abstraction points located within 1km of the site and the site is not located with an Environment Agency designated Source Protection Zone (SPZ).



# 3.0 Development and Flood Risk

# 3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance

In July 2018, the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government published the revised National Planning Framework (NPPF). This document replaces the first National Planning Policy Framework published in March 2012 by the Department of Communities and Local Government. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) was published in March 2014 which provides guidance on how flood risk should be assessed during the planning and development process. This guidance remains current.

#### Table 1: (Extract from Planning Practice Guidance) Flood Zone Classifications

These Flood Zones refer to the probability of river and sea flooding, ignoring the presence of defences. They are shown on the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea (20), available on the Environment Agency's web site, as indicated in the table below.

Flood Zone	Definition
Zone 1 Low Probability	Land having a less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding. (Shown as 'clear' on the Flood Map – all land outside Zones 2 and 3)
Zone 2 Medium Probability	Land having between a 1 in 100 and 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river flooding; or Land having between a 1 in 200 and 1 in 1,000 annual probability of sea flooding. (Land shown in light blue on the Flood Map)
Zone 3a High Probability	Land having a 1 in 100 or greater annual probability of river flooding; or Land having a 1 in 200 or greater annual probability of sea flooding. (Land shown in dark blue on the Flood Map)
Zone 3b The Functional Floodplain	This zone comprises land where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood. 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. (Not separately distinguished from Zone 3a on the Flood Map)



### Table 2: (Extract from Planning Practice Guidance) Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification

#### 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 and ambulance stations; fire stations and command centres; telecommunications installations required to be operational during flooding.
- Emergency dispersal points.
- Basement dwellings.
- Caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use.
- 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.

## 071551-CUR-XX-RP-C-92001 West Cumberland Hospital Phase 2 and Phase 3



Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy

#### 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, cafes and hot food takeaways; offices; general industry, storage and distribution; non-residential institutions not included in the 'More Vulnerable' class; 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 defence installations.
- 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.



Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy

# Table 3: (Extract from Planning Practice Guidance) Flood Risk Vulnerability and Flood Zone Compatibility

Flood Zones	Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification				
	Essential infrastructure	Highly vulnerable	More vulnerable	Less vulnerable	Water compatible
Zone 1	1	1	1	1	1
Zone 2	✓	Exception Test required	√	1	<i>✓</i>
Zone 3a †	Exception Test required †	x	Exception Test required	1	✓
Zone 3b *	Exception Test required *	x	x	x	√*

#### Key:

- ✓ Development is appropriate
- X Development should not be permitted.

Notes to table 3:

- This table does not show the application of the Sequential Test which should be applied first to guide development to Flood Zone 1, then Zone 2, and then Zone 3; nor does it reflect the need to avoid flood risk from sources other than rivers and the sea;
- The Sequential and Exception Tests do not need to be applied to minor developments and changes of use, except for a change of use to a caravan, camping or chalet site, or to a mobile home or park home site;
- Some developments may contain different elements of vulnerability and the highest vulnerability category should be used, unless the development is considered in its component parts.

† In Flood Zone 3a essential infrastructure should be designed and constructed to remain operational and safe in times of flood.

\* In Flood Zone 3b (functional floodplain) essential infrastructure that has to be there and has passed the Exception Test, and water-compatible uses, 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.



#### 3.2 Sequential Test

Paragraph 100 of the NPPF states that 'inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere'.

This policy is implemented through the application of the flood risk Sequential Test which aims to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding.

#### 3.3 Exception Test

If, following application of the Sequential Test, it is not possible for the development to be located in zones with a lower probability of flooding, the Exception Test can be applied, if appropriate. As detailed in paragraph 102 of the NPPF, for the Exception Test to be passed:

- It must be demonstrated that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) where one has been prepared; and
- A site-specific FRA must demonstrate that 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.

## 3.4 Local Planning Policy and Guidance

The Copeland Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (DPD)<sup>1</sup>, adopted December 2012, falls under the umbrella title of the Local Development Framework. The DPD sets out the overall strategic direction for planning by providing policies to guide decisions on planning applications over the period 2013 to 2028.

The Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (DPD) contains a set of development management policies for the local planning authority area of Copeland. When a planning application is submitted, the Council uses development management policies (planning policies) alongside other policies in the Development Plan to help it assess whether or not the application should be granted planning permission.

The relevant policies of the DPD in respect to development and flood risk are identified as:

- Policy DM11 Sustainable Development Standards and
- Policy DM24 Development Proposals and Flood Risk

Policy DM11 and DM24 are reproduced as Figure 3-1 and Figure 3-2 below.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/copeland\_local\_plan\_2013\_2028.pdf



#### Policy DM11 – Sustainable Development Standards



Development should not result in the unnecessary sterilisation of surface mineral resources, and wherever appropriate should incorporate remediation measures to ensure that the development is not at risk from ground instability arising from mining legacy or other former uses.

Figure 3.1: DPD Policy DM11

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.

Figure 3.2: DPD Policy DM24



## 3.5 Site Specific NPPF Flood Risk Categorisation

To assess the NPPF flood risk classification for the site, the first step was to inspect the Environment Agency web-based flood mapping data for flooding from rivers and seas, surface water and reservoirs. The rivers and sea flood map is used to inform planning of a sites Flood Zone(s); however, the surface water and reservoir flood maps should also be used to identify other flood risks.

From the Environment Agency flooding from rivers and seas map, it can be seen that the proposed site and the surrounding area are entirely located within an area classified as Flood Zone 1 (low risk of flooding from rivers or sea).

## 3.6 Site Specific Flood Zone Compatibility

The proposals for the development site are likely to fall within the following category:

- 'Hospitals'.
- 'Buildings used for dwelling houses, student halls of residence, drinking establishments, nightclubs and hotels.'

This type of development is classed as 'More Vulnerable' development in the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification (Table 2).

The site is located within Flood Zone 1, for which 'More Vulnerable' development is deemed to be appropriate, and neither the sequential nor the exception test is required (refer to Table 3 for the Flood Zone compatibility table taken from NPPF technical guidance).

It is anticipated that the lifespan of the development will be 60 years. If operational in 2020, the design life will be to 2080.



## 4.0 Assessment of Flood Risk

## 4.1 Sources of Flood Risk

This study assesses the risk from different types of flooding to the development and the risk of flooding from the development, taking into consideration climate change, as well as how flood risks should be managed. The approach to assessing flood risk at the development site was informed by the requirements of NPPF in conjunction with the client and Environment Agency requirements.

## 4.2 Fluvial Flooding (Rivers and Streams)

From the Environment Agency flooding from rivers and seas map:

- Zone 1 Low Probability: Land having a less than 0.1% (1 in 1,000) annual probability of river or sea flooding. (Shown as 'clear' on the Flood Map all land outside Zones 2 and 3)
- Zone 2 Medium Probability: Land having between a 1% (1 in 100) and 0.1% (1 in 1,000) annual probability of river flooding; or land having between a 0.5% (1 in 200) and 0.1% (1 in 1,000) annual probability of sea flooding. (Land shown in light blue on the Flood Map).
- Zone 3a High Probability: Land having a 1% (1 in 100) or greater annual probability of river flooding; or Land having a 1 in 200 or greater annual probability of sea flooding (Land shown in dark blue on the Flood Map).
- Zone 3b The Functional Floodplain: This zone comprises land where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood. 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. (Not separately distinguished from Zone 3a on the Flood Map). Notionally, Flood Zone 3b indicates there is a chance of flooding of greater than 1 in 30 (3.3%).

The flood map also contains the following information:

- Flood defences built in the last five years to protect against river floods with a 1% (1 in 100) chance of happening each year, together with some natural or constructed entities which retain, store or channel water and which may protect against smaller floods.
- Areas benefiting from flood defences areas that benefit from the flood defences shown, in the event of a river flood with a 1% (1 in 100) chance of happening each year, or a flood from the sea with a 0.5% (1 in 200) chance of happening each year. If the defences were not there, these areas would flood.

Flooding to the site from rivers and seas is indicated in Figure 4-1 below and it can be seen that the entire proposed site is located within an area classified as Flood Zone 1, therefore the site is considered to be at low risk from fluvial flooding.





## Figure 4.1: Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea)

The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment<sup>2</sup> further confirms that there is no fluvial flood risk associated with the site.

