

Please note that not all of the Examining Authority's written questions and requests are listed below. The County Council has reference those that it considered applicable.

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
BIO.1.2	<p>Landscape and Ecological Management Plan</p> <p><b>All Relevant Planning Authorities</b></p>	<p>Comment on the absence of an Outline LEMP in the Examination and whether it is agreed that such a document could be submitted as part of the discharge of Requirement 12 (pg 71) of the draft DCO <a href="#">[AS-059]</a>.</p> <p>N.B – There is overlap between this question and LV.1.2 you may therefore wish to provide a combined response to both questions</p>	<p><i>The County Council has some concerns that the 'Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments', as set out in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement, does not provide a sufficiently clear and informative framework to guide the preparation of a future landscape and ecological management plan. It is suggested that an outline LEMP should be provided to the Examination, reflecting and supporting the Landscape and Visual Aspects of the Environmental Statement, including Design and Good Practice Commitments.</i></p>
DCO.1.11	<p>Part 3 Article 9 – Power to alter layout, etc. of streets. and Part 3 Article 10 – Street works</p>	<p>The ExA considers that the explanation contained within the EM <a href="#">[AS-061]</a>, which centres on the need for consent from the highway authority, is insufficient</p>	<p><i>The County Council remains concerned that the broad powers detailed within Articles 9 and 10, which could amount to significant, and at times permanent, changes to the network would occur with only presumed consent from the Local Highway Authority. It is suggested that a clearer process of consultation on such works is established and that no alteration occur until the relevant Local Highway Authority has confirmed consent to the timing of the works.</i></p>

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
	<b>The Applicant</b> <b>All Relevant Local Highway Authorities</b>	<p>justification for such wide powers conveyed within the Article.</p> <p>To the Applicant: i) Provide justification for the wide powers sought in these Articles.</p> <p>To All Relevant Local Highway Authorities: ii) Provide a response as to the appropriateness of the powers sought by these Articles. (page 9 &amp; 10 of the DCO <a href="#">here</a>)</p>	
DCO.1.15	Part 3 Article 14 – Access to works  <b>All Relevant Planning Authorities</b>	Comment on the provision contained within Part 3 Article 14 of the draft DCO [page 12 <a href="#">AS-059</a> ].	<p><i>The proposed wording of Article 14 is not readily understandable as it appears to have omitted some wording. On the basis that this article would convey powers on the applicant to provide a new (or altered) means of access onto the highway for the purposes of the development, the County Council is concerned about this provision.</i></p> <p><i>This is particularly the case in relation to those parts of the highway network that are either a 'trunk road' or otherwise 'classified', as it would appear to exceed the broad approach otherwise set out in the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (Part 2, Class B) in</i></p>

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
			<p><i>relation to certain permitted development rights to create new access points onto the highway.</i></p> <p><i>Where a means of access is required onto a 'trunk' or 'classified' road, the County Council would want to agree details of the proposed means of access prior to consent being granted with a commitment of the applicant to return the highway to its previous condition if the access was temporary.</i></p>
DCO.1.16	<p>Part 4 Article 17 – Discharge of water</p> <p><b>All Relevant Planning Authorities</b></p>	<p>Comment on the provision contained within Part 4 Article 17 of the draft DCO <a href="#">[AS-059]</a>.</p>	<p><i>As the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) for Hampshire, the County Council is concerned that there is no provision in the Article, as currently drafted, to ensuring that the water proposed to be discharged is not contaminated. Further, although not specifically relating to the discharge of water, any works to the watercourse itself (which Article 17 (1) implies) usually require consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority under the Land Drainage Act 1991. This requirement is recommended to be specifically identified in sub-section (7) alongside the reference to the permitting requirements provided for by the Environmental Permitting Regulations.</i></p> <p><i>The LLFA also draws specific attention to the need to manage discharge rates such that flood risk is not increased downstream. Such provision, including the process therein, does not appear to have been addressed to date in the draft Development Consent Order.</i></p>
DCO.1.30	<p>Schedule 2 Requirement 3 – Stages of the authorised development</p> <p><b>The Applicant</b></p>	<p>The ExA is concerned by this Requirement as it considers there is a lack of clarity in how it is worded and how it would operate in practice.</p>	<p><i>The County Council is concerned that the requirement, as drafted, is insufficiently precise to be enforceable.</i></p>

