

Civil Engineers & Transport Planners

Kingston Bridge House

Drainage Strategy

March 2022 201345/DS/JR/KBL/02



Civil Engineers & Transport Planners

LANMOR Consulting Ltd, Thorogood House, 34 Tolworth Close Surbiton, Surrey, KT6 7EW

Tel: 0208 339 7899 Fax: 0208 339 7898 E-mail: <u>info@lanmor.co.uk</u> Internet: <u>www.lanmor.co.uk</u>

DOCUMENT STATUS

| Project: | Kingston Bridge House |
|------------|-----------------------|
| Title: | Drainage Strategy |
| Client: | Westcombe Group |
| Reference: | 201345/DS/JR/KBL/02 |

| Produced by: | JR | D | Date: | |
|--------------|-----|---|-------|--|
| Checked by: | KBL | | Date: | |
| Approved by: | KBL | D | Date: | |

| <u>lssue/revision</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Status</u> | <u>Issued by</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|
| First | 23/03/2022 | For Approval | JR |

CONTENTS

| 1 | INTR | ODUCTION | 4 |
|---|--------|--|----|
| | 1.1 | Scope | 4 |
| 2 | SITE I | LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION | 5 |
| | 2.1 | Location | 5 |
| | 2.2 | Existing Geology | 5 |
| | 2.3 | Proposed Development | 6 |
| 3 | EXIST | ING DRAINAGE | 7 |
| | 3.1 | Existing Foul Drainage | 7 |
| | 3.2 | Existing Surface Water Drainage | 7 |
| 4 | PROP | POSED DRAINAGE REGIME | 8 |
| | 4.1 | Proposed Foul Drainage | 8 |
| | 4.2 | Proposed Surface Water Drainage | 8 |
| 5 | SURF | ACE WATER DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE 1 | 1 |
| | 5.1 | General1 | 1 |
| | 5.2 | Inspection, Manhole, Catchpit Chambers and Pipes 1 | 1 |
| | 5.3 | Drainage Channels and Gullies1 | 3 |
| 6 | SUM | MARY AND CONCLUSION | .5 |

TABLES

| TABLE 5.1 – MANHOLE, CATCHPIT AND PIPES MAINTENANCE | . 12 |
|---|------|
| TABLE 5.2 – CHANNEL AND GULLY MAINTENANCE | . 13 |
| TABLE 5.3 – PERMEABLE PAVING MAINTENANCE SCHEDULE | . 14 |

FIGURES

| FIGURE 2.1 – SITE LOCATION | 5 |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| FIGURE 4.1 – ARRIVAL VIEW OF SITE | 8 |

APPENDICES

| APPEND | DIX A |
|--------|--|
| | Drawings FLU.1191.3.03 – 09 – Existing Floor Plans |
| | Drawings FLU.1191.3.11 – 17 – Proposed Floor Plans |

APPENDIX B

Thames Water Record Drawings

APPENDIX C

Drawings FLU.1191.3.10 – Proposed Site Layout

APPENDIX D

Drawing 201345/DS/01 – Propsoed SuDS layout Microdrainage Calulations Drainage Proforma

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Scope

- 1.1.1 Lanmor Consulting has been commissioned by Westcombe Group to prepare a Drainage Strategy for the proposed development at Kingston Bridge House, Church Road, Hampton Wick, KT1 4AG. This report has been prepared in support of redevelopment of the site and has been commissioned to advise on the feasibility of providing a solution for the foul and surface water drainage for the proposed development.
- 1.1.2 This report will consider the drainage regime for the site and sets out the drainage strategy for the development including discharge rates and any requirements for attenuation.
- 1.1.3 The information within this report will be refined, modified, and updated as the detailed design is progressed. The scope of the works for this drainage strategy report is outlined below:
 - Review available data in relation to on-site drainage and other drainage networks near the site
 - Review of the ground conditions for the suitability of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)
 - Consider the use of SuDS as an option for disposal of surface water runoff from the proposed development
 - An assessment of the run-off likely to be generated.
 - Undertake drainage assessments to establish attenuation requirements to deal with any increase in surface water runoff from the development.

2 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

2.1 Location

- 2.1.1 The site is located with the Borough of Richmond. The site is located at the junction of Church Grove and Hampton Court Road, opposite the Kings Field. The River Thames is located just east of the site, approximately 140m away. Figure 2.1 below shows the location of the site.
- 2.1.2 Kingston Bridge House is currently made up of student living facilities which spans over 7 floors. Drawings FLU.1191.3.03 – 09 in Appendix A show the plans for the existing development.