## 4.3 Tidal Flooding (Coastal or Estuarine)

- 1.1.1 There is currently no flood risk identified on the Environment Agency flood maps for the site and it is therefore regarded to be at low risk from tidal flooding.
- 1.1.2 The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment<sup>4</sup> further confirms that there is no tidal flood risk associated with the site.

#### 4.4 Reservoir Flooding

1.1.3 Reservoir flooding is extremely unlikely to happen and there has been no loss of life in the UK from reservoir flooding since 1925. The Environment Agency is the enforcement authority and ensures that reservoirs are inspected regularly, and essential safety work is carried out.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Copeland Borough Council, *Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)*, Jacobs, August 2007.



1.1.4 The Flood Warning Information Service Long Term Flood Risk from Reservoirs map indicates the site is not at risk from reservoirs in either the local or wider vicinity of the site.



Figure 4.2: Risk of Flooding from Reservoirs - Extent of Flooding

## 4.5 Canal Flooding

There are no canals in the vicinity of the site.



## 4.6 Groundwater Flooding

The SFRA<sup>3</sup> indicates a limited potential for groundwater flooding exists in the Borough. If further states that Groundwater flooding can and does occur throughout the Borough and cannot always be predicted.

The Phase 1 Geoenvironmental assessment<sup>4</sup> by Curtins accessed the British Geological Survey (BGS) groundwater flooding vulnerability maps, reproduced as Figure 4-1 below. The map shows a Limited Potential for Groundwater Flooding to Occur on the site.



#### Figure 4.3: BGS Susceptibility to Groundwater Flooding

The map shows a Limited Potential for Groundwater Flooding to Occur on the site.

A Geotechnical Site investigation<sup>5</sup> undertaken in 2010 by AECOM identified the soils to be generally made ground over boulder clay/glacial till (up to a depth of 4.8 m bgl) over mud/sand /siltstone bedrocks and with a high (possibly perched) water table within 1.5m of the surface. It therefore unlikely groundwater poses a risk at surface. However, to ensure that the risk remains low, mitigation measures are proposed in section 5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Copeland Borough Council, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), Jacobs, August 2007.

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> 073096-CUR-00-XX-RP-GE-001-V01, West Cumberland Hospital Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment, 21 August 2019.
 <sup>5</sup> WCH-ACM-ZZ-ZZ-GN-S-XX-1011, West Cumberland Hospital, Whitehaven Geo-Environmental Interpretative Report, AECOM Ltd, 20 October 2010.



### 4.7 Public Sewers, Highway Drainage Flooding and Infrastructure Failure

United Utilities are responsible for the public sewer systems in Whitehaven and records of the public sewers have been obtained and are provided in Appendix B. The records shown a minor intrusion of the public sewers in to the development site.

The site contains extensive private foul and surface water drainage systems which are understood to connect to the public sewer system. These serve buildings and hard standings and highways within the site.

There is no record of historic flooding within these private systems. And where possible, this existing drainage infrastructure is to remain.

The hydraulic design standard of the existing surface water drainage system has not been assessed. However, Phases 2 and 3 of the project involve the demolition of some existing buildings and replacement with new with an overall reduction of approximately 1.9 ha in hardstanding/roof areas following the completion of the development.

In that sense, the proposed development will reduce the risk of flooding from the on-site surface water system.

#### 4.8 Surface Water Flooding to the site

Surface water flooding can be caused when rainwater during extreme rainfall events does not drain away through the normal drainage system or soak into the ground with flooding occurring, principally from manholes and gullies. Surcharging sewers can result in overland flows which if originating at a higher elevation than a development site can potentially pose a flood risk.

From the UK Government's Flood Risk from Surface Water, (extent of flooding) map, level of surface water flood risk is expressed as;

- Very low risk meaning that that each year this area has a chance of flooding of less than 0.1%.
- Low risk meaning that each year this area has a chance of flooding of between 0.1% and 1%.
- Medium risk means that each year this area has a chance of flooding of between 1% and 3.3%
- High risk means that each year this area has a chance of flooding of greater than 3.3%.

The extent of flooding to the site from surface water is indicated in Figure 4-4 along with indicative flood depths for the standard risk scenarios.

## 071551-CUR-XX-RP-C-92001 West Cumberland Hospital Phase 2 and Phase 3



Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy



Figure 4.4: Risk of Flooding from Surface Water - Extent of Flooding

There are areas identified as at risk from surface water flooding both within and outside the site boundary. Those areas within the site are attributed to localised low spots in the topography and are focussed around existing buildings. However, the topography used in the surface water mapping relies on a digital terrain model rather than ground survey and, whilst it is understood that some modification is also made to account for positively drained areas, it is likely that the algorithms do not fully account for localised positive drainage as is known to existing within the site.

The development proposals include for an element or landscaping of the hospital grounds and where possible, external levels should be set to fall away from the buildings.

Considering the above information, the risk of surface water flooding to the redeveloped site is generally considered low. Mitigation measures to ensure the risk remains low are proposed in Section 5.



#### 1.2 Surface Water Flooding from the site

Developers are responsible for ensuring that new development does not increase the flood risk elsewhere. The proposed surface water drainage network directly relating to the development proposals shall be designed to not flood for the critical 1 in 30-year storm event and flood water generated up to the critical 1 in 100-year plus climate change storm event shall be constrained within areas on site so as not to cause damage to buildings, essential services or adjoining developments and services.

New development has the potential to increase flood risk where any increase in impermeable areas results in additional run-off from proposed roads, car parks and building roofs being discharged freely into the downstream drainage network. It is therefore encouraged to propose permeable areas, landscaping areas and incorporate sustainable drainage features utilising infiltration or attenuation where possible.

Mitigation measures to ensure the risk remains low are proposed in Section 5 and an assessment of the proposed surface water flows is carried out within the drainage strategy within section 6 of this report.

#### 4.9 Historical Flooding

No historic flood events have been identified in the SFRA.

#### 1.3 Summary of Flood Risk

From the evidence collated and subsequent correspondence and meetings, the main types of flooding that may apply to the proposed development site are as follows:

- Fluvial / Tidal flooding to the site (No potential)
- Reservoir flooding to the site (No potential)
- Groundwater flooding to the site (Low potential)
- Surface water flooding to the site (Low potential / Isolated High Potential)
- Surface water flooding from the site (Low potential).



# 5.0 Mitigation

## 5.1 Fluvial/Tidal Flood Mitigation

The development site lies entirely within Flood Zone 1 and therefore is at no risk of fluvial and tidal flooding. No specific measures are required at this location to mitigate against fluvial and tidal flooding.

## 5.2 Reservoir Flooding Mitigation

There are no reservoirs within the wider vicinity of the site and therefore the site is considered as being no risk of reservoir flooding. No specific measures are required at this location to mitigate against reservoir flooding

## 5.3 Groundwater Flood Mitigation

Groundwater flooding tends to be more persistent than other sources of flooding, typically lasting for weeks or months rather than hours or days. Groundwater flooding does not generally pose a significant risk to life due to the slow rate at which the water level rises; however, it can cause significant risk to property.

The site is considered at low risk of groundwater flooding based on no recorded instances of flooding from this source. However, Phase 2 geoenvironmental site investigations should include groundwater monitoring to further confirm groundwater levels.

Finished floor levels for the development should be set above the highest groundwater level.

External ground levels across the site should fall away from the proposed buildings and ensure that the creation of low points are avoided (other than those used intentionally for drainage features) in order that in the unlikely event of groundwater flooding, the flood water is safely routed away from the buildings on site.

Providing the above mitigation measures are imposed, the risk from groundwater flooding would be considered low post development.

## 5.4 Surface Water Flooding to the site Mitigation

The UK Government surface water flood maps indicate that there are localised areas of high - low risk of surface water flooding, predominantly adjacent to existing buildings. Where locations of surface water flooding is predicted, a positive drainage system is known to exists.

Whilst the site is to be redeveloped, the existing drainage systems where possible will be retained. As part of the drainage design the existing site drainage should be reviewed and where retained, continue to be maintained.



Providing the above measures are implemented the flooding risk to the development site from surface water is therefore considered low post development.

