

## **APPENDIX 14B: OUTLINE DRAINAGE STRATEGY**

# **South Humber Bank Energy Centre Project**

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN010107

South Marsh Road, Stallingborough, DN41 8BZ

The South Humber Bank Energy Centre Order

**Document Ref: 6.4 Environmental Statement – Volume III Appendix 14B: Outline  
Drainage Strategy**

The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations  
2017 (as amended)

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure)  
Regulations 2009 - Regulation 5(2)(a)



---

**Applicant: EP Waste Management Limited**  
**Date: April 2020**

## DOCUMENT HISTORY

<b>Document Ref</b>	Appendix 14B Outline Drainage Strategy		
<b>Revision</b>	1.0		
<b>Author</b>	D. Hotten J. Boddey J. Prentice		
<b>Signed</b>		<b>Date</b>	April 2020
<b>Approved By</b>	H. Burton		
<b>Signed</b>		<b>Date</b>	April 2020
<b>Document Owner</b>	AECOM		

## GLOSSARY

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Description</b>
AEP	Annual Exceedance Probability
CC	Climate Change
CIRIA	Construction Industry Research and Information Association
DDF	Depth Duration Frequency
EA	Environment Agency
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment
Ha	Hectare
mAOD	Meters Above Ordnance Datum
NELIDB	North East Lindsey Internal Drainage Board
NELC	North East Lincolnshire Council
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NSTS	Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS
OSNGR	Ordnance Survey National Grid Reference
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance
ReFH2	Revitalised Flood Hydrograph Model
SHBEC	South Humber Bank Energy Centre
SuDS	Sustainable Drainage Systems

## CONTENTS

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1. Background and Purpose of this Outline Drainage Strategy.....	1
<b>2.0 POLICY AND STAKEHOLDER REQUIREMENTS</b> .....	<b>5</b>
2.1. National Planning Policy Framework (2019).....	5
2.2. National Planning Statement EN-1 (2011).....	5
2.3. National Planning Statement EN-3 (2011).....	5
2.4. Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Non-Statutory SuDS Guidance (2015).....	5
2.5. Environment Agency.....	7
2.6. North East Lindsey Internal Drainage Board.....	8
2.7. North East Lincolnshire Council.....	8
2.8. Anglian Water.....	9
<b>3.0 EXISTING SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</b> .....	<b>11</b>
3.1. Existing Site Drainage.....	11
3.2. Existing Surface Water Runoff Rates.....	11
<b>4.0 PROPOSED SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</b> .....	<b>13</b>
4.1. Un-attenuated Proposed Surface Water Runoff Rates.....	13
4.2. Surface Water Volume Attenuation Requirements.....	13
4.3. Proposed Surface Water Attenuation Solution.....	16
<b>5.0 PROPOSED FOUL DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>6.0 RESIDUAL RISK MITIGATION</b> .....	<b>20</b>
6.1. Drainage System Failure and Maintenance.....	20
6.2. Design Capacity Exceedance.....	20
<b>7.0 REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>ANNEX 1: EXISTING DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE DRAWINGS</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>ANNEX 2: SOURCE CONTROL CALCULATIONS</b> .....	<b>23</b>

## TABLES

Table 1: Key NSTS relating to flood risk.....	6
Table 2: Calculated ReFH2 greenfield surface water runoff rates for the Main Development Area within the Site.....	12
Table 3: Calculated impermeable surface water runoff rates for the proposed land use within the Main Development Area (up to 6.5 ha); un-attenuated (including allowances for climate change (EA, 2020)).....	14
Table 4: Calculated surface water runoff attenuation volumes and areas for storage required for the Main Development Area (assuming up to 6.5 ha impermeable land use).....	15
Table 5: Sustainable drainage systems.....	16