Figure 2.1 – Site Location

2.2 Existing Geology

2.2.1 The British Geological Survey indicates that the site has an underlying bedrock of London Clay Formation, which consists primarily of clay, silt and sand. Sedimentary bedrock formed between 56 and 47.8 million years ago during the Palaeogene period. 2.2.2 Superficial deposits have also been recorded at the site. The superficial geology consists Kempton Park Gravel Member, which is made up of sand and gravel. These deposits were formed between 1.6 and 1.8 million years ago during the Quaternary period.

2.3 Proposed Development

- 2.3.1 The proposed development will consist of the conversion of the existing student living accommodation to residential apartments a total of 70 units will be provided.
- 2.3.2 Drawings FLU.1191.3.11 17 included in Appendix B shows the proposed makeup of the development at Kingston Bridge House.

3 EXISTING DRAINAGE

3.1 Existing Foul Drainage

- 3.1.1 As part of the investigation, Thames Water asset mapping was requested. The records show that there is an existing foul sewer located beneath Church Grove flowing from northwest to southeast. The pipe is 175mm in diameter and flows to another network located beneath Hampton Court Road. The nearest manholes located to the site are 4301 and 4302. Unfortunately, Thames Water have not provided any level information for either of these manholes.
- The next nearest manholes are 4306 and 4308, which are located to towards the south of the site at the junction between Hampton Court Road and Church Grove.
 Manhole 4305 has no information. Manhole 4308 has a cover level of 7.61m and an invert level of 5.48m.

3.2 Existing Surface Water Drainage

- 3.2.1 According to the sewer records, there is an existing surface water located to the southeast of the site beneath Hampton Court Road, flowing from the southwest to the northeast. The sewer is a 450mm diameter pipe with the nearest manhole to the site being 4306. Manhole 4306 has a cover level of 7.49m and an invert level of 5.18m.
- 3.2.2 The Thames Water records can be found in Appendix B of this report.

4 PROPOSED DRAINAGE REGIME

4.1 Proposed Foul Drainage

- 4.1.1 The proposed foul drainage will utilise the existing foul drainage pipe network on site. The existing building accommodates approximately 216 students and has the potential to generate up to 10 l/s foul flows.
- 4.1.2 The proposed development will include for 70 new residential units with up to 210 residents in the development. Based on Sewers for Adoption 0.046 l/s per dwelling the 70 residential units might generate 3.2 l/s.
- 4.1.3 The proposed discharge rate will be a reduction on the current facility and therefore there will be no capacity issues with the existing drainage network as it will be approximately 50% less.

4.2 Proposed Surface Water Drainage

4.2.1 The development proposals do not involve any extension of to the existing buildings. The existing site is largely hard surfaced as indicated in Figure 4.1 below.



Figure 4.1 – Arrival View of Site

Kingston Bridge House 201345/DS/JR/KBL/02 March 2022

- 4.2.2 The proposed development will incorporate landscaped areas so the proposals will reduce the impermeable area on site. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) were considered as part of this assessment for disposing of the surface water run from the development. A copy of the proposed site plan is included in Appendix C as drawing FLU.1191.3.10. However, the building is already drained, and it is not possible to introduce any recycling of rainwater, or attenuation within the building.
- 4.2.3 Also, for rainwater harvesting to be affective the harvesting tank needs to be empty to receive the next storm. For these reasons, rainwater harvesting has been discounted.
- 4.2.4 Next on the sustainable drainage hierarchy is the use of ground infiltration techniques such as soakaways and infiltration basins. BGS records indicate the underlying bedrock to consist of London Clay. Therefore, since the ground conditions are not viable and the there is a lack of space on site, the use of infiltration techniques have been discounted.
- 4.2.5 The hierarchy suggest the next method of discharge is to a watercourse. The River Thames is the nearest but is located 140m away to the east of the site and is concluded to be too far from the site to discharge surface water run-off there. Thus it is not possible to adopt this method of discharge.
- 4.2.6 Therefore, in accordance with the SuDS hierarchy, surface water runoff will discharge to the existing surface water sewer, the proposed development will reduce the volume and rate of discharge from the development due to the introduction of soft landscaped areas. The existing drainage network for the building is already in place and connected to the existing Thames Water sewer, the drainage will therefore be utilised for the proposed development.
- 4.2.7 The drainage proforma is included in Appendix D and shows the proposed / existing drainage areas and discharge rates.

- 4.2.8 The existing parking area is currently impermeable, part of this will be landscape so will be permeable and the remainder will be replace with a new hard surfaced car park. This gives the opportunity to incorporate permeable paving into the development which will further reduce the runoff for the site. The rear car park will therefore have permeable surface over a 300m gravel layer with a restricted discharge to the on-site drainage system.
- 4.2.9 Drawing 201345/DS/01 included in appendix D shows the proposed SuDS features on site and the Microdrainage calculation are also included in Appendix D demonstrating the paving has been design to accommodate a 1 in 100 year +40% storm event.