## 5.5 Surface Water Flooding from the site Mitigation

Any new development site drainage should be designed in accordance with current best practice to provide adequate capacity not to flood for the critical 1 in 30-year storm event and flood water generated from up to the critical 1 in 100-year plus climate change storm event shall be constrained within the areas on site so not to cause damage to buildings, essential services or adjoining developments & services.

In February 2016, the Environment Agency released updated climate change allowances for peak rainfall intensities which should be applied to new developments. Table 4 demonstrates the climate change allowances with central and upper end allowances being considered.

Based on the nature of the development, a lifespan in excess of 60 years is anticipated. Therefore, the potential climate change allowance for 2070-2115 ranges between 20% for the central allowance and 40% for the upper end allowance. As such, an allowance of 40% for climate change on peak rainfall intensity will be included in calculations.

# Table 5.1: (Extract Environment Agency Guidance) Peak Rainfall Intensity Allowance in small and urban catchments

Applies across all of England	Total potential change anticipated for the '2020s' (2015 to 2039)	Total potential change anticipated for the '2050s' (2040 to 2069)	Total potential change anticipated for the '2080s' (2070 to 2115)
Upper end	10%	20%	40%
Central	5%	10%	20%

In following the standard hierarchy of drainage solutions, consideration should firstly be given to the discharge of surface water runoff by sustainable methods such as infiltration.

Section 6 reviews the surface water discharge options and based on the site information obtained it is concluded that an infiltration-based solution will not be appropriate for this site.

To minimise localised flooding within the site, the drainage design should ensure that gullies, drainage channels and drains are all suitably sized to accommodate peak storm flows. Also, all inlet features should have suitably sized sumps to catch silts and should be subject to a documented routine maintenance and cleansing regime.



The surface water should be constrained within the site and this could be attained by enhanced landscaping features where suitable.

Flood water exceedance routes should be identified, both on and off site as detailed design progress.

For any sustainable drainage systems employed in the development, an appropriate management and maintenance plan for the sustainable drainage system for the lifetime of the development should be submitted which should include:

- Any arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, management and maintenance by a Residents' Management Company
- Arrangements concerning appropriate funding mechanisms for its on-going maintenance of all elements of the sustainable drainage system (i.e. inspections, regular maintenance)
- Means of access for maintenance and easements where applicable

Assuming that the proposed drainage system is designed to provide adequate capacity, and that the system will be correctly maintained, it can be assumed risk of flood from blockage or overloading is minimal.

The final design of the drainage networks shall be in accordance with the legislation set by the Copeland Borough Council and Cumbria County Council.



# 6.0 Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy

#### 6.1 Overview

The proposed site is split and has two boundaries, the smaller southern site has no proposed impermeable area as the proposals are to demolish two existing buildings, this is therefore a 100% reduction in surface water run-off. The site that this drainage strategy focusses on is the larger northern site. Current development proposals will result in an overall reduction in impermeable area of 5,700m<sup>2</sup>, when compared to the existing site. This reduction means that the proposed overall peak surface water run-off from the site is less than the existing (not including climate change). This can be seen in Appendix C with results summarised in Table 6.1 below. The proposed Outline Drainage Strategy is shown on drawing 071551-CUR-00-ZZ-DR-C-04921.

	Peak Rate of Run-Off (Litres/sec)			
Event	Pre-development (Brownfield Site)	Post-development	Post- development (Climate change)	
QBAR	275.9	201.9	282.6	
Q10	375.6	274.8	384.8	
Q30	458.7	335.7	469.9	
Q100	588.0	430.3	602.4	

#### Table 6.1: Pre and post development peak run off rates

#### 6.2 Surface Water Disposal

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), SuDS Guidance and Part H of the Building Regulations, the surface water disposal hierarchy should in the first instance be discharged to the ground by infiltration. If ground conditions prevent this, surface water should be disposed of to a watercourse or waterbody. If this is not possible, surface water should be discharged to a surface water sewer or drain and only as a very last resort to a combined sewer.

#### Infiltration

A Geotechnical Site investigation<sup>6</sup> undertaken in 2010 by AECOM has identified the soils to be generally made ground over boulder clay/glacial till (up to a depth of 4.8 m bgl) over mud/sand /siltstone bedrocks and with a high (possibly perched) water table within 1.5 m of the surface. This would suggest that infiltration to ground is unlikely to be feasible, however this should be confirmed during the detailed

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> WCH-ACM-ZZ-ZZ-GN-S-XX-1011, West Cumberland Hospital, Whitehaven Geo-Environmental Interpretative Report, AECOM Ltd, 20 October 2010.



design stage with BRE 365 infiltration tests undertaken at the location and depths of the proposed attenuation tanks.

#### Watercourses

There are no apparent watercourses in the vicinity of the site.

#### Discharge to Surface Water Sewer

United Utility (UU) sewer maps indicate that a 225 mm diameter surface water sewer is present in Homewood Road to the north of the project. Utility mapping of the existing hospital indicates that the existing surface water drainage leaves the site at 3 locations along the southern and western boundaries of the site.

It is proposed to drain the attenuated surface water flows from the proposed development into the existing Surface Water MH on the western boundary of the site which appears to be directed towards the UU sewer in Homewood Road, however the utility mapping does not extend beyond the hospital boundary there this will be subject to confirmation by CCTV during the detailed design stage.

#### 6.3 Storage Volumes

A storage estimate has been conducted for the proposed site based on the impermeable areas and using the existing QBAR (275l/s) as a discharge rate. The calculations can be seen in figure 6.1 below, which gives a required attenuation volume of 470m<sup>3</sup>.

Rainfall Methodology		FSR	~
FSR Region		England & Wales	~
M5-60 (mm)		17.000	
Ratio-R		0.300	
Summer CV	✓	1.000	
Winter CV	~	1.000	
Storage Estimate			
Return Period (years)		100	
Climate Change (%)		40	
Impermeable Area (ha)		1.555	
Peak Discharge (I/s)		275.000	
Infiltration Coefficient (m (leave blank if no infiltrat	n/hr) tion)	0.00000	
Required Storage (m <sup>3</sup> )		Calc	
f	from	215	
	to	470	

Figure 6.1: Storage Calculation



### 6.4 Attenuation Methods

It is recommended that sustainable methods of attenuation are implemented where possible; this can be achieved using a combination of ponds, swales, permeable paving with high voids sub-base and percolation pipes. Use of ponds, swales and permeable paved areas would also be considered as methods of filtration to improve water run-off quality.

The site has a number of constraints, primarily related to ground conditions including both made ground and likely inability to infiltrate, and the requirement to provide adequate car parking on the site.

It is therefore proposed to provide attenuation using below ground cellular storage and flow control devices. The locations for these drainage features are indicated on drawing 071551-CUR-00-ZZ-DR-C-04921 in Appendix D. The exact volume and the attenuation structures will be determined during the detailed design phase of the project.

1.3.1 Surface Water run-off from hard paved areas at risk from contamination should receive water quality treatment. Non-residential car parks and in-site access roads, typical for hospitals, are considered Medium hazard in terms of contamination. Figure 6-1 illustrates the pollution hazard indices for different land use classifications from The CIRIA SuDS Manual C753 (2015).

Land use	Pollution hazard level	Total suspended solids (TSS)	Metals	Hydro- carbons
Residential roofs	Very low	0.2	0.2	0.05
Other roofs (typically commercial/ industrial roofs)	Low	0.3	0.2 (up to 0.8 where there is potential for metals to leach from the roof)	0.05
Individual property driveways, residential car parks, low traffic roads (eg cul de sacs, homezones and general access roads) and non- residential car parking with infrequent change (eg schools, offices) ie < 300 traffic movements/day	Low	0.5	0.4	0.4
Commercial yard and delivery areas, non-residential car parking with requent change (eg hospitals, retail), all roads except low traffic roads and trunk roads/motorways!	Medium	07	0.6	07
Sites with heavy pollution (eg haulage yards, lorry parks, highly frequented orry approaches to industrial estates, waste sites), sites where chemicals and tuels (other than domestic fuel oil) are to be delivered, handled, stored, used or manufactured; industrial sites; trunk roads and motorways <sup>1</sup>	High	0.8*	0.82	0.9°



Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy

## Figure 6.2: Pollution Hazard indices for land use classification (Table 26.2 the CIRIA SuDS manual 2015)

Treatment could be provided using sustainable methods such as: filter strips, filter drains, swales, bioretention systems, and/or permeable paving. Figure 6-3 illustrates the SuDS Component mitigation indices from The CIRIA SuDS Manual C753 (2015).