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
	<b>All Host Relevant Planning Authorities</b>	<p>To the Applicant:</p> <p>i) Explain how this Requirement would function when dealing with multiple authorities.</p> <p>ii) Explain whether it is the intention for all stages or Work Nos to be approved before development commences, or just individual stages and Work Nos with individual host authorities. iii) If the former, explain when and how these stages will be identified.</p> <p>iv) If the latter, explain whether this approach differs with the definition of "commence" in Part 1 Article 1 of the draft DCO [AS-059] or that all stages and all relevant Requirements must</p>	

Hampshire County Council's response to Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
		<p>be approved by all host authorities prior to commencement (except in the circumstances outlined).</p> <p>To the Host Local Authorities and National Park Authority:</p> <p>i) Comment on the effectiveness of this Requirement</p>	
DCO.1.33	<p>Schedule 2 Requirement 6(2) – Construction environmental management plan</p> <p><b>The Applicant All Relevant Planning Authorities</b></p>	<p>Requirement 6 of the draft DCO [<a href="#">AS-059</a>] states that the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) must be substantially in accordance with the Outline CEMP. However, the Outline CEMP [APP-129] contains scant and in some cases no details regarding the plans and measures set</p>	<p><i>The County Council shares the Examining Authority's concerns in this regard. It is suggested that the applicant should provide further details in the outline CEMP, particularly the annexes, which would serve to provide a more appropriate framework for the preparation of the different components of the detailed CEMP.</i></p>

Hampshire County Council's response to Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
		<p>out in Requirement 6(2)(d). The ExA is concerned that in discharging the Requirement, relevant planning authorities would be determining information and evidence which is not before the Secretary of State, and subsequently the CEMP will be a substantial departure from the Outline CEMP.</p> <p>To the Applicant: i) Respond and justify the current approach.</p> <p>To All Relevant Planning Authorities: ii) Comment on the above.</p>	
DCO.1.34	Schedule 2 Requirement 6(2) – Construction	<a href="#">Requirement 6(2)(d)(vi)</a> makes provision for a Community	<i>The County Council agrees with the Examining Authority that a Community Engagement Plan (and potentially a Local Liaison Officer) should form a separate requirement in the DCO in recognition of the important role of</i>

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
	environmental management plan <b>The Applicant</b> <b>All Relevant Planning Authorities</b>	<p>Engagement Plan to form part of the CEMP. The ExA places considerable importance on the need for such a plan to ensure effective engagement with the local community prior to and during construction. However, the ExA considers that a Community Engagement Plan or Local Liaison Officer should form a separate Requirement in draft DCO.</p> <p>Respond.</p>	<p><i>ensuring that local communities and businesses are kept well informed of construction activities that could affect them.</i></p>
DCO.1.35	Schedule 2 Requirement 8(3) – Hedgerows and trees <b>The Applicant</b>	Requirement 8(3) of the draft DCO <a href="#">[AS-059]</a> states that any hedgerow or tree planting which is removed, uprooted, destroyed, dies or becomes seriously damaged or	<p><i>The County Council considers that the proposed three-year period for the management and replacement of hedgerows and trees is unjustifiably short. It is generally accepted good practice that a five-year period is more appropriate in ensuring that the trees/hedgerows are sufficiently established.</i></p> <p><i>The County Council would also suggest that the final sentence of Requirement 8 (3) is modified to allow for planting material of <u>different</u> specification to be planted as a replacement in circumstances where the original specification of tree/hedgerow may no longer be considered to be</i></p>