5 SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE

5.1 General

- 5.1.1 Regularly inspection of the surface water drainage network for blockages and clearing unwanted debris / silt from the system should improve the performance of the surface water network and decrease the need for future repairs. In the event of blockages, high pressure water jets can be used to clear the gullies and pipes to ensure they are functioning correctly, this should be undertaken by certified trained professionals.
- 5.1.2 The level and frequency of maintenance required on site is dependent on the type of facility. The type of maintenance will fall into one of three categories "regular maintenance", "occasional maintenance" and "remedial maintenance".
- 5.1.3 Regular maintenance of the drainage features will include, inspections, removal of litter / debris and sweeping of the surfaces. Occasional maintenance will include removal of sediment etc. and remedial maintenance may include structural repairs and infiltration reconditioning if required.
- 5.1.4 Following completion of the development a Management Company will be set up to maintain all the communal areas, including the drainage. It will be their responsibility to maintain the drainage networks.

5.2 Inspection, Manhole, Catchpit Chambers and Pipes

- 5.2.1 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.
- 5.2.2 Pipes are intended to be the main conveyance across the development. 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.

5.2.3 For the Inspection, Manhole, Catchpit Chambers and Pipes, the following maintenance will be required.

| Manhole / Pipe Maintenance Schedule | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| | Required Action | Typical Frequency |
| Regular maintenance | 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 |
| | Remove sediment from structures. | Annually or as required |
| Remedial Actions | Rod through poorly performing runs as initial remediation. | As required |
| | If continued poor performance jet and CCTV survey poorly performing runs. | As required |
| Monitoring | Inspect/check all inlets, outlets, to ensure that they are in good condition and operating as designed. | Annually |
| | Survey inside of pipe manholes for sediment build-up and remove if necessary | Every 5 years or as required |

Table 5.1 – Manhole, Catchpit and Pipes Maintenance

5.3 Drainage Channels and Gullies

5.3.1 For the Inspection, drainage channel and gullies, the following maintenance will be required.

| | Required Action | Typical Frequency |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Regular | Litter and debris removal | Monthly or as required |
| maintenance | 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 area or berm adjacent to the paving | 3-monthly, 48 hours after large storms |
| Remedial Actions | Inspect access/outlet boxes and rod through poorly performing channels and outlets as initial remediation. | As required |
| Monitoring | Inspect/check all inlets, outlets, to ensure that they are in good condition and operating as designed. | Annually |
| | Survey inside of gullies for sediment build-up and remove if necessary | Every year or as required |

Channel and Gully Maintenance Schedule

Table 5.2 – Channel and Gully Maintenance

Permeable Paving

5.3.2 For permeable paving areas, the following maintenance is recommended.

| Permeable Paving Maintenance Schedule | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| | Required Action | Typical Frequency |
| Regular maintenance | Remove debris and leaves etc. | Once a year, after autumn leaf fall, or reduced frequency as required, based on site-specific observations of clogging or manufacturer's recommendations – pay particular attention to areas where water runs onto pervious surfaces from adjacent impermeable areas as this area is most likely to collect the most sediment. |
| Occasional | Stabilise and mow contributing and adjacent areas | As required |
| maintenance | Removal of weeds | As required- once per year on less frequently used pavements |
| Remedial Actions | Remediate any landscaping which, through vegetation maintenance or soil slip, has been raised to within 50 mm of the level of the paving | As required |
| | Remedial work to any depressions, rutting etc | As required |
| | Rehabilitation of surface and upper substructure | Every 10 to 15 years or as required (if infiltration performance is reduced due to significant clogging) |
| Monitoring | Inspect for evidence of poor operation and/or weed growth - if required, take remedial action. | Three-monthly, 48 hours after large storms in the first six months |
| | Inspect silt accumulation rates and establish appropriate frequencies for rehabilitation | Annually |
| | Monitor inspection chambers | Annually |

Table 5.3 – Permeable Paving Maintenance Schedule

6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

- 6.1.1 The proposals seek permission to convert the existing building to provide 89 residential units including additional floors on the existing building. The majority of the site is currently hard surfaced, and the building is positively drained to the public surface water.
- 6.1.2 The proposed drainage strategy is to reuse the existing drainage network, for the proposed conversion. Additional soft landscape area will be provided in the existing hard surfaced parking areas which will result in a reduction in the volume and rate of discharge leaving the site.
- 6.1.3 The foul sewage currently serves 216 students, the proposed 89 apartments will generate 50% of the current discharge so there will no issue with the capacity for the proposed development.
- 6.1.4 The proposed development will result in a reduction in the discharge of both foul and surface water discharges from the development. For the reasons set out above, the proposed development is considered suitable for the development, as there will be no negative impacts on the public sewers or result in increased flood risk in the area.