ABLE	Indicative SuDS mitigation indices for discharges to surface waters							
26.3		Mitigation indices <sup>1</sup>						
	Type of SuDS component	TSS	Metals	Hydrocarbons				
	Filter strip	0.4	0.4	0.5				
	Filter drain	0.42	0.4	0.4				
	Swale	0.5	0.6	0.6				
	Bioretention system	0.8	0.8	0.8				
	Permeable pavement	0.7	0.6	0.7				
	Detention basin	0.5	0.5	0.6				
	Pond*	0.7*	0.7	0.5				
	Wetland	0.8*	0.8	0.8				
	Proprietary treatment systems <sup>1,5</sup>	These must demonstrate that they can address each of the contaminant ty acceptable levels for frequent events up to approximately the 1 in 1 year re- period event, for inflow concentrations relevant to the contributing drainage						

Notes

SuDS components only deliver these indices if they follow design guidance with respect to hydraulics and treatment set out in the relevant technical component chapters.

2 Filter drains can remove coarse sediments, but their use for this purpose will have significant implications with respect to maintenance requirements, and this should be taken into account in the design and Maintenance Plan.

Ponds and wetlands can remove coarse sediments, but their use for this purpose will have significant implications with respect to the maintenance requirements and amenity value of the system. Sediment should normally be removed upstream, unless they are specifically designed to retain sediment in a separate part of the component, where it cannot easily migrate to the main body of water.

Where a wetland is not specifically designed to provide significantly enhanced treatment, it should be considered as having the same mitigation indices as a pond.

See Chapter 14 for approaches to demonstrate product performance. A British Water/Environment Agency assessment code of practice is currently under development that will allow manufacturers to complete an agreed test protocol for systems intended to treat contaminated surface water runoff. Full details can be found at: http://tinyurl.com/gf7yuj7

SEPA only considers proprietary treatment systems as appropriate in exceptional circumstances where other types of SuDS component are not practicable. Proprietary treatment systems may also be considered appropriate for existing sites that are causing pollution where there is a requirement to retrofit treatment. SEPA (2014) also provides a flowchart with a summary of checks on suitability of a proprietary system.

#### Figure 6.3: Indicative SuDS mitigation indices (Table 26.3 the CIRIA SuDS manual 2015)

The selection of treatment should ensure that the SuDS mitigation component index (Figure 6-1) exceeds the pollution hazard index (Figure 6-2). Where two stages of treatment are required, the second stage of treatment should account for reduced performance due to lower inflows; therefore 0.5 (mitigation index) should be used.

Treatment could be provided using a combination of sustainable methods such as permeable paving with high voids sub-base/percolation pipes, swales, and filter strips. Other methods of partial treatment include the use of Oil Interceptors, Trapped Gullies, Smart Sponge gullies and chambers.

The type(s) of mitigation should be considered as the site design is finalised i.e. paving surfaces etc. The proposals for pollution protection should be agreed with Cumbria County Council, Lead Local Flood Authority.



## 7.0 Maintenance

## 7.1 Introduction

This section is intended to give an overview of the operation and maintenance for the drainage features included with the drainage strategy and in relation to typical details. Where proprietary products are specified, the manufacturer's instructions and recommendations should be followed in priority to this document unless specifically noted otherwise due to project constraints.

The recommended operations and frequencies are typical only and should be more frequent initially to ensure that there are no unforeseen issues with the operation and then adjusted to suit the site requirements.

The surface water network has been designed to accommodate the 1 in 100-year storm rainfall event plus an allowance for climate change particular to the requirements of the site. It may be that the exceedance flows above the 1 in 30-year storm rainfall event are stored within the site partially above ground, on non-habitable external landscaping, parking or other space. As the flows are generally being attenuated on site and within SuDS features there will be a period after storm events where the network is still partially or fully surcharged and is draining down. Where this surcharging is still present after 48hrs appropriate action should be taken as noted in this section.

#### 7.2 Components

The following components have been included within the drainage design for the proposed development:

- Inspection, Manhole and Catchpit Chambers
- Pipes
- Drainage Channels and Gullies
- Attenuation Tanks
- Hydro brake

A suitable maintenance strategy should be adopted to ensure the drainage network is cleaned regularly and the routine maintenance and cleansing regime should be documented.

It is assumed that the maintenance of the drainage network will be the responsibility of an on-site facilities management team.

A copy of the final construction drainage layout should be provided in the final Operations and Maintenance Manual.

It is recommended that the drainage system is inspected as a minimum twice a year, with the system also being inspected after any major storm event.



Significant sediment deposition is likely in areas used for storage, so a post clean-up operation may be required including the removal of litter, vegetation, sewerage debris and larger objects.

Long-term management practices include monthly sweeping of external paved areas. The sweeping program will remove sand and contaminants directly from paved surfaces before they become mobilised during storm events and transported to the drainage system.

During the winter months, drainage features such as gullies and channels should be cleared of ice, snow, debris or litter

Sediment/material removal should be undertaken in consultation with the environmental regulator to confirm appropriate protocols; especially where run-off is taken from potentially contaminated areas such as the filter drains and the upstream/downstream chambers.

#### 1.4 Inspection, Manhole and Catchpit Chambers

- 1.4.1 The indicative locations of the Inspection Chambers, Manholes are indicated on Curtins drainage strategy drawing 071551-CUR-00-ZZ-DR-C-04921.
- 1.4.2 Access points have been located at the head of each run, at a change in direction and at a change of pipe size in accordance with Building Regulations Part H.
- 1.4.3 The appropriate health and safety equipment must be used when accessing manholes. Confined space certificates must be held by any personnel entering a manhole and the appropriate permits should be obtained from the Maintenance Manager prior to any access.

#### 1.5 Pipes

The indicative locations of the drainage pipes are indicated on Curtins drainage strategy drawing 071551-CUR-00-ZZ-DR-C-04921.

Pipes are proprietary products and the materials can vary across the site and as such where used the manufacture's recommendations should be followed. Regardless of the product used the pipes will be fully compliant with the Curtins drainage specification.

Pipes are intended to be the main conveyance across the development and where oversized they form the attenuation volume required by the limitation of the discharge rate. They are intended to be dry except for during rainfall events. These have been designed to be self-cleaning where possible for smaller diameter pipes, and for larger diameters the risk is reduced due to the overall pipe size.

Access for maintenance is provided through access chambers and manholes.

Regular inspection and maintenance is important to identify areas which may have been obstructed/clogged and may not be drainage correctly thus exposing the development to a greater level of flood risk.

## 071551-CUR-XX-RP-C-92001 West Cumberland Hospital Phase 2 and Phase 3

Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy



Maintenance Schedule	Required Action	Frequency
Monitoring (to be undertaken more regularly within the first year of operation and adjusted as required).	Initial Inspection should be provided as post construction CCTV survey.	N/A
Regular maintenance\ inspection	Inspect for evidence of poor operation via water level in chambers. If required, take remedial action.	3-monthly, 48 hours after large storms.
	Check and remove large vegetation growth near pipe runs.	Monthly or as required
Remedial Action	Rod through poorly performing runs as initial remediation.	As required.
	If continued poor performance jet and CCTV survey poorly performing runs.	As required.
	Seek advice as to remediation techniques suitable for the type of performance issue and location.	As required If above does not improve performance.

## 1.6 Drainage Channels and Gullies

The indicative locations of the drainage channels and gullies are indicated on Curtins drainage strategy drawing 071551-CUR-00-ZZ-DR-C-04921.

Channels and gullies should be inspected and cleaned in accordance with the manufacturer's details. Channel units can be cleaned through the use of a high-pressure hose; this can be fed into the channel system through access units strategically placed along the channel run. The throat section of channel units should be kept clear at all times to ensure uninterrupted flow of surface water into the drainage channel and any debris within the throat should be removed.



Locking bolts should be replaced and sufficiently tightened, taking care that the bolt heads do not stand above the top surface of the cover or grate. If covers are allowed to move within their frame, this may cause damage to the frame or seating.

Sediment\material removal should be undertaken in consultation with the environmental regulator to confirm appropriate protocols; especially where run-off is taken from potentially contaminated areas such as the car park channels.