**FIGURES**

Figure 1: The Site (in red) and Main Development Area (in purple)..... 3  
Figure 2: Proposed Development Layout (extract from Figure 4.1 ES Volume II,  
Document Ref. 6.3)..... 4  
Figure 3: Source Control Input for Greenfield Run-off Discharge Rate ..... 23  
Figure 4: Source Control Output for Greenfield Run-Off Discharge Rate ..... 23  
Figure 5: Source Control Input for No Discharge ..... 24  
Figure 6: Source Control Output for No Discharge ..... 24

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION


### 1.1. Background and Purpose of this Outline Drainage Strategy

- 1.1.1. AECOM Infrastructure and Environment Ltd (AECOM) were commissioned by EP Waste Management Ltd ('the Applicant') to prepare an Outline Drainage Strategy for the Proposed Development of the South Humber Bank Energy Centre (SHBEC).
- 1.1.2. The Proposed Development is for the construction and operation of a new up to 95 MW energy from waste power station. The Proposed Development Site ('the Site') is located adjacent to the South Humber Bank Power Station (SHBPS) off South Marsh Road, Stallingborough in North East Lincolnshire centred at Ordnance Survey National Grid Reference (OS NGR) 523019, 413263 (see Figure 1).
- 1.1.3. The Proposed Development will occupy land which is currently undeveloped and therefore an increase of impermeable area will increase the rate and volume of surface water runoff (without mitigation). The Main Development Area of the Site is approximately 7 ha (see Figure 1).
- 1.1.4. The aim of this report is to provide an Outline Drainage Strategy for surface water runoff that is appropriate to the nature and scale of the Proposed Development, which will meet the necessary requirements of current planning guidance (refer to Section 2.0), and which will be sufficient to inform the Flood Risk Assessment in Environmental Statement (ES) Volume III Appendix 14A (Document Ref. 6.4), and the development consent application. In order to meet this aim, the following was undertaken with regard to the Proposed Development:
- consultation with and obtaining data from North East Lincolnshire Council (NELC);
  - consultation with and obtaining data from the Environment Agency (EA);
  - review of publicly available data to determine the existing drainage infrastructure and its relation to the local Ordinary Watercourses (including those under the jurisdiction of North East Lindsey Internal Drainage Board (NELIDB)), Main Rivers and the Humber Estuary; and
  - review of the Proposed Development design in light of the identified flood risks and identification of measures, where necessary, that would manage any residual flood risk to the Site to acceptable levels.
- 1.1.5. Foul drainage options for the Proposed Development are also considered.

#### Proposed Development Drawings

- 1.1.6. This Outline Drainage Strategy report is based on the Proposed Development Site layout plan referred to and shown below in Figure 1. The drainage strategy will be reviewed when further design details are available during the detailed design phase; however, the broad principles are provided here.

- 1.1.8. Drawings illustrating the Proposed Development are provided in ES Volume II (Document Ref. 6.3). These include:
- Site Location Plan Figure 1.1
  - Proposed Development Site Layout Plan Figure 4.1
- 1.1.9. Further details regarding the Proposed Development are provided in Chapter 4: The Proposed Development in ES Volume I (Document Ref. 6.2).



Contains Ordnance Survey Data © Crown Copyright and database right 2020

**Figure 1: The Site (in red) and Main Development Area (in purple)**






Figure 2: Proposed Development Layout (extract from Figure 4.1 ES Volume II, Document Ref. 6.3)

## **2.0 POLICY AND STAKEHOLDER REQUIREMENTS**

### **2.1. National Planning Policy Framework (2019)**

2.1.1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 2019) and Planning Policy Guidance: Flood risk and coastal change (PPG) (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 2019) requires that the new development should not increase flood risk both on the Site and to the area surrounding it. Surface water runoff should therefore not exceed the rates and volumes already generated by the existing Site and betterment should be provided where possible.