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
	<b>All Relevant Planning Authorities</b>	defective within a three-year period must be replaced.  Comment on the adequacy of the Requirement and on the time period allowed for reinstatement and management.	<i>suitable e.g. that the planting scheme was subsequently found to be inherently unsuitable for the site.</i>
DCO.1.37	Schedule 2 Requirement 20 – Further information <b>The Applicant All Relevant Planning Authorities</b>	To the Applicant: i) Justify the time period of two business days from receipt of the application that the relevant planning authority has for requesting further information, which the ExA is concerned is unreasonably short.  To All Relevant Planning Authorities: ii) Comment on the above.	<i>The County Council shares the Examining Authority's concerns. In considering applications for discharging the requirements of the DCO, it is anticipated that there will be a need for internal consultation within individual local authorities, as well as the potential need to liaise with neighbouring local authorities and other key stakeholders.</i>  <i>Taking into account the need to effectively and efficiently manage resources within local authorities, it is considered that 14 calendar days is a more appropriate timescale for requesting further information.</i>
DCO.1.38	Schedule 2 Part 2 –	Comment on the Requirements in	<i>The County Council is content with the provisions of Requirement 18 of Schedule 2 Part 2.</i>



Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
	Procedure for Discharge of Requirement <b>All Relevant Planning Authorities</b>	Schedule 2 Part 2 of the draft DCO [AS-059] in particular regard to the timescales given and the deemed consent provisions.	<i>In relation to Requirement 19, clarity is sought in relation to the scope of this provision. Is this referring to an informal 'pre-application' prior to an application under Requirement 18? The basis of the 20 day period is also unclear. Whilst it is acknowledged that the applicant will have potential cross-boundary issues which it needs to address, local planning authorities will also need to liaise with each other to provide for a consistent approach. As such a minimum 28 day period is suggested.</i>
FR.1.2	Surface and Foul Drainage System <b>All Relevant Planning Authorities The Environment Agency</b>	Comment on the absence of an Outline SFDS in the Examination and whether it is agreed that such a document could be submitted as part of the discharge of Requirement 9 of the draft DCO [AS-059].	<p><i>As the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) for Hampshire, the County Council is concerned about the reliance of the Requirement on the 'Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments', as set out in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement. It is considered that neither this, nor the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), provides a sufficiently clear, informative or robust framework to guide the preparation of detailed schemes for providing appropriate surface and foul drainage systems for the development.</i></p> <p><i>This lack of clarity is of particular concern given the disparity of information between the submitted FRA and the draft DCO. For example, the DCO in schedule 1 refers to proposed attenuation ponds, yet the FRA states that no areas of hardstanding will be provided and therefore no drainage will be required.</i></p> <p><i>The LLFA is also concerned about the robustness and adequacy of the submitted FRA, particularly in relation to the conclusions drawn in relation to surface water management. For example, section 13.2.11 of the Flood Risk Assessment states '... it is acknowledged that there is a risk of the ground becoming compacted due to the movement of plant, reducing its permeability. In such circumstances and where appropriate, cross-fall would be installed on access and haul roads, to direct runoff away from the pipeline trench (G186)'. In the absence of an appropriate level of assessment to inform such an</i></p>