Maintenance Schedule	Required Action	Frequency
Monitoring (to be undertaken more regularly within the first year of operation and adjusted as required).	Initial Inspection including channel outlet boxes.	Half yearly and after large storms.
Regular maintenance\ inspection	Litter and debris removal	Monthly or as required.
	Check and remove large vegetation growth near channel runs.	Monthly or as required
	Inspect for evidence of poor operation and/or weed growth. If required, take remedial action. Inspect silt accumulation rates and establish appropriate brushing frequencies. Silt can also be caused by adjacent landscaping areas which should be reprofiled to provide a flat	3-monthly, 48 hours after large storms.
	area or berm adjacent to the paving.	
Remedial Action	Inspect access/outlet boxes and rod through poorly performing channels and outlets as initial remediation.	As required.



### 1.7 Attenuation Tanks

The indicative locations of the attenuation tanks are indicated on Curtins drainage strategy drawing 071551-CUR-00-ZZ-DR-C-04921.

Access for maintenance should be provided, for example by locating inspection chambers within the crate structure.

Sediment\material removal should be undertaken in consultation with the environmental regulator to confirm appropriate protocols.

Maintenance Schedule	Required Action	Frequency
Monitoring (to be undertaken more regularly within the first year of operation and adjusted as required).	Inspect inlets for blockages, and clear if required. If faults persist jetting and CCTV survey may be required.	Monthly and after large storms.
Regular maintenance\ inspection	Inspect and identify any areas that are not operating correctly. If required, take remedial action.	Monthly for 3 months, then six monthly.
	Debris removal from catchment surface (where may cause risks to performance).	Monthly
	Remove sediment from pre- treatment structures, catchpits and filter chambers.	Annually (or as required after heavy rainfall events)
Remedial Actions	Repair/rehabilitation of inlets/outlets.	As required.
	Rehabilitation of surface and upper sub-structure. This could include replacement of the jointing and bedding material.	As required (if infiltration performance is reduced as a result of significant clogging).



The upper geotextiles layer may also need replacing if clogged and Terram 1000 has a life span of 25 years.	
Reconstruct soakaway and or replace or clean void area / fill, if performance deteriorates or failure occurs	As required
Replace clogged geotextile (will required reconstruction of soakaway). Terram 1000 has a life span of 25 years.	As required



Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy

# 8.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has determined the level of risk associated with the proposed development.

From the evidence collated the main types of flooding that may apply to the proposed development site are as follows:

- Fluvial / Tidal flooding to the site (No potential)
- Reservoir flooding to the site (No potential)
- Groundwater flooding to the site (Low potential)
- Surface water flooding to the site (Low potential / Isolated High Potential)
- Surface water flooding from the site (Low potential).

In respect to flood risk, the following recommendations are made:

- Proposed external ground levels across the site should fall away from the proposed buildings in a manner which does not create low points where water might collect unintentionally.
- It is recommended that groundwater levels are monitored over a longer period than undertaken during ground investigation works. Typically, groundwater levels are recorded during gas monitoring over a 3-month period.

In respect to surface water drainage, the assessment has concluded that:

- Whilst no Infiltration testing has been undertaken, site investigation results indicate that infiltration drainage is not appropriate for the site.
- There are no nearby watercourses in which to discharge surface water.
- The existing development is discharged to the public surface water sewer system.

It is recommended that:

- The below ground surface water drainage system should be designed to accommodate the 100-year plus 40% increase in peak rainfall event on the 100-yr design rainfall.
- In respect to exceedance flows, i.e. flows in excess of the 100-yr plus climate change design flows, that finished floor levels are set above external levels to minimise risk of internal flooding.
- An assessment of pollution indices and appropriate mitigation measures should be assessed during detailed design stage.
- An operation and maintenance plan is produced and adhered to.



# 9.0 Appendices

Appendix AProposed Development PlansAppendix BSewer RecordsAppendix CSurface Water Run-off CalculationsAppendix DDrainage Strategy Drawing



Appendix A Proposed Development Plans







Appendix B Sewer Records



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: B071551 Our Ref: UUPS-ORD-118253 Date: 14/08/2019

Curtins Consulting Ltd

51-55 Tithebarn Street, Liverpool, L2 2SB

FAO:

**Dear Sirs** 

#### **Location: West Cumberland Hospital**

I acknowledge with thanks your request dated 13/08/2019 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. <u>http://www.unitedutilities.com/work-near-asset.aspx</u>.

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,

ned

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.



Abandoned Foul S	Surface Water Combined Public Sewer Private Sewer Section 104 Rising Main Sludge Main Overflow Water Course Highway Drain
All point assets follow th red - combined brown - foul Manhole	Public Sewer Private Sewer Section 104 Rising Main Sludge Main Overflow Water Course Highway Drain
All point assets follow th red - combined brown - foul Manhole 5 Head of System	te standard colour convention: blue - surface water purple - overflow
All point assets follow th red - combined brown - foul Manhole S Head of System	te standard colour convention: blue - surface water purple - overflow
• Manhole <sup>55</sup> Head of System	
<ul> <li>Head of System</li> </ul>	Side Entry Manhole
Extent of Survey	Screen Chamber
<ul> <li>Rodding Eye</li> <li>Inlet</li> </ul>	Bifurcation Chamber
Discharge Point	<ul> <li>Lamp Hole</li> <li>T Junction / Saddle</li> </ul>
Penstock	Catchpit     Value Chamber
Washout Chamber Valve	Vent Column
Air Valve	O Vortex Chamber
<ul> <li>Non Return Valve</li> <li>Soakaway</li> </ul>	Network Storage Tank
Sully	Sewer Overflow     Ww Treatment Works
Cascade Flow Meter	Ww Pumping Station
Hatch Box	<ul> <li>Septic Tank</li> <li>Control Kiosk</li> </ul>
Oil Interceptor	
<ul> <li>Drop Shaft</li> <li>Orifice Plate</li> </ul>	V Change of Characteristic
MAN	HOLE FUNCTION
FO	Foul / Surface Water
SW	Combined
ov	Overflow
s	EWER SHAPE
CI Circula EG Eco	ar TR Trapezoidal AR Arch
OV Oval	BA Barrel
FT Flat To	p HO HorseShoe
RE Rectar SQ Square	ngular UN Unspecified e
SE	WER MATERIAL
AC Asb	estos Cement
BR Brid	*
RP Rei	nforced Plastic Matrix
CO Con	crete
CSB Con	crete Segment Bolted
CC Con	crete Box Culverted
PSC Plas	stic / Steel Composite
GRC Gla	ss Reinforeod Plastic tile Iron
PVC Poly	rvinyl Chloride
CI Cas	t Iron
SI Spu ST Stee	BI
VC Vitrif	fied Clay
PP Poly	ypropylene h Eibre
PF Pitc MAC Mas	sonry, Coursed
MAR Ma: U Uns	sonry, Random specified
Address o	or Site Reference:
	nherland Hospital
	<ul> <li>Discharge Point</li> <li>Vortex</li> <li>Penstock</li> <li>Washout Chamber</li> <li>Valve</li> <li>Air Valve</li> <li>Non Return Valve</li> <li>Soakaway</li> <li>Gully</li> <li>Cascade</li> <li>Flow Meter</li> <li>Hatch Box</li> <li>Orifice Plate</li> <li>MAN</li> <li>FO</li> <li>Summit</li> <li>Drop Shaft</li> <li>Orifice Plate</li> <li>MAN</li> <li>FO</li> <li>Sum</li> <li>Ci Circuit</li> <li>EG</li> <li>Eg</li> <li>OV</li> <li>Oval</li> <li>FT</li> <li>Flat Tc</li> <li>Re Retar</li> <li>SQ</li> <li>Square</li> <li>SE</li> <li>AC</li> <li>Ast</li> <li>BR</li> <li>Brick</li> <li>Penta</li> <li>Ci Circuit</li> <li>EG</li> <li>Eg</li> <li>OV</li> <li>Oval</li> <li>FT</li> <li>Flat Tc</li> <li>RE</li> <li>Retar</li> <li>SQ</li> <li>Square</li> <li>SE</li> <li>AC</li> <li>Ast</li> <li>BR</li> <li>Brick</li> <li>Ci Circuit</li> <li>EG</li> <li>Eg</li> <li>OV</li> <li>Oval</li> <li>FT</li> <li>Flat Tc</li> <li>RE</li> <li>Retar</li> <li>SQ</li> <li>Square</li> <li>SE</li> <li>AC</li> <li>Ast</li> <li>BR</li> <li>Brick</li> <li>Ci Circuit</li> <li>EG</li> <li>AC</li> <li>Ast</li> <li>BR</li> <li>Brick</li> <li>Eg</li> <li>Eg&lt;</li></ul>