### **2.2. National Planning Statement EN-1 (2011)**

2.2.1. Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) (Department of Energy & Climate Change, 2011a) provides the following general guidance relating to drainage assessments and climate change pertaining to energy production facilities:

- include the assessment of the remaining (known as 'residual') risk after risk reduction measures have been taken into account and demonstrate that this is acceptable for the particular project;
- consider how the ability of water to soak into the ground may change with development, along with how the proposed layout of the project may affect drainage systems;
- consider if there is a need to be safe and remain operational during a worst-case flood event over the development's lifetime; and
- new energy infrastructure will typically be a long-term investment and will need to remain operational over many decades, in the face of a changing climate. Consequently, applicants must consider the impacts of climate change when planning the location, design, build, operation and, where appropriate, decommissioning of new energy infrastructure.

### **2.3. National Planning Statement EN-3 (2011)**

2.3.1. Overarching National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) (Department of Energy & Climate Change, 2011b) provides the following general guidance relating to drainage, flood risk assessments and climate change pertaining to renewable energy production facilities:

- consider how the proposal would be resilient to effects of rising sea levels and increased risk from storm surge and tidal flooding resulting from climate change; and
- consider how plant will be resilient to increased risk of flooding and increased risk of drought affecting river flows.

### **2.4. Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Non-Statutory SuDS Guidance (2015)**

2.4.1. The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) published their Sustainable Drainage Systems: Non-Statutory Technical Standards (NSTS) in March 2015 (Defra, 2015) setting the requirements for the design, construction,

maintenance and operation of SuDS (sustainable drainage systems). The NSTS are intended to be used alongside the NPPF and PPG.

2.4.2. The NSTS that are of chief concern in relation to the consideration of flood risk to and from development relate to runoff destinations, peak flow control and volume control as provided in Table 1. Additional guidance is provided for structural integrity, designing for maintenance considerations and construction.

**Table 1: Key NSTS relating to flood risk**

CONSIDERATION	SUDS NSTS
<p><b>Peak Flow Control</b></p>	<p><b>NS2</b> – “For greenfield developments, the peak runoff rate from the development to any highway drain, sewer or surface water body for the 1 in 1 year rainfall event and the 1 in 100 year rainfall event must not exceed the peak greenfield runoff rate for the same event”</p>
	<p><b>NS3</b> – “For developments which were previously developed, the peak runoff rate from the development to any drain, sewer or surface water body for the 1 in 1 year rainfall event and the 1 in 100 year rainfall event must be as close as reasonably practicable to the greenfield runoff rate from the development for the same rainfall event, but should never exceed the rate of discharge from the development prior to redevelopment for that event”.</p>
<p><b>Volume Control</b></p>	<p><b>NS4</b> – “Where reasonably practicable, for greenfield development, the runoff volume from the development to any highway drain, sewer or surface water body in the 1 in 100 year, 6 hour rainfall event should never exceed the greenfield runoff volume for the same event”.</p>
	<p><b>NS5</b> – “Where reasonably practicable, for developments which have been previously developed, the runoff volume from the development to any highway drain, sewer or surface water body in the 1 in 100 year, 6 hour rainfall event must be constrained to a value as close as is reasonably practicable to the greenfield runoff volume for the same event, but should never exceed the runoff volume from the development site prior to redevelopment for that event”.</p>
	<p><b>NS6</b> – “Where it is not reasonably practicable to constrain the volume of runoff to any drain, sewer or surface water body in accordance with SuDS NS4 or SuDS NS5 above, the runoff volume must be discharged at a rate that does not adversely affect flood risk”.</p>

CONSIDERATION	SUDS NSTS
<p><b>Flood Risk within the Development</b></p>	<p><b>NS7</b> – “The drainage system must be designed so that, unless an area is designated to hold and/or convey water as part of the design, flooding does not occur on any part of the site for a 1 in 30 year rainfall event”.</p>
	<p><b>NS8</b> – “The drainage system must be designed so that, unless an area is designated to hold and/or convey water as part of the design, flooding does not occur during a 1 in 100 year rainfall event in any part of: a building (including a basement); or in any utility plant susceptible to water (e.g. pumping station or electricity substation) within the development”</p>
	<p><b>NS9</b> – “The design of the site must ensure that, so far as is reasonably practicable, flows resulting from rainfall in excess of a 1 in 100 year rainfall event are managed in exceedance routes that minimise the risks to people and property”</p>

