



---

**Report of the Chief Planning Officer**

**NORTH AND EAST PLANS PANEL**

**Date: 16<sup>th</sup> November 2017**

**Subject: 17/00307/FU – Demolition of existing buildings, development of 241 dwellings and provision of open space, landscaping and drainage works at the former Stocks Blocks site, off Ninelands Lane, Garforth**

**APPLICANTS**

Stocks Bros Ltd & Redrow  
Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd

**DATE VALID**

25<sup>th</sup> January 2017

**TARGET DATE**

TBC

---

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

Garforth and Swillington

Yes

Ward Members consulted  
(referred to in report)

**Specific Implications For:**

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**Members are asked to note the contents of this supplementary report and to agree the officer recommendation as detailed within Appendix A, including the addition of two extra drainage related conditions as follows:**

**No. 25: Water saving devices within the proposed development, so as to reduce water usage down to 105 litres per person per day.**

**No. 26 Water butts (250 litres minimum per dwelling) to minimise use of mains water.**

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This report accompanies the update/covering report which appears within the main Panel papers. The report contains further information from Yorkshire Water which Members specifically requested to aid their understanding of the development's impact on the foul drainage system and the issue of flooding more generally.

- 1.2 In addition, the report also refers to further local representations received and that the Flood Risk Management Team have provided additional advice in the light of this further information. Both Yorkshire Water and Flood Risk Management maintain their position of no objection to the development. Flood Risk Management also confirm there will be significant betterment in terms of surface water runoff and improvements to the capacity of the piped drainage system.

## 2.0 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS REGARDING FOUL DRAINAGE

### Yorkshire Water Update:

- 2.1 In seeking additional comments from Yorkshire Water, officers also requested confirmation it's 'no objection' response remained. Yorkshire Water has confirmed this is the case and also that the original suggested conditions (Nos. 19 and 20 as detailed in Appendix A) have not altered. The following additional information has also been provided:

#### 1. Proposed foul water connection point:

Either the 152mm diameter public foul water sewer in Ninelands Lane or the 203mm diameter public sewer traversing the site. The final discharge point will be depend on the site layout and finished floor levels but in the first instance we would expect a gravity connection to be made, thus reducing the requirement for a pumping station. The use of a gravity system over a pumped system will also reduce the flood risk for the site.

It should be noted that this is brownfield development and the site previously discharged domestic foul water and trade effluent from commercial premises. It is our view that the discharge of the proposed houses would be comparable with that from the original use of the site.

#### 2. Network connections/infrastructure beyond the site:

Regardless of which public foul water sewer is utilised for the connection (as in point No. 1), both communicate with the 375/381mm diameter public foul water sewers to the south of Meriden Avenue and Medway Avenue.

YW will require separate systems for foul and surface water, on and off site.

The existing public foul water network discharges to a public combined sewer further downstream to the south west of Garforth.

#### 3. Existing network callouts/issues within the area:

Over the last 3 years there has been approximately 20 visits in the general area.

Our investigations suggest that the blockages have been caused by unsuitable material being discharged into the sewers including fat from a commercial operation, silt probably also from a commercial operation and wipes etc from domestic properties.

#### 4. Future YW proposals:

We are currently undertaking a comprehensive drainage area plan of Garforth but will not have the results until November 2018 (*this relates to the modelling study as referenced within para 10.21 of the original officer report*)

- 2.2 Yorkshire Water's response has been shared with the applicant, officers from Flood Risk Management and also interested parties who specifically spoke at the previous

meeting regarding the issue of flooding (e.g. Cllr Dobson and the Garforth Flood Group)

**Redrow Response:**

- 2.3 On receipt of Yorkshire Water's comments, the applicant concurs with the additional information provided and confirms gravity connections are proposed so no pumping station will be required on site. The letter confirms this accords with Yorkshire Water's preferred approach (see point No. 1 above) as it states "*The use of a gravity system over a pumped system will also reduce the flood risk for the site.*" The letter also restates the main network improvements that can also be delivered as listed in para. 1.4 of the update/covering report.

**Third Party Representations:**

*Garforth Flood Group*

- 2.4 A summary of the main points made by the Flood Group is provided below:

- Have been dealing with YW since 2007 onwards and find them extremely difficult and almost impossible to get them to accept responsibility for any damage/inconvenience cause as a result of failure of one of their assets.
- Always claiming excessive rainfall and limited impact so further expenditure not justified. Only persistence and threats of legal action result in action.
- YW has recently changed engineering service provider (from Ami to Morrison's) but no records passed on so all historic knowledge lost and issues have to be recapped over again.
- Promises made to camera pipes and set up meetings not stuck to.
- YW has sketchy knowledge of their underground pipework and not happy to share details and confirm who has responsibility for what (which may include LCC).
- Request individual households complain direct so they can 'divide and rule' and still often don't accept problems exist.
- Taken back by the speed the application is returned to Panel and that no mention of a consultative committee is made.
- Do not agree with YW's response that the site's previous effluent in anyway equates to that of 241 houses.
- The claim that foul will be kept separate off site is disputed. Once off site everything gets into the sewers even if it's not supposed to.
- Don't accept the sewage bursts are due to what people put down their loos. The system should be able to cope and adapted to screen out alien objects.
- Consider that there have been many more call outs than 20 in the last 3 years.