t	Size x 100	Size y	Shape	Matl VC	Length 39.41388	Grad	LEGEND
	225 150 225 150			VC VC VC VC	79.9062 22.2036 52.95281 9.899495	1 in 29 1 in 6	Abandoned Foul Surface Water Combined
	150 150 100			VC VC VC	9.899495 12.37279 16.17083 26.60563	1 in 83	Public Sewer
	150 150 225 300			VC VC VC	6.708204 13.45362 38.0526	1 in	Section 104
	150 225 225 0			VC VC VC	32.51481 52.03845 52.03845 53.06074		Sludge Main
;	300 225 150			VC VC VC	41.59327 92.91394 5.656854	1 in 11 1 in 23	Water Course Highway Drain
;	150 225 100 100			VC VC VC	5.656854 2 11.44424 1.523291		
;	100 225 150			VC VC VC	4.366651 47.01064 27.65863	1 in 85	All point assets follow the standard colour convention:
	300 300 300 225			VC VC VC VC	34.04999 8.246211 8.246211 24.59675	1 in 170 1 in 0.13810435 1 in 0.13810435 1 in 18	red - combined blue - surface water brown - foul purple - overflow
	150 150 150			VC VC VC	18.43909 18.43909 22.36068	-	Manhole     Side Entry Manhole
	225 100 225 225			VC VC VC	э 5.693299 7.358759 47.43417	1 in 12	Head of System     Outfall     Second Chember
; ;	225 225 225 150				47.43417 32.01562 37.57659 12.20656	1 in 12 1 in 10 1 in 6	Rodding Eye     Inspection Chamber     Diffurction Chamber
8	150 150 225			VC VC VC	21.47091 21.47091 22.02271	1 in 17	PP Discharge Point     Pr Lamp Hole     The second se
5	225 225 150 150			VC VC VC VC	22.02271 4.472136 27.80288 12.80625	1 in 17 1 in 9	Vortex     F Junction / Saddle     Catchpit     Output
	150 100 100			VC UN UN	2.447339 2.707188 2.707188		Valve Chamber Valve Chamber
	150 150 150 100			VC VC VC VC	13.89244 13.89244 21.40093 19.85966		Air Valve     Vortex Chamber     Non Return Valve     Penstock Chamber
	1200 150 225				12.84985 11.40206 25.80698	1 in 214 1 in 70	Soakaway     Image: Network Storage Tank       Gully     Image: Sewer Overflow
	225 225 150 150			VC VC VC VC	∠5.80698 22.2036 2.828427 6.403124	1 in 70	Cascade Ww Treatment Works
;	150 150 150			VC VC VC	6.403124 7.28011 25.29301	1 in 12	Hatch Box Septic Tank
	150 150 150 225			VC VC VC VC	12.64911 12.64911 1 11.18034		Oil Interceptor     Summit     Change of Characteristic
	150 150 150			VC VC VC	27.25008 10.63015 10.63015 28.59007	1 in 8	Drop Shaft     Orifice Plate
	100 100 150 150			VC VC VC	26.30987 18.43909 38.58756 26.31764		
; 4 4	100 150 225 225			VC VC VC	18.06347 36.23534 27.01851 27.01851	1 in 41 1 in 52 1 in 52	
	300 225 150			VC VC VC	32.31099 59.23681 16.03122	1 in 14 1 in 12 1 in 12	FO Foul
	150 150 225 225			VC VC VC VC	16.12452 16.12452 35.35534 35.35534		SW Surface Water
2 2	225 225 225			VC VC VC	30.80584 5.09902 5.09902	1 in 73 1 in 73	CO Combined OV Overflow
	150 375 100 100			VC VC VC VC	3.867599 11.08652 28.90358 28.90358		
	375 150 150			VC VC VC	32.31872 17.69181 17.69181		SEWER SHAPE
6 6	100 225 225 225			VC VC VC VC	8.73541 12.72792 12.72792 10.04988	1 in 91 1 in 91	CI Circular TR Trapezoidal EG Eon AR Arch
Ļ	150 100 225			VC VC VC	9.848858 20.61553 47.85394	1 in 7	OV Oval BA Barrel
	225 150 150 100			VC VC VC VC	1 12.04159 12.04159 14.48718	т in	FT Flat Top HO HorseShoe RE Rectangular UN Unspecified
:	150 300 150 225			VC VC VC	60 16.27882 12.72792 16.76205	1 in 16	SQ Square
	150 150 225			VC VC VC	27.20294 19.64688 44.04543	1 in 20	
•	225 150 150			VC VC VC	93.80418 11.40175 11.40175 7.126692	1 in 13	SEWER MATERIAL AC Asbestos Cement
	150 225 225			VC VC VC	7.071068 5.09902 8.602325	1 in 20 1 in 10	BR Brick
	225 150 150 150				8.602325 35.34119 17.02939 17.02939	1 in 10 1 in 14	PE Polyethylene RP Reinforced Plastic Matrix
;	150 150 150			VC VC VC	17.02939 8.485281 8.485281	4	CO Concrete CSB Concrete Segment Bolted
	300 150 100 150			VC VC VC	13.63866 19.42896 1.655486 8.485281	1 in 6	CSU Concrete Segment Unbolted
	150 150 150			VC VC VC	8.485281 16.64332 16.64332		PSC Plastic / Steel Composite
	100 150 150 100			VC VC VC UN	20.92479 20.27811 6.286202 10.38323		GRC Glass Reinforeod Plastic DI Ductile Iron
	100 150 100			UN VC UN	10.38323 15.70882 11.39401		PVC Polyvinyl Chloride
	100 150			UN VC	11.39401 19.51291		SI Spun Iron
							ST Steel VC Vitrified Clay
							PP Polypropylene PF Pitch Fibre
							MAC Masonry, Coursed
							MAR Masonry, Random U Unspecified
							Address or Site Pafarance:
							vvest Cumberland Hospital,
							OS sheet NX9816SE Number: Scale: 1:1250 Date: 14/08/2019 Nodes: 346 Sheet: 2 of 5
							Printed by: Property Searches
							SEWER RECORDS