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
			<p><i>approach, the LLFA does not consider it acceptable to direct runoff away from the pipeline trench as this could directly increase flood risk.</i></p> <p><i>It is also noted that there are 61 proposed temporary construction hubs. Whilst the access roads may be permeable, there will still be site offices and other impermeable areas within the hubs. They cannot therefore be considered entirely permeable. A factor will need to be applied and some form of drainage assessment undertaken. The LLFA would advise that detailed proposals for each of these hubs should be required to allow it to assess the level of flood risk in the form of a site specific flood risk assessment and drainage strategy.</i></p> <p><i>Requirement 9 makes specific references to the need for approval of details from the Environment Agency or sewage and/or drainage authority. For consistency, and to reflect the statutory responsibility of the LLFA, it is recommended that the wording of this Requirement is also updated to specifically reference the need for approval from the relevant LLFA (for information Hampshire County Council's checklist of information required in relation to surface water management is included as Appendix 1 to this response).</i></p> <p><i>Finally, the LLFA would also ask that the matter of groundwater monitoring is also addressed in the DCO, with specific monitoring requested in susceptible areas (and only between the months of Nov and Apr) in order to ensure that the 1m unsaturated zone is being provided for to enable the surface water drainage to function.</i></p>
FR.1.3	<b>Baseline Data The Environment Agency</b>	i) Confirm whether the baseline data included within Chapter 8 of the ES	<i>As the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) for Hampshire, the County Council has undertaken a further review of Chapter 8 (and accompanying appendices) of the Environmental Statement. There are reservations about the baseline data as presented and understood.</i>

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
	<b>Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFA)</b>	<p><a href="#">[APP 048]</a> and the accompanying appendices are acceptable</p> <p>ii) If issues with the baseline have been identified, state what these are.</p>	<p><i>In general terms, there does not appear to have been any assessment of existing overland flow routes, areas where gradients / levels are proposed to be amended, areas of proposed additional impermeable areas and areas where flow route blockages might reasonably be expected to occur.</i></p> <p><i>Although there are no significant concerns in relation to the provision of the pipeline itself, the LLFA is not satisfied that there has been a sufficient assessment in relation to the temporary and ancillary works. Much of the data appears to have been prepared on the basis that the only area of impermeable area being introduced is 'The Piggery'. However, depending on the geology and works being undertaken, the LLFA does not believe this to be a valid conclusion. This is particularly evident with the haul roads where it is stated that the gradient will be set such that water is directed away from the trench. This approach could lead to excessive surface water being unintentionally re-directed to more vulnerable areas.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the effects of projected future climate change have been considered not to be applicable for this application. The LLFA would dispute this and request that climate change is considered particularly in relation to the permanent elements of the proposal.</i></p>
HE.1.2	<b>Written Scheme of Investigation All Relevant Planning Authorities</b>	<p>Comment on the absence of an Outline WSI in the Examination and whether it is agreed that such a document could be submitted as part of the discharge of</p>	<p><i>The County Council is currently discussing a draft of the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy with the applicant and hopes to be in a position to confirm its support for a finalised version shortly. Once finalised, it is anticipated that the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy will provide an appropriate framework for the written scheme of investigation to subsequently be undertaken. In this context, and subject to the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy being finalised and agreed, the wording of Requirement 11 is considered to be acceptable in principle.</i></p>

Hampshire County Council's response to Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
		Requirement 11 of the draft DCO <a href="#">[AS-059]</a> .	<i>Given the potential for this development proposal to affect areas of archaeological interest along its route, the County Council does not agree that the consideration of the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy itself could be deferred at this time for submission as part of the subsequent requirements of the DCO</i>
LV.1.2	Landscape and Ecological Management Plan <b>All Relevant Planning Authorities</b>	<p>Comment on the absence of an Outline LEMP in the Examination and whether it is agreed that such a document can be submitted as part of the discharge of Requirement 12 of the draft DCO <a href="#">[AS-059]</a>.</p> <p>N.B – This question is repeated in BIO.1.2. The Relevant Planning Authorities may wish to address the issue in a combined response to both questions.</p>	<i>The County Council has some concerns that the 'Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments', as set out in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement, does not provide a sufficiently clear and informative framework to guide the preparation of a future landscape and ecological management plan. It is suggested that an outline LEMP should be provided to the Examination, reflecting and supporting the Landscape and Visual Aspects of the Environmental Statement, including Design and Good Practice Commitments.</i>
LV.1.20	Planting Mitigation	The REAC (Ref: G92 Table 16.2) <a href="#">[APP-056]</a> states	<i>The County Council considers that the proposed three-year period for the management and replacement of hedgerows and trees is unjustifiably short. It</i>