APPENDIX A

Drawings FLU.1191.3.03 – 09 – Existing Floor Plans



| Date | Description |
|------|-------------|
| | Date |





| Rev | Date | Description |
|-----|------|-------------|
| | | |





| Rev | Date | Description |
|-----|------|-------------|
| | | |





| Rev | Date | Description |
|-----|------|-------------|
| | | |





| Rev | Date | Description |
|-----|------|-------------|
| | | |





| Rev | Date | Description |
|-----|------|-------------|
| | | |





| Rev | Date | Description |
|-----|------|-------------|
| | | |



Drawings FLU.1191.3.11 – 17 – Proposed Floor Plans



| Rev | Date | Description |
|-----|------|-------------|





| Rev | Date | Description |
|-----|------|-------------|





| Rev | Date | Description |
|-----|------|-------------|
| | | |





| Rev | Date | Description |
|-----|------|-------------|





| Rev | Date | Description |
|-----|------|-------------|
| | | |





| Rev | Date | Description |
|-----|------|-------------|
| | | |





| Rev | Date | Description |
|-----|------|-------------|
| | | |



APPENDIX B

Thames Water Record Drawings



Based on the Ordnance Survey Map with the Sanction of the controller of H.M. Stationery Office, License no. 100019345 Crown Copyright Reserved

Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Property Searches, PO Box 3189, Slough SL1 4W, DX 151280 Slough 13 T 0845 070 9148 E searches@thameswater.co.uk I www.thameswater-propertysearches.co.uk

| Manhole Reference | Manhole Cover Level | Manhole Invert Level |
|--|--|--|
| 441C | n/a | n/a |
| 541A | n/a | n/a |
| 4301 | n/a | n/a |
| 5403 | n/a | n/a |
| 5405 | n/a | n/a |
| 5404 | n/a | n/a |
| 5402 | n/a | n/a |
| 5406 | n/a | n/a |
| 4401 | n/a | n/a |
| 44ZY | n/a | n/a |
| 54ZT | n/a | n/a |
| 441A | n/a | n/a |
| 5401 | n/a | n/a |
| 54ZY | n/a | n/a |
| 441B | n/a | n/a |
| 54ZR | n/a | n/a |
| 4303 | 7.23 | 5.39 |
| 431C | n/a | n/a |
| 431B | n/a | n/a |
| 431A | n/a | n/a |
| 4307 | 7.55 | 5.43 |
| 4304 | 7.46 | 5.19 |
| 4305 | n/a | n/a |
| 4306 | 7.49 | 5.18 |
| 5304 | 7.53 | 5.11 |
| 4308 | 7.61 | 5.48 |
| 4302 | n/a | n/a |
| 5303 | n/a | n/a |
| 5301 | n/a | n/a |
| 5302 | n/a | n/a |
| | | |
| | | |
| The position of the apparatus shown on this plan i | s given without obligation and warranty, and the acc | curacy cannot be guaranteed. Service pipes are not |

NB. Levels quoted in metres Ordnance Newlyn Datum. The value -9999.00 indicates that no survey information is available

shown but their presence should be anticipated. No liability of any kind whatsoever is accepted by Thames Water for any error or omission. The actual position of mains and services must be verified and established on site before any works are undertaken.

ALS Sewer Map Key



Sewer Fittings

A feature in a sewer that does not affect the flow in the pipe. Example: a vent is a fitting as the function of a vent is to release excess gas.

- Air Valve
 Dam Chase
 Fitting
- ≥ Meter
- Vent Column

Operational Controls

A feature in a sewer that changes or diverts the flow in the sewer. Example: A hydrobrake limits the flow passing downstream.

Control Valve
Control Valve
Control Valve
Ancillary
Weir

Outfall

Inlet

Undefined End

End Items

いし

End symbols appear at the start or end of a sewer pipe. Examples: an Undefined End at the start of a sewer indicates that Thames Water has no knowledge of the position of the sewer upstream of that symbol, Outfall on a surface water sewer indicates that the pipe discharges into a stream or river.

Other Symbols

Symbols used on maps which do not fall under other general categories

- ▲ / ▲ Public/Private Pumping Station
- * Change of characteristic indicator (C.O.C.I.)
- Ø Invert Level
- Summit

Areas

Lines denoting areas of underground surveys, etc.