Grad			LE	EGEI	ND	)		
_A	bandoned	Foul		Surface \	Vater	Combine	ed	Public Sewer
+	••••							Private Sewer Section 104 Rising Main Sludge Main Overflow
	•••••••			••••				Water Course Highway Drain
	All po	oint assets fo red - combin own - foul	ollow I ned	the stand blue - : purple - :	ard co surface overfi	olour conve ce water low	ntion	E
	• Ma	nhole			• \$	ide Entry M	anho	le
	Ext	ad of System ent of Surve	n N		III S	outfall creen Chan	nber	
	Roc	dding Eye st			• Ir	hspection C lifurcation C	hamt Chaml	ber
	P Dis	charge Point	t		L T	amp Hole Junction / S	Saddl	le
	Per Per	nstock	her		© 0 © V	atchpit alve Chamb	ber	
	a va	ve			• V	ent Column	ber	
	<ul> <li>Air</li> <li>Nor</li> </ul>	valve n Return Val	ve		0 P	enstock Cha	ambe	er Task
	Sos	akaway Ilv				letwork Stor	rage ' low	Tank
	Ca:	scade			ii v	Vw Treatmei Vw Pumping	nt Wo Stat	orks ion
	Flo	w Meter tch Box			S S	eptic Tank	k	
	Oil	Interceptor mmit			es C	NIGOL KIOS	•	
	• Sur • Dro • Ori	op Shaft fice Plate			⊽ c	hange of Cl	harad	oteristic
			MA	NHOLE F	JNCT	TION		
			S	W Surfac	e Wa	őer		
			0	O Comb V Overflo	ned w			
				SEWER S	НАРЕ	£		
		CI	Circu	ular	IR T	rapezoidal		
		EG	Egg Oval		AR A BA F	Vrch Barrel		
		FT	Flat	Тор	HO H	torseShoe		
		RE	Recta Squa	angular ire	UN (	Unspecified		
			S	EWER MA	TERI	AL		
		AC BR	As Br	sbestos Ce rick	ment			
		PE	Po	olyethylene	1			
		RP CO	Re	einforced F oncrete	lastic	Matrix		
		CSE	B Co	oncrete Se	gmen	t Bolted		
		CSI CC	U Co	oncrete Se oncrete Bo	gmen < Culv	t Unbolted		
		PSC	C Pk	astic / Stee	I Con	nposite		
		GR	U GI	ass Reinfo uctile Iron	recd	mastic		
		PV(	C Po	lyvinyl Chi	oride			
		SI	Sp	sun Iron				
		ST	Sto	eel rified Clau				
		PP	Po	olypropyler	e			
		PF	Pit C M	tch Fibre	)Ufsa	đ		
		MAJ	R M	asonry, Ra	ndom			
		U	Ur	nspecified				
		Addre West	ess Cu	or Site	e R and	<b>eferenc</b> Hospita	<b>:e:</b> al,	
		PF MAI U <b>Addre</b> West	Pit C Mi R Mi Un ess Cu	tch Fibre asonry, Ci asonry, Ra nspecified <b>or Sit</b> e mberla	ndom e R and	eferenc Hospita	<b>:e:</b> al,	
Sc	C N ale: 1	<b>DS she</b> Numbe :1250 Node:	et er: s:	NX:	991 Da	I6SW ate:	14	4/08/2019
		Shee Printed b	et:	3 of	5 ertv	Searcher	S	
	9514		<i>у</i> :	rop	erty		。 Ic	ited
R	ECO			5	U	U	til	ities



ert	Size x	Size y	Shape	Matl	Length	Gr
.68	225			VC	43.38344	1 in
	100			VC	16.51454	
	100			VC	16.51454	
)	150			VC	23.43075	
)	150			VC	23.43075	
.84	225			VC	28.30194	1 ir
.84	225			VC	28.30194	1 ir
)	150			VC	15.65248	
	300			VC	6.738397	
.48	150			VC	24.08319	1 ir
.48	150			VC	24.08319	1 ir
.76	150			VC	36.23534	1 in
	225			VC	18.83547	
.66	150			VC	19.23538	1 in
47	150			VC	13.60147	
.21	225			VC	40.22437	1 in
51	150			VC	25 01999	1 in
)	150			VC	50 24938	
94	100			VC	1	
94	100			VC	1	
11	525			co	64 00781	1 in
11	525			00	64 00781	1 in
	225			VC	2 701522	
	225			VC	20 55006	
02	100			VC	23.33300	1 ir
.02 \	150			VC	16 27002	
5	150			VC	16.27002	
ິ	150			VC	10.27002	1 in
.02	150			VC	17 20155	1 111
25	150			VC	25 61261	1 in
.25	100			VC	33.01301	1 0.04
.62	225			VC	21.8653	1 IN 0.84
	100			VC	12.5538	
) 	150			VC	17.20465	
.61	150			VC	27.20294	4 :
.96	150			VC	37.95677	1 in
.14	300			VC	2.305402	1 in 3.60
5.6	150			VC	39	1 in
	100			VC	19.66671	
)	225			VC	25.6125	
)	225			VC	25.6125	
.5	225			VC	8.602325	1 in
.5	225			VC	8.602325	1 in
	150			VC	18.26448	
	100			VC	17.09685	
.19	150			VC	14.80399	1 in 15.9
	100			UN	11.39401	
	100			UN	11.39401	
	100			UN	10.38323	
	100			LINI	10 20222	

Grad in 37 lin6 lin6 in 9 in 9 in 41 in 18 in 10 in 69 in 20 in 20 l in 0 in 16 n 13 34097320 in 42 60219034 in 10 in 10 in 10 .9182671



#### MANHOLE FUNCTION

FO	Foul
SW	Surface Water
co	Combined
ov	Overflow

#### SEWER SHAPE

CI	Circular	TR	Trapezoidal
EG	Egg	AR	Arch
ov	Oval	BA	Barrel
FT	Flat Top	HO	HorseShoe
RE	Rectangular	UN	Unspecified
sq	Square		

#### SEWER MATERIAL

AC	Asbestos Cement
BR	Brick
PE	Polyethylene
RP	Reinforced Plastic Matrix
co	Concrete
CS8	Concrete Segment Bolted
CSU	Concrete Segment Unbolted
cc	Concrete Box Culverted
PSC	Plastic / Steel Composite
GRC	Glass Reinforecd Plastic
DI	Ductile Iron
PVC	Polyvinyl Chloride
CI	Cast Iron
SI	Spun Iron
ST	Steel
VC	Vitrified Clay
PP	Polypropylene
PF	Pitch Fibre
MAC	Masonry, Coursed
MAR	Masonry, Random

#### Address or Site Reference:

U Unspecified

## West Cumberland Hospital,

OS sheet NX9815NE Number: Scale: 1:1250 Nodes: Sheet: 4 of 5

**Date:** 14/08/2019 250

Printed by: Property Searches

SEWER RECORDS

**U**nited Utilities Ping life flow smoothly



· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	LEGEND				
	Abandoned Foul Surface Water Combined				
	Public Sewer Private Sewer				
	Rising Main				
	Sludge Main Overflow				
	Water Course				
	All point assets follow the standard colour convention:				
	brown - foul purple - overflow				
	Manhole     Side Entry Manhole     Side Entry Manhole     Gutfall				
	Extent of Survey     Screen Chamber				
	Rodding Eye     Injet     Sifurcation Chamber				
	Discharge Point				
	Vortex I Junction / Saddle				
	Washout Chamber G Valve Chamber				
	Valve   Vent Column				
	Air Valve     Ovortex Chamber     Deschool Observer				
	Non Return Valve     Penstock Chamber     Network Storage Tank				
	Soakaway     Gully     Gully				
	Cascade Ww Treatment Works				
	Flow Meter				
	Hatch Box Septic Tank				
	Oil Interceptor				
	Summit     Venue of Characteristic     Drop Shaft				
	• Orifice Plate				
	MANHOLE FUNCTION				
	FO Foul				
	SW Surface Water				
	CO Combined				
	OV Overflow				
	SEWER SHAPE				
	CI Circular TR Trapezoidal				
	EG Egg AR Arch				
	FT Flat Too HO HorseShoe				
	RE Rectangular UN Unspecified				
	SQ Square				
	SEWER MATERIAL				
	AC Asbestos Cement				
	BR Brick				
	PE Polyethylene				
	RP Reinforced Plastic Matrix				
	CO Concrete				
	CSB Concrete Segment Bolled CSU Concrete Segment Unholted				
	CC Concrete Box Culverted				
	PSC Plastic / Steel Composite				
	GRC Glass Reinforeod Plastic				
	DI Ductile Iron				
	PVC Polyvinyl Chloride				
	SI Spun Iron				
	ST Steel				
	VC Vitrified Clay				
	PP Polypropylene				
	PF Pitch Fibre				
	MAC Masonry, Coursed				
	U Unspecified				
	Address or Site Reference:				
•	West Cumberland Hospital,				



Appendix C Surface Water Run-off Calculations

#### PEAK RATE OF RUN-OFF CALCULATION

#### Design Brief

The following Peak Rate of Run-off calculations have been undertaken to determine peak run-off comparison from the previously developed site against current development. These calculations are for the <u>Peak Rate of Run-Off</u> requirements only. <u>Volume of Run-Off</u> calculations should be undertaken seperately using catchment descriptors and the FEH methodology.

#### **Background Information & References**

Runoff from the site is calculated using the Modified Rational Method as outlined in the Wallingford proceedure, based on rainfall depths provided in the Flood Studies Report (FSR).

**No** allowance has been made for the effects of climate change in accordance with the guidance provided in Table 5 of the Technical guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework. Based on the design life of the proposed development of 100 years, an increase in runoff of 40% has been used in the calculations for the post-development peak rate of run-off.