## 2.5. Environment Agency

2.5.1. The EA general advisory comments set out the following recommendations:

- **Runoff Rates** – Peak discharge rates from a site will not increase as a result of a proposed development, up to a 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (1 in 100 chance) storm event including an allowance for climate change (CC). Refer to Section 3.0 of the FRA at Appendix 14A in ES Volume III, Document Ref. 6.4) for the EA’s current guidance on climate change allowances (EA, 2020). The EA expects all applicants to strive to achieve greenfield runoff rates to reduce the impact of the development on the surface water drainage infrastructure, unless it is demonstrated that this is not practicable. Measures must ensure that surface water runoff will not increase flood risk to the development or third parties;
- **Storage Volumes** – Storage volume provision must be provided on site so no flooding from surface water runoff will occur on any part of the development during events up to a 3.3% AEP (1 in 30 chance) event. Surface water flooding will also be safely contained within the site boundary during all storm events up to a 1% AEP (1 in 100 chance) event, including an allowance for climate change;
- **Sustainable Drainage Techniques** – SuDS such as green roofs, ponds, swales and permeable pavements should be used. The SuDS hierarchy should be followed; and
- **Residual Risk** – The residual risk of flooding can be managed and contained safely on site should any drainage features fail or during an extreme storm event. The location, depth and flow routes of any over ground flooding should be clearly shown on a plan.

2.5.2. Surface water management measures to address these requirements are provided in Section 4.3 and Section 0.

2.5.3. As part of the Section 42 consultation on the Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) Report (December 2019), the EA was made aware of the primary and potential additional mitigation strategies provided within this Outline Drainage Strategy. The EA's response to Section 42 consultation included the following comments:

- It is noted that *“additional mitigation strategies will be considered, which include providing flood resistance and resilience measures into the design of the buildings; and designing for failure, maintenance and capacity exceedance of the surface water drainage network”*.

2.5.4. The EA's consultation response confirmed that the EA was satisfied with the additional mitigation strategies to be considered by the Applicant detailed in Section 4.3 and Section 6.0.

## **2.6. North East Lindsey Internal Drainage Board**

2.6.1. The EIA Scoping Opinion response from the North East Lindsey Internal Drainage Board (NELIDB) for the Consented Development (refer to Annex 2 of the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) in Appendix 14A in ES Volume III (Document Ref. 6.4), provided the following points for consideration:

- no development should be commenced until the Local Planning Authority (LPA) has approved a scheme for the provision, implementation and future maintenance of a surface water drainage system;
- the Board would support the use of SuDS and the drainage policies of NELC. Any discharge should be limited to the greenfield rate; however, Middle Drain Pump Station was designed to allow for areas of development (to the design standard of the day). Any potential increase in discharge would be subject to the drainage system being able to convey the flows (modelling required) and a development charge payable to the Board; and
- under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991 the prior written consent of the Board is required for any proposed temporary or permanent works or structures within any watercourse including infilling or a diversion.

2.6.2. The EIA Scoping Opinion for the Proposed Development provided in Appendix 1B in ES Volume III (Document Ref. 6.4) identified the following additional requirements for consideration in the Environmental Statement and related FRA and drainage strategy, based on comments from the NELIDB:

- surface water discharge will be limited to the greenfield rate; and
- under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991 the prior written consent of the NELIDB is required for any proposed temporary or permanent works or structures within any watercourse including infilling or a diversion.

## **2.7. North East Lincolnshire Council**

2.7.1. The scoping consultation response from NELC for the Consented Development (refer to Annex 3 of the FRA in Appendix 14A of the ES Volume III, Document Ref. 6.4) stated that no development shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision of surface water drainage works has been approved in writing by the LPA. Such scheme shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the LPA.

2.7.2. NELC has created a SuDS Guide (NELC, 2016) which stipulates the expectations of NELC for designers and developers in regard to the use of SuDS. This guidance document has been produced based on best practice guidelines from the Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA) SuDS Manual (C753) (CIRIA, 2015).