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
	<b>All Relevant Planning Authorities</b>	<p>that a three-year aftercare period would be established for all mitigation planting and reinstatement.</p> <p>Comment on the appropriateness of this measure and time length proposed.</p>	<i>is generally accepted good practice that a five-year period is more appropriate in ensuring that the trees/hedgerows are sufficiently established.</i>
PC.1.1	Community Receptors <b>All Relevant Planning Authorities</b>	Confirm that the study area applied to community receptors (500m from the Order Limits) in Chapter 13 of the ES [ <a href="#">APP-053</a> ] is adequate.	<i>The County Council confirms that the 500 metre buffer zone from the Order Limits represents an appropriate buffer to apply to identify community receptors for this proposal.</i>
PC.1.8	Working Hours <b>The Applicant All Relevant Planning Authorities</b>	<p>The proposed hours of work are 4 hours longer than a standard working day and would operate 6 days a week [<a href="#">APP-128</a>].</p> <p>To the Applicant: i) Advise why the extended working</p>	<i>Unless a compelling justification is provided by the applicant in response to this question, the County Council is concerned that there would be the risk of significant and unjustifiable harm to the amenities of residents if the provisions of the DCO were exercised in their fullest extent. Whilst it is accepted that there are significant parts of the route that have limited direct impact on residents, it is suggested that in areas likely to cause impacts on residents, the standard working hours are amended to 08:00 to 16:00 Mondays to Friday, and 08:00 to 12:00 on Saturdays, with suitable provision provided for through an amended requirement 13 (3) to allow for other events that either are not likely to cause noise or disturbance or could not otherwise reasonably have been expected.</i>

Hampshire County Council's response to Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
		<p>hours would be required. ii) Confirm that there would be no working on public as well as bank holidays. iii) What action is proposed to minimise the effect of deliveries and construction on the living conditions of residential properties particularly between the hours of 07:00 and 09:00. iv) Paragraphs 1.1.30 and 1.1.31 of the CoCP [APP-128] list a number of circumstances where working outside of these hours/days would be required. Explain the frequency that this may occur and what measures are proposed to inform residents when this does occur and</p>	<p><i>The exception to this may be street works, as in some locations it will be necessary to expedite the works to minimise disruption and therefore longer working hours or overnight working may be appropriate.</i></p>

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
		<p>what measures are proposed to minimise any harm to living conditions that may occur as a result of these alternative working hours.</p> <p>To All Relevant Planning Authorities: v) Comment on the working hours proposed.</p>	
EIA.1.7	<p>Cumulative Effects</p> <p><b>All Relevant Planning Authorities</b></p>	<p>i) Comment on the long list of other developments that have the potential to lead to inter-project cumulative effects at Appendix 15.1 of the ES <a href="#">[APP-125]</a>.</p> <p>ii) Confirm that potential inter-project cumulative effects have been fully assessed in the ES</p>	<i>The County Council has no comment to make in this respect.</i>
EIA.1.8	<i>Cumulative Effects</i>	Confirm the ES [APP-055] to [APP-127] and the HRA	<i>The County Council has no comment to make in this respect.</i>