The following references have been used in the preparation of these calculations:

- Design and Analysis of Urban Storm Drainage-The Wallingford Proceedure, V4 Modified Rational Method
- Designing for Exceedance in Urban Drainage good practice, CIRIA Report C635, 2006
- Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH)
- Flood Studies Report (FSR), Volume 1, Hydrological Studies, 1993
- Flood Studies Supplementary Report No 2 (FSSR2), The Estimation of Low Return Period Floods
- Flood Studies Supplementary Report No 14 (FSSR14), Review of Regional Growth Curves, 1983
- Table 2 of the Government Guidance Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances

#### **Results Summary**

Post development results indicate a 26.8% decrease in peak discharge as a direct result of the proposed development. The results include a without climate change case to enable direct comparison with the pre-development case. Post-development (Climate change) demonstrates the increase by applying a 40% increase to peak runoff.

	Peak Rate of Run-Off (Litres/sec)						
Event	Pre-development (Brownfield Site)	Post-development	Post- development (Climate change)				
QBAR	275.9	201.9	282.6				
Q10	375.6	274.8	384.8				
Q30	458.7	335.7	469.9				
Q100	588.0	430.3	602.4				

Job Title:	West Cumberland Ho	ospital					
Job No:	071551		<b>.</b>		-		urtine
Made by:	DM	Checked:	CJS	Sheet No.	2		ILLINS
Date:	26/03/2020	Date:	26/03/2019	of	4		
PRE-DEVEI	OPMENT PEAK RATE	OF RUN-C	OFF				
	Total site impermeabl	e area, A =	21250	m <sup>2</sup>			
	M5-60 rai Ratio M5-60/I	nfall depth M5-2Day, r	17 0.30	mm	[Flood Si [The Wa Modified (Hydraul	tudies Report (NE Ilingford Proceed Rational Method ics Research, 19	ERC, 1975)] ure - V4 . Fig A.2 83)]
	Storr	m Duration	15	mins	Anticipat usually 1	ed critical duratio 5 minutes	n for the site -
	Duratior	i factor, Z1	0.59		[The Wa Modified (Hydraul	llingford Proceed Rational Method ics Research 19	ure - V4 . Fig A.3b 83)1
	M5-15 rainf	all depth =	10.03	mm	(Try araan		
		Return pe M1-15 M10-15 M30-15 M100-15	riod ratio, Z2 0.61 1.22 1.49 1.91 Rair Depth	fall	[The Wa Modified (Hydraul	llingford Proceed Rational Method ics Research, 19	ure - V4 . Table A1 83)]
		M1-15	(mm) 6.1	24	1		
		M10-15	12.2	49	1		
		M30-15	14.9	60	]		
	Deel dieeb	M100-15	19.2	77	J		
	Peak disch	arge, Qp –	CVUITA				
	Where:	Cv = Cr = i =	Volumetric R Routing Coe Rainfall inter	unoff Coeffi fficient sity (mm/ho	cient our)		
		Cv = Cr =	1 1.3	]			
		Peak	Runoff	_			
		Q10 Q30 Q100	Litres/sec 375.6 458.7 588.0				

Job Title:	West Cumberland Ho	ospital					
Job No:	071551						
Made by:	DM	Checked:	: CJS	Sheet No.	3		5
Date:	26/03/2020	Date:	26/03/2019	of	4		
ESTIMATIO	N OF QBAR (BROWN	FIELD RUN	NOFF RATE)				
See Table 2	.39 for region curve ord	inates					
Use FSSR2	Growth Curves to estim	ate Qbar	10	•			
		Region =	10				
		Poturn					
		neriod	Ordinato				
		1			Ordinato	from ESSP2	
		2	0.07	1	Uninale		
		5	1.19	1			
		10	1.38	1			
		25	1.64	1			
		30	1.68		Linear in	terpolation b/w 25 and 50 yr R	P
		50	1.85	]			
		100	2.08				
		200	2.24	4	Linear in	terpolation b/w 100 and 500 yr	-
		500	2.73		RP		
		1000	3.04	J			
			Ohor				
	Or	linata ucad		1			
	OIC		272.2	1			
		30 year	272.2	1			
		100 year	282.7				
				1			
Exis	sting Brownfield Rund	off, Qbar =	275.9	l/s	Using th	e average Qbar	
					derived f	from three	
					ordinates	S.	

Job Title: West Cumberland Hospital									
Job No:	071551								
Made by:	DM	С	hecked:	CJS	Sheet No.	4		urtins	
Date:	26/03/20	20 <b>D</b>	ate:	26/03/2019	of	4			
ESTIMATI	ON OF QB	AR (BROWNFIE	LD PEA	K RATE OF F	<u>RUN-OFF)</u>				
Total si	te proposed	l impermeable a	rea, A =	15550	m²				
				Rain	fall	1			
				Depth	Intensity, i	1			
				(mm)	(mm/hr)	1			
			M10-15	12.2	49				
		- Fr	M100-15	14.9	77				
		Peak discharc	ie. Qp =	Cv Cr i A					
			Cv =	1					
			Cr =	1.3					
			Peak	Runoff	1				
		Г	010	Litres/sec	{				
			Q10 Q30	335.7	1				
			Q100	430.3	1				
			(	Qbar					
		Ordina	ate used	Litres/sec					
			10 30	199.2					
			100	206.9					
	Po	st development	Qbar =	201.9	l/s				
DETERMI					CE FOR CL	IMATE C	HANGE		
An allowan	Table 2 of	the Government	effects of Guidan	climate chan	ge in accord	ance witr s: climate	the guidance	inces	
https://www	v.gov.uk/gu	idance/flood-risk		ments-climate	-change-all	owances	onange allowe		
Climate ch	ange allowa	ance dependa <u>nt</u>	upon de	sign life of dev	elopment				
Design life			100	years	Developme	ent date	2020	to <b>2120</b>	
Allowance		_	70%	for for	peak river	tlow Il intensity			
	Therefor	e take	40%	to account	for future cli	imate cha	y nae		
	mercioi						iigo		
[	Table 2 p	eak rainfall int	tensity	allowance in	small and	urban c	atchments		
	(use 1961 to 1990 baseline)								
	Applies	Total potential ch	ange	Total potential	change	Total pote	ntial change		
	across all	anticipated for the	e '2020s'	anticipated for	the '2050s'	anticipate	d for the '2080s'		
	or England	(2010102033)		(2040 10 2003	· ·	(2070102		_	
	Upper end	10%		20%		40%		_	
	Central	5%		10%		20%		_	



Appendix D Drainage Strategy Drawing



# **Our Locations**

#### Birmingham

2 The Wharf Bridge Street Birmingham B1 2JS T. 0121 643 4694 birmingham@curtins.com

#### Bristol

Quayside 40-58 Hotwell Road Bristol BS8 4UQ T. 0117 302 7560 bristol@curtins.com

#### Cambridge

50 Cambridge Place Cambridge CB2 1NS T. 01223 631 799 cambridge@curtins.com

#### Cardiff

3 Cwrt-y-Parc Earlswood Road Cardiff CF14 5GH T. 029 2068 0900 cardiff@curtins.com

#### Douglas

Varley House 29-31 Duke Street Douglas Isle of Man IM1 2AZ T. 01624 624 585 douglas@curtins.com

#### Dublin

11 Pembroke Lane Dublin 2 D02 CX82 Ireland T. +353 1 507 9447 dublin@curtins.com

#### Edinburgh 1a Belford Road Edinburgh EH4 3BL T. 0131 225 2175 edinburgh@curtins.com

#### Glasgow

Queens House 29 St Vincent Place Glasgow G1 2DT T. 0141 319 8777 glasgow@curtins.com

#### Kendal

Units 24 & 25 Riverside Place K Village Lound Road Kendal LA9 7FH T. 01539 724 823 kendal@curtins.com

#### Leeds

Ground Floor Rose Wharf 78-80 East Street Leeds LS9 8EE T. 0113 274 8509 leeds@curtins.com

#### Liverpool

51-55 Tithebarn Street Liverpool L2 2SB T. 0151 726 2000 liverpool@curtins.com

London 40 Compton Street London EC1V 0BD T. 020 7324 2240 Iondon@curtins.com

#### Manchester

Merchant Exchange 17-19 Whitworth Street West Manchester M1 5WG T. 0161 236 2394 manchester@curtins.com

#### Nottingham

56 The Ropewalk Nottingham NG1 5DW T. 0115 941 5551 nottingham@curtins.com