Agreement
Agreement
Operational Site
Chamber
Tunnel
Conduit Bridge

Other Sewer Types (Not Operated or Maintained by Thames Water)



Notes:

hames

Water

- 1) All levels associated with the plans are to Ordnance Datum Newlyn.
- 2) All measurements on the plans are metric.
- Arrows (on gravity fed sewers) or flecks (on rising mains) indicate direction of flow.
- Most private pipes are not shown on our plans, as in the past, this information has not been recorded.
- 5) 'na' or '0' on a manhole level indicates that data is unavailable.
- 6) The text appearing alongside a sewer line indicates the internal diameter of the pipe in milimetres. Text next to a manhole indicates the manhole reference number and should not be taken as a measurement. If you are unsure about any text or symbology present on the plan, please contact a member of Property Insight on 0845 070 9148.

Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Property Searches, PO Box 3189, Slough SL1 4W, DX 151280 Slough 13 T 0845 070 9148 E searches@thameswater.co.uk I www.thameswater-propertysearches.co.uk

APPENDIX C

Drawings FLU.1191.3.10 – Proposed Site Layout



| HIGH STREFT | |
|-------------|--|
| Home Park | |
| Ray | Rev Date Description |
| | ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN SERVICES |
| | FLUENT ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN SERVICES 69:71 Windmill Road, Sunbury, Middlesex, tw16 7DT Tel: 0800 0438838 E-mail: inf0@fluent-ads.co.uk Web: fluent-ads.co.uk |
| | Kingston Bridge House Church Grove, Hampton Wick |
| | Proposed Site Plan |
| | |
| 2 | Scale Dwg No. 1:500 @ A3 FLU.1191.3.10 Date 07.10.20 |
| | Drawn N.Millin H |

APPENDIX D

Drawing 201345/DS/01 – Propsoed SuDS layout



Microdrainage Calulations

| Lanmor Consulting L | td | | | | | | Page 1 |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Thorogood House | | | | | | | |
| 34 Tolworth Close | | | | | | | 4 |
| Surbition Surrey | кт6 7EW | | | | | | - Com |
| $D_{2} = 22/08/2022 = 12$ | 10 | Dogi | anod | hu Kuna | .1 | | — Micro |
| Date 22/08/2022 13: | 49 | Desi | .gnea | by Kulle | 11 | | Drainage |
| File | | Chec | ked b | у | | | bidinage |
| XP Solutions | XP Solutions Source Control 2015.1 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Summary | of Results | for 10 |) <u>0 yea</u> | ar Retui | <u>rn Perio</u> | d (+40 | 양) |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Half I | rain Tim | ne : 13 | 882 minut | es. | | |
| Storm | May May | May | | May | Max | Max | Status |
| Event | Max Max | Max Infiltr | ation | Control | Max E Outflow | Volume | Status |
| livenc | (m) (m) | (1/s | () | (1/s) | (1/s) | (m ³) | |
| | (, (, | (1) | , | (1) 57 | (1)0) | () | |
| 15 min Summer | 99.607 0.157 | | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 47.9 | O K |
| 30 min Summer | 99.634 0.184 | | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 65.8 | 0 K |
| 60 min Summer | 99.660 0.210 | | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 83.8 | O K |
| 120 min Summer | 99.685 0.235 | | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 101.2 | O K |
| 180 min Summer | 99.699 0.249 | | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 110.3 | O K |
| 240 min Summer | 99.707 0.257 | | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 116.0 | Flood Risk |
| 360 min Summer | 99.717 0.267 | | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 122.8 | Flood Risk |
| 480 min Summer | 99.723 0.273 | | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 126.8 | Flood Risk |
| 600 min Summer | 99.726 0.276 | | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 128.9 | Flood Risk |
| 720 min Summer | 99.727 0.277 | | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 129.8 | Flood Risk |
| 960 min Summer | 99.727 0.277 | | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 129.5 | Flood Risk |
| 1440 min Summer | 99.723 0.273 | | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 127.1 | Flood Risk |
| 2160 min Summer | 99.716 0.266 | | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 122.4 | Flood Risk |
| 2880 min Summer | 99.709 0.259 | | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 117.0 | Flood Risk |
| 4320 min Summer | 99.692 0.242 | | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 105.8 | O K |
| 5760 min Summer | 99.677 0.227 | | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 95.3 | 0 K |
| 7200 min Summer | 99.663 0.213 | | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 85.8 | O K |
| 8640 min Summer | 99.651 0.201 | | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 77.3 | O K |
| 10080 min Summer | 99.639 0.189 | | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 69.6 | ОК |
| 15 min Winter | 99.618 0.168 | | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 55.1 | 0 K |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Storm | Rain | Flood | ed Disch | arge Time | -Peak | |
| | Event | (mm/hr) | Volum | ne Volu | ume (mi | ins) | |
| | | | (m³) | (m ³ | •) | | |
| | E min C | 100 100 | ~ | 0 | 1.0 1 | 1.0 | |
| | 5 min Summer | 139.469 | 0 | .0 | 46.1 | 19 | |
| 3 | o min Summer | 91.145 | 0 | .0 | 55.U | 34 | |
| 6 | 0 min Summer | 56./13 | 0 | .0 | 85./ | 64 | |
| 12 | o min Summer | 34.093 | 0 | .0 1 | U4.6 | 124 | |
| 18 | o min Summer | 24.982 | 0 | .0 1 | 14.U | 184 | |
| 24 | U min Summer | 19.920 | 0 | .0 1 | 18.8 | 242 | |
| 36 | U min Summer | 14.430 | 0 | .0 1 | 24.0 | 362 | |
| 48 | U min Summer | 11.481 | 0 | .0 1 | 26.8 | 482 | |
| 60 | 00 min Summer | 9.608 | 0 | .0 1 | 28.3 | 602 | |
| 72 | U min Summer | 8.303 | 0 | .0 1 | 29.1 | 720 | |
| 96 | 0 min Summer | 6.590 | 0 | .0 1 | 29.1 | 936 | |
| 144 | U min Summer | 4.752 | 0 | .0 1 | 25.7 | 1154 | |
| 216 | 0 min Summer | 3.421 | 0 | .0 1 | 89.8 | 1536 | |
| 288 | 0 min Summer | 2.707 | 0 | .0 1 | 97.9 | 1956 | |
| 432 | 0 min Summer | 1.944 | 0 | .0 1 | 99.3 | 2768 | |
| 576 | 0 min Summer | 1.535 | 0 | .0 2 | 14.2 | 3576 | |
| 720 | 00 min Summer | 1.278 | 0 | .0 2 | 17.6 | 4392 | |
| 864 | 0 min Summer | 1.099 | 0 | .0 2 | 19.3 | 5184 | |
| 1008 | 0 min Summer | 0.968 | 0 | .0 2 | 19.8 | 5944 | |
| 1 | .5 min Winter | 139.469 | 0 | .0 | 50.2 | 19 | |