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
	<b>All Interested Parties</b>	report [APP-130] and [APP-131] ( <a href="#">click here for the list</a> ) have adequately assessed the cumulative or in-combination effects that could arise from other development, plans and projects along the proposed route.	
TT.1.2.	Construction Traffic Management Plan <b>All Relevant Highway and Planning Authorities</b>	Comment on the absence of an Outline CTMP in the Examination and whether it is agreed that such a document can be submitted as part of the discharge of Requirement 7 of the draft DCO [ <a href="#">AS-059</a> ].	<i>The County Council has some concerns that the 'Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments', as set out in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement, does not provide a sufficiently clear and informative framework to guide the preparation of a future construction traffic management plan. It is suggested that an outline CTMP should be provided to the Examination, utilising the information set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments along with the Transport Assessment and Environmental Statement where appropriate.</i>
TT.1.4	Study Areas <b>The Applicant</b> <b>All Relevant Highway and</b>	To the Applicant: i) Confirm that the Traffic and Transport assessment study area [ <a href="#">APP-135</a> ] is established relevant	<i>The County Council is not aware of any specific definition of the extent of the study area within the submitted Transport Statement, albeit it notes that Appendix 3 to the Transport Assessment appears to be missing. The broad methodology which seeks to scope out those parts of the highway network which are likely to only be affected for a period up to four weeks is broadly accepted.</i>



Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
	<b>Planning Authorities</b>	to the locations of the proposed logistics hubs, construction compounds and where works are within roads which are anticipated to exceed four weeks in duration. To All Relevant Highway and Planning Authorities: i) Explain whether the extent of the study area for this assessment is acceptable.	<i>Taking account of the projected typical trip generation rates arising from the construction of the proposed pipeline (and particularly the use of logistics hubs), it is considered that the areas identified within the transport assessment as meriting particular scrutiny are broadly acceptable.</i>
TT.1.11	Heavily-Trafficked Roads <b>The Applicant and All Relevant Highway and Planning Authorities</b>	Paragraph 1.1.4 of the Planning Statement [APP-132] refers to the selection criteria for when trenchless as opposed to open cut techniques would be used. Amongst other things this includes 'heavily trafficked roads.	<i>As recognised in the submitted Initial Statement of Common Ground, the County Council is still in discussion with the applicant as to the extent of the roads which it would expect to benefit from trenchless crossings through the proposed development due to being 'heavily trafficked'. The County Council's position is being informed by the definition in the National Street Gazetteer, in particular the Category 2 roads that are traffic sensitive. The County Council will update the Examining Authority with its position in an updated Statement of Common Ground as soon as possible, and no later than 'Deadline 3' on 18 December 2019.</i>

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
		<p>To the Applicant: i) Explain the criteria which determined roads which are deemed to be 'heavily trafficked'</p> <p>To All relevant Highway and Planning Authorities: ii) Confirm the roads selected as being correct. iii) Explain whether additional roads could be defined as 'heavily trafficked' and should benefit from trenchless crossings and if so, why.</p>	
TT.1.15	Construction Traffic Routing <b>All Relevant Planning Authorities</b>	i)Comment on the extent to which the local community (including local businesses, schools and farms) might be affected by the construction traffic routeing, diversions and related	<i>In the absence of an outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), it is difficult to provide an informed view on the potential impact on local communities arising from the anticipated traffic routing, diversions etc. The County Council notes however that the projected traffic movements are likely to be limited, with any future CTMP likely to ensure that the vehicles used, their number, routeing and diversions arising, are proportionate.</i>

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
		<p>arrangements as proposed by the Applicant.</p> <p>ii) Comment on the suitability of the local road network for the size, quantity and type of construction traffic which is proposed would use it.</p>	
TT.1.16	<p>Rural Road Network</p> <p><b>All Relevant Highways Authorities</b></p>	<p>i) Given the rural nature of the road network on the lower part of the route, comment on whether the road network is capable of taking the volume of traffic and loads proposed and would not be damaged as a result of the use by construction traffic; and</p> <p>ii) Explain who would be responsible for its repair if the road network were to be</p>	<p><i>As already identified above, in the absence of an outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), it is difficult to provide an informed view on the potential impacts arising on the road network.</i></p> <p><i>In accordance with Section 82 of the New Roads and Street Works Act, the applicant would be liable for any damage to the highway as a result of construction traffic. The DCO should therefore include provisions for highway condition surveys prior to work in any particular area commencing and a requirement to put right any damage that occurs to the satisfaction of the Local Highway Authority.</i></p>

Hampshire County Council's response to Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)

Ref	Matter	Question	Hampshire County Council response
		damaged by construction traffic. iii) Comment on the adequacy of mitigation proposed by the Applicant in the ES.	

