



Flood Risk Management
Derbyshire County Council
County Hall
Matlock, Derbyshire
DE4 3AG

Development Services
High Peak Borough
Council PO Box 136
Buxton
SK17 1AQ

Telephone
Ask for
Email
Our ref HPBC 2025/16
Your ref DOC/2025/0023
Date 18 June 2025

Dear,

Proposal: Discharge of Condition 9 in relation to HPK/2022/0456 approved on Appeal APP/H1033/W/24/3339815

Location: Land rear of 21 Dinting Vale Dinting Glossop

Application reference DOC/2025/0023

Objection to the discharge of Condition 9

Derbyshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has reviewed the updated information submitted for this application, which was received on 16/05/2025. We have now received the information requested in our response letter dated 04/04/2025. However, we have identified some concerns with the information provided which require resolution to demonstrate that the proposed drainage network design is suitable and will not increase flood risk. Therefore, we cannot recommend the discharge of Condition 9 until these issues have been resolved. Further information is provided below.

Site Specific Comments

The following concerns require resolution before we can recommend discharge of this condition:

- The design setting within the drainage network calculations has set the maximum rainfall to 50mm/hr; as per Derbyshire County Council drainage guidance, this should be set to at least 150mm/hr or justification provided.
- A MADD factor of 2 has been used in the calculations. Derbyshire County Council drainage guidance requires this to be set to 0, to avoid overestimating the amount of storage provided by the drainage system.

- Several of the manhole diameters shown in the calculations do not appear to match those shown in the manhole schedule previously provided.
- No climate change allowance has been included for the 1 in 30-year event as required by national guidance.
- There are several inconsistencies between the impermeable areas shown on the impermeable area plan (previously provided) and the drainage calculations. The total impermeable area represented in the calculations is lower than that shown on the plan.
- A review of the information provided in the calculations indicates that several of the oversized pipes within the system will have less than the 1.2m of cover which is recommended for pipes beneath highway areas. No details have been provided to demonstrate how these will be protected from damage to allow the drainage system to function unimpeded.
- The drainage calculations include non-return valves at each of the storage crate locations. These are not shown on the drainage plan (WAI25-XX-BET-ZZ-XX-DR-C-1001 P03) or the typical details provided for the storage crates.
- The Hydrobrake flow control included in the drainage calculations for manhole S37HB does not appear to match that shown in the details for this Hydrobrake or the drainage plan that were previously provided.
- The pipe diameter and gradient for pipe 3.006 does not appear to be consistent between the calculations and drainage plan.
- The invert level for cellular storage 1 does not appear to be consistent between the calculations and drainage plan.
- The manhole levels and labels do not appear to be consistent between the calculations and drainage plan in the area around cellular storage 2, cellular storage 3 and cellular storage 4. There are also several other manhole cover levels elsewhere which are not consistent between the calculations and drainage plan.
- Only storm durations of up to 1,440 minutes have been tested. Testing of a full range of storm durations up to 10,080 minutes is required to demonstrate that the proposed drainage system will perform as required in a range of storm conditions.
- The applicant has now provided typical details for the cellular storage. However, no information has been provided either in the typical details or on the drainage plan for the required invert levels for the overflow pipes.

Yours sincerely

Senior Project Engineer

Checked by:

Date 19/06/2025