| Lanmor Consulting Ltd Page 2 | | | | | | Page 2 | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|----------|-----------|--------|------------|
| Thorogood House | | | | | | | |
| 34 Tolworth Close | | | | | | | 4 |
| Surbition Surrey KT6 7EW | | | | | | | - Com |
| Date 22/08/2022 13 | :49 | | Designed | by Kuna | al | | |
| | | | Checked | hv | | | Drainage |
| VD Gelutions | | | Chevera | | 2015 1 | | J |
| XP Solutions | | | Source C | ontrol / | 2015.1 | | |
| Summar | v of Be | 2911149 | for 100 ve | ar Botu | rn Perio | 1 (+40 | 우) |
| <u>Salatar</u> | <u>y 01 100</u> | <u>.54105</u> | <u>101 100 yc</u> | ar necu | | | <u> </u> |
| Storm | Max | Max | Max | Max | Max | Max | Status |
| Event | Level | Depth | Infiltration | Control | Σ Outflow | Volume | |
| | (m) | (m) | (1/s) | (1/s) | (1/s) | (m³) | |
| 30 min Winter | 99.647 | 0.197 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 75.1 | 0 K |
| 60 min Winter | 99.677 | 0.227 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 95.4 | O K |
| 120 min Winter | 99.706 | 0.256 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 115.0 | Flood Risk |
| 180 min Winter | 99.721 | 0.271 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 125.5 | Flood Risk |
| 240 min Winter | 99.730 | 0.280 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 132.0 | Flood Risk |
| 360 min Winter | 99.742 | 0.292 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 140.1 | Flood Risk |
| 480 min Winter | 99.749 | 0.299 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 144.9 | Flood Risk |
| 600 min Winter | 99.753 | 0.303 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 147.7 | Flood Risk |
| 720 min Winter | 99.756 | 0.306 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 149.3 | Flood Risk |
| 960 min Winter | 99.757 | 0.307 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 150.0 | Flood Risk |
| 1440 min Winter | 99.752 | 0.302 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 146.6 | Flood Risk |
| 2160 min Winter | 99.742 | 0.292 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 140.3 | Flood Risk |
| 2880 min Winter | 99.732 | 0.282 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 132.9 | Flood Risk |
| 4320 min Winter | 99.708 | 0.258 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 117.0 | Flood Risk |
| 5760 min Winter | 99.686 | 0.236 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 101.9 | 0 K |
| 7200 min Winter | 99.667 | 0.217 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 88.4 | 0 K |
| 8640 min Winter | 99.649 | 0.199 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 76.4 | 0 K |
| 10080 min Winter | 99.634 | 0.184 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 65.9 | 0 K |
| | | | | | | | |