## Appendix One – Hampshire County Council’s checklist for surface water drainage considerations in major planning applications

<p>Hampshire County Council's Flood and Water Management Team have created this template to assist developers when seeking planning permission for new sites. In order for the team to be able to act as a statutory consultee for surface water drainage for major planning applications ALL of the following information is required. This check list is designed to help developers provide the correct information and reduce time spent by HCC searching for details we require.</p>			
<p><b>FOR ALL APPLICATIONS WE ARE ASKED TO COMMENT ON WE WILL NEED THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION - PLEASE FILL IN THIS FORM AND SUBMIT WITH ANY SURFACE WATER CONSULTATIONS</b></p>			
	<b>Information required:</b>	<b>Included</b>	<b>Document chapter/page number where information can be viewed</b>
1	<b>Background information</b> on the proposed design. Including proposal; site; plans of surface water drainage and any SuDS featured in the scheme		
2	Evidence that the applicant understands the <b>sensitivity of discharge points</b> relating to the receiving water body. Where this is main river or discharging through contaminated land the LPA may have to consult the Environment Agency (EA)		
3	Evidence of and information on the <b>existing surface water flow paths</b> of undeveloped (greenfield) sites		
4	Evidence of and information on the <b>existing drainage network</b> for previously developed (brownfield) sites		
5	Identification of and information on areas that may have been affected by <b>failures in the existing drainage regime</b>		
6	Evidence that the <b>proposed drainage will follow the same pattern as the existing</b> . This avoids directing flow to other locations.		
7	Information evidencing that the <b>correct level of water treatment exists</b> in the system in accordance with the Ciria SuDS Manual C753		
8	<b>Where infiltration is used for drainage</b> , evidence that a <b>suitable number of infiltration tests</b> have been completed. These need to be across the whole site; within different geologies and to a similar depth to the proposed infiltration devices. Tests must be completed according to the BRE 365 method or another recognised method including British Standard BS 5930: 2015		
9	<b>If not using infiltration for drainage</b> - Existing and proposed <b>run-off rate calculations</b> completed according to a suitable method such as IH124 or FEH. Information is available from UK Sustainable Drainage: Guidance and Tools. Calculations must show that the proposed run off rates do not exceed the existing run-off rates. This must be shown for a one in one year event plus climate change and a one in one hundred year event plus climate change.		
10	<b>If not using infiltration for drainage</b> - Existing and proposed <b>run-off volume calculations</b> completed according to a suitable method such as IH124 or FEH. Calculations must show that, where reasonably practical, runoff volume should not exceed the greenfield runoff volume for the same event. This must be shown for a 1 in 100 year, 6 hour rainfall event		
11	Evidence that <b>enough storage/attenuation</b> has been provided without increasing the runoff rate or volume. This must be shown for a 1 in 100 year plus climate change event		
12	Evidence that <b>runoff exceeding design criteria has been considered</b> . Calculations and exceedance flow diagram/plans must show where above ground flooding might occur and where this would pool and flow.		
13	<b>Maintenance regimes</b> of entire surface water drainage system including individual SuDS features, including a plan illustrating the organisation responsible for each element. <b>Evidence</b> that those responsible/adopting bodies are in discussion with the developer. For larger/phased sites, we need to see evidence of measures taken to protect and ensure continued operation of drainage features during construction.		
14	Evidence that <b>Urban Creep</b> has been considered in the application and that a <b>10% increase</b> in impermeable area has been used in calculations to account for this.		
15	Did you take advantage of <b>Hampshire County Council's Pre-Application advice service</b> (details below)? If so, please insert your pre-application reference number here.	Y/N	<b>Pre application number -</b>