*Councillor M Dobson*

- 2.5 Maintains his position regarding the adverse impact the development will have on local flooding problems following the receipt of the additional comments from Yorkshire Water and he endorses the sentiments made by the Garforth Flood Group. He has also requested to address Panel Members on this issue when the application is reconsidered.

- 2.6 In addition to the above comments, a neighbour who attended the previous panel meeting continues to raise objections on highway issues, in particular that residents of the Grange Estate (some 26 streets) have no option but to use the Derwent Avenue access and this will become more congested, that speeding already takes place and is not properly enforced. He also queries if the necessary paperwork from

the Coal Authority has been provided to allow building on the site and if the likely build out period will be 4 years.

**Flood Risk Management Review:**

- 2.7 The additional information provided by Yorkshire Water and the applicant’s response to this has been assessed by officers from the Flood Risk Management Team. In particular, the applicant’s assessment of the improvements to the network as summarised in the table at para. 1.3 of the update/covering report and which now includes both surface water and foul calculations requires further comment.
- 2.8 The figures presented in the table, although considered to be correct are conservative and do not show the full picture in terms of the direct impact the Stocks Blocks site has on flooding effects in the immediate area. The reason for this is because they focus on volumes travelling through the pipes themselves and do not take into consideration volumes which never makes it into the system, which for a site like Stocks Blocks are very significant. This lack of consideration for any overland flows, whilst being the correct technical assessment in terms establishing existing pipe flows also significantly down plays the benefits redevelopment of the site with a completely new and fully adoptable/separate surface and foul drainage systems can achieve relative to the current situation.
- 2.6 Flood Risk Management officers have therefore added this data to the table for comparison purposes to help show the predicted benefits are significantly higher than currently presented and when considering the nature of the local problems which are known to include surface water flooding directly influenced by the site:

	<i>1 in 1 Year Event</i>	<i>1 in 30 Year Event</i>	<i>1 in 100 Year Event</i>
<i>Existing Discharge- Pipe System (l/s)</i>	203	304	313
<i>Existing Discharge- Overland Flow (l/s)*</i>	175	613	884
<b>Total</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>919</b>	<b>1,197</b>
<i>Proposed Discharge (l/s)</i>	148	148	148
<b>Betterment (%)</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>87%</b>

\*Overland Flow is calculated based on the average rainfall for the Leeds area over a 30 minute storm and applied to the impermeable parts of the site (which is currently 79% of a 9ha site).

- 2.7 In addition to the above, Flood Risk Management officers have provided calculations regarding predicted water usage from the housing development as this was discussed during the previous meeting and is clearly of relevance to foul water capacity. The following water usage assumptions have therefore been applied:

*Occupancy:* 2.3 people per dwelling  
*Usage:* 120 litres per person, per dwelling, per day (this is a worse case water consumption rate and based on the highest level of usage as contained in the previous ‘Code for Sustainable Homes’ document.  
*Amount:* 241 dwellings

- 2.8 The above calculation produces an average figure of 0.77 Litres per second and a peak discharge rate of 4.6 litres per second.
- 2.9 Members are advised the foul water system for the proposed development will be designed to comply with 'Sewers for Adoption 7<sup>th</sup> Ed'. This document sets out foul water design requirements which are significantly higher than has been assessed. As such, the new system will have a design capacity of 11 litres per second.
- 2.10 Separate to this planning application and those from private individuals and/or developers, the council has taken direct action to help address local flooding issues. Recent examples include flood alleviation works directly adjacent to the application site within the Glebelands Recreation Ground. This scheme proposes embankment works to protect both Ninelands Lane Primary School and the properties to the south and was granted planning permission under reference: 15/06080/LA. A similar scheme has also more recently been approved at Barley Hill Park (under ref: 16/03047/LA). Both of these schemes have recently become operational and are now helping to protect property.
- 2.11 In addition to the above, officers in Flood Risk Management are also, at a strategic level undertaking modelling work for the local catchment with the aim of delivering further flood defence works/strategies for the local area. This work is at a relatively early stage.

### **3.0 SUMMARY:**

- 3.1 The officer assessment regarding the development's overall impact on flood risk has not altered following the receipt of additional information from Yorkshire Water. Furthermore, Yorkshire Water itself, as the organisation with responsibility for foul water drainage infrastructure maintains its 'no objection' response and has not altered its initial advice in any way. Officers in Flood Risk Management have also given clear advice that the proposed development will result in a significant improvement in local flooding/drainage conditions with the reduction in surface water runoff and improvements in the capacity of the piped drainage system.
- 3.2 Notwithstanding the above, deferment of the application for additional information has allowed officers to reflect further on the issue of flood risk and the concerns that have been expressed by Panel Members and interested parties. With this in mind, two additional conditions are now advanced which will also help ensure water is used in an efficient way.
- 3.3 The officer recommendation to defer and delegate approval subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement and the conditions specified in Appendix A (and Nos. 25 and 26 as stated above) therefore remains.

### **Background Papers:**

Application file: 17/00307/FU

Certificate of Ownership: Signed by the applicants