| | Stor Even | m t | Rain (mm/hr) | Flooded Volume (m³) | Discharge Volume (m³) | Time-Peak (mins) |
|-------|--------------|--------|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| 30 | min | Winter | 91.145 | 0.0 | 58.5 | 33 |
| 60 | min | Winter | 56.713 | 0.0 | 97.2 | 64 |
| 120 | min | Winter | 34.093 | 0.0 | 116.4 | 122 |
| 180 | min | Winter | 24.982 | 0.0 | 123.9 | 180 |
| 240 | min | Winter | 19.920 | 0.0 | 128.0 | 240 |
| 360 | min | Winter | 14.430 | 0.0 | 132.8 | 356 |
| 480 | min | Winter | 11.481 | 0.0 | 135.4 | 472 |
| 600 | min | Winter | 9.608 | 0.0 | 136.8 | 586 |
| 720 | min | Winter | 8.303 | 0.0 | 137.5 | 700 |
| 960 | min | Winter | 6.590 | 0.0 | 137.4 | 922 |
| 1440 | min | Winter | 4.752 | 0.0 | 133.9 | 1324 |
| 2160 | min | Winter | 3.421 | 0.0 | 215.2 | 1644 |
| 2880 | min | Winter | 2.707 | 0.0 | 223.8 | 2104 |
| 4320 | min | Winter | 1.944 | 0.0 | 217.7 | 2984 |
| 5760 | min | Winter | 1.535 | 0.0 | 245.0 | 3864 |
| 7200 | min | Winter | 1.278 | 0.0 | 249.7 | 4680 |
| 8640 | min | Winter | 1.099 | 0.0 | 252.6 | 5448 |
| 10080 | min | Winter | 0.968 | 0.0 | 254.3 | 6248 |

| Lanmor Consulting Ltd | | Page 3 |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|
| Thorogood House | | |
| 34 Tolworth Close | | L. |
| Surbition Surrey KT6 7EW | | Micco |
| Date 22/08/2022 13:49 | Designed by Kunal | |
| File | Checked by | Diamaye |
| XP Solutions | Source Control 2015.1 | |
| Ra | infall Details | |
| Rainfall Model | FSR Winter Storms | Yes |
| Return Period (years) | 100 Cv (Summer) 0 | .750 |
| Region Engla | and and Wales Cv (Winter) 0 | .840 |
| M5-60 (mm) | 20.000 Shortest Storm (mins) | 15 |
| Ratio R | 0.411 Longest Storm (mins) 10 | 080 |
| Summer Storms | Yes Climate Change % | +40 |

<u>Time Area Diagram</u>

Total Area (ha) 0.229

| Time | (mins) | Area |
|-------|--------|------|
| From: | To: | (ha) |

0 4 0.229

| Lanmor Consulting Ltd | | Page 4 |
|------------------------------|--|---------|
| Thorogood House | | |
| 34 Tolworth Close | | 4 |
| Surbition Surrey KT6 7EW | | Misco |
| Date 22/08/2022 13:49 | Designed by Kunal | |
| File | Checked by | Diamage |
| XP Solutions | Source Control 2015.1 | |
| | | |
| | <u>Model Details</u> | |
| Storage is (| Online Cover Level (m) 100.000 | |
| Porou | us Car Park Structure | |
| | | |
| Infiltration Coefficient Bas | e (m/hr) 0.00000 Width (m) | 26.0 |
| Membrane Percolation | (mm/hr) 1000 Length (m) | 88.0 |
| Max Percolati | on (1/s) 635.6 Slope (1:X) | 500.0 |
| Salet | y Factor 2.0 Depression Storage (mm) | 2 |
| Invert I. | evel (m) 99 450 Can Volume Depth (m) | 0 300 |
| | | 0.000 |
| Orif | ice Outflow Control | |
| | | |
| Diameter (m) 0.030 Dischar | ge coefficient 0.000 invert Level (m) 95 | 9.450 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |



Drainage Proforma





| | Project / Site Name (including sub- catchment / stage / phase where appropriate) | Kingston Bridge House | | |
|---------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | Address & post code | at Kingston Bridge house, Church Road, Hampton Wick, KT1 4AG | | |
| | OS Grid ref (Easting Northing) | E 517487 | | |
| s | 05 Ond Ter. (Lasting, Northing) | N 169400 | | |
| etail | LPA reference (if applicable) | | | |
| l. Project & Site D | Brief description of proposed work | Conversion of exisitng building from student accomodation to residential apartments | | |
| `` | Total site Area | 2,780 m ² | | |
| | Total existing impervious area | 2,550 m ² | | |
| | Total proposed impervious area | 2,200 m ² | | |
| | Is the site in a surface water flood risk catchment (ref. local Surface Water Management Plan)? | no | | |
| | Existing drainage connection type and location | Sewer | | |
| | Designer Name | | | |
| | Designer Position | | | |
| | Designer Company | | | |

| | 2a. Infiltration Feasibility | | | | | | | |
|----------|---|-----------------------|-------------------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| | Superficial geology classification | npton Park Gravels | | | | | | |
| | Bedrock geology classification | London Clay | | | | | | |
| | Site infiltration rate | | m/s | | | | | |
| | Depth to groundwater level | | | wground | | | | |
| | Is infiltration feasible? | | | | | | | |
| | 2b. Drainage Hierarchy | | | | | | | |
| ements | | Feasible (Y/N) | Proposed (Y/N) | | | | | |
| ang | 1 store rainwater for later use | Ν | Ν | | | | | |
| arge Arr | 2 use infiltration techniques, such surfaces in non-clay areas | Y | Y | | | | | |
| d Discha | 3 attenuate rainwater in ponds or features for gradual release | open water | Ν | N | | | | |
| ropose | 4 attenuate rainwater by storing ir sealed water features for gradual r | n tanks or release | N | N | | | | |
| 2. P | 5 discharge rainwater direct to a v | vatercourse | Ν | Ν | | | | |
| | 6 discharge rainwater to a surface sewer/drain | water | Y | Y | | | | |
| | 7 discharge rainwater to the comb | Ν | Ν | | | | | |
| | 2c. Proposed Discharge Details | | | | | | | |
| | Proposed discharge location | ng conection to sewer | | | | | | |
| | Has the owner/regulator of the discharge location been consulted? | | No | | | | | |



GREATER **LONDON** AUTHORITY



| | 3a. Discharge Rates & Required Storage | | | | | | | |
|--------|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | Greenfield (GF) runoff rate (l/s) | Existing discharge rate (I/s) | Required storage for GF rate (m ³) | Proposed discharge rate (l/s) | | | |
| | Qbar | n/a | \ge | \ge | \geq | | | |
| | 1 in 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | | |
| | 1 in 30 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | | |
| | 1 in 100 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | | |
| | 1 in 100 + CC | | \ge | n/a | n/a | | | |
| | Climate change allowance used | | 40% | | | | | |
| rategy | 3b. Principal Met Control | hod of Flow | | | | | | |
| e St | 3c. Proposed Sul | DS Measures | | | | | | |
| nag | | | Catchment | Plan area | Storage | | | |
| Drai | | | area (m²) | (m²) | vol. (m ³) | | | |
| 3. | Rainwater harves | sting | 0 | \geq | 0 | | | |
| | Infiltration syster | ns | 0 | > | 0 | | | |
| | Green roofs | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | Blue roofs | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | Filter strips | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | Filter drains Bioretention / tree pits Pervious pavements Swales | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | | | 2290 | 2290 | 200 | | | |
| | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | Basins/ponds | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | Attenuation tank | S | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| | Iotal | | 2290 | 2290 | 200 | | | |

| | 4a. Discharge & Drainage Strategy | Page/section of drainage report | | |
|-------|---|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | Infiltration feasibility (2a) – geotechnical factual and interpretive reports, including infiltration results | section 2.2 | | |
| | Drainage hierarchy (2b) | section 4.2 | | |
| 5 | Proposed discharge details (2c) – utility plans, correspondence / approval from owner/regulator of discharge location | Appendix B | | |
| | Discharge rates & storage (3a) – detailed hydrologic and hydraulic calculations | section 4 | | |
| | Proposed SuDS measures & specifications (3b) | section 4.2 | | |
| 2 | 4b. Other Supporting Details | Page/section of drainage report | | |
| 1 2 2 | Detailed Development Layout | Appendix C | | |
| ŕ | Detailed drainage design drawings, including exceedance flow routes | n/a | | |
| | Detailed landscaping plans | Appendix C | | |
| | Maintenance strategy | section 5 | | |
| | Demonstration of how the proposed SuDS measures improve: | n/a | | |
| | a) water quality of the runoff? | | | |
| | b) biodiversity? | | | |
| | c) amenity? | | | |