2.7.3. The document details the requirements for SuDS, appropriate design processes and discusses various types of SuDS. Specific NELC requirements for drainage projects are also detailed with a checklist given for the required steps to be taken for the adoption of SuDS.

## **2.8. Anglian Water**

2.8.1. Anglian Water's surface water drainage policy (Anglian Water, 2019) requires that the disposal hierarchy of preference should be followed:

- discharge by infiltration to the ground;
- discharge to an open surface water body;
- discharge to a surface water sewer;
- discharge to a combined sewer; and
- discharge to a foul sewer.

2.8.2. It must be demonstrated that the Proposed Development does not increase flood risk both within the Site and elsewhere, and that the surface water disposal hierarchy above has been considered.

2.8.3. The scoping consultation response from Anglian Water in relation to the Consented Development (refer to Annex 4 of the FRA in Appendix 14A of the ES Volume III, Document Ref. 6.4) stated that the use of SuDS for the development is encouraged and provided a guidance document on the use of SuDS and an overview of the adoption policy should a developer seek to connect into an Anglian Water asset.

2.8.4. The EIA Scoping Opinion for the Proposed Development (Planning Inspectorate, October 2019) provided in Appendix 1B of the ES Volume III identified the following additional requirements for consideration in the ES and related FRA and drainage strategy from Anglian Water:

- consideration to all potential sources of flooding - including foul drainage, sewage treatment and water services;
- consideration of any increased flood risks linked to climate change;
- consideration of whether the Proposed Development would lead to alterations in the drainage patterns around the Site; and
- Anglian Water fully supports the use of SuDS as an alternative to discharging surface water to the public sewerage network and welcome further details of the proposed method of surface water disposal including the SuDS attenuation feature being provided for comment.

2.8.5. Anglian Water's response to Section 42 consultation on the PEI Report (December 2019) provided in the following comments:

- Anglian Water is supportive that the proposed surface water storage pond is a preferable option, but other techniques should also be considered during the detailed design phase;
- Anglian Water wish to have further discussions with the Applicant at the detailed design phase regarding the provision, implementation and future maintenance of the SuDS scheme;
- there have been pre-application discussions with Anglian Water in relation to a foul connection to the public sewerage network although the specific requirements have yet to be confirmed. Anglian Water wish to continue discussions with the Applicant in relation to the requirement for foul drainage as part of the application process including the post consent stage; and
- Anglian Water wishes to be part of any further discussion regarding the preparation in of a Foul Water Strategy.

2.8.6. The detailed design of the drainage scheme will take these considerations into account.

---

## 3.0 EXISTING SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT

### 3.1. Existing Site Drainage

3.1.1. The drawings listed below provided in Annex 1 of this report illustrate the existing drainage infrastructure at the Site:

- Phase 1 & 2 (DRG DS2500);
- Phase 1 & 2 (DRG DS2506);
- Phase 1 (DRG DS2507); and
- Phase 2 (DRG DS2560).

3.1.2. The effluent from the boiler facilities of SHBPS discharge into effluent basins with buried outlet pipes connected to the cooling water pumping station at the far eastern extent of the Site. Surface water from the rooftop and access road areas of the Site that are already developed is currently collected via gullies and conveyed into these effluent basins via buried surface water pipelines. A body of standing water located at the far eastern extent of the Site next to the cooling water pumping station is a holding channel for water in and out of the cooling pipes. The combined water is discharged off Site into the Humber Estuary.

3.1.3. Surface water land drains (Ordinary Watercourses) exist around the perimeter of the Site; these eventually discharge to the Humber Estuary via Middle Drain Pumping Station (located approximately 550 m to the north of the Site). Site topography is generally flat, but slopes gently to the east (towards the Humber Estuary). No level information has been provided for these drains and it is understood that these land drains accept lateral drainage of surface water from the greenfield areas of the Site.

3.1.4. The plans and OS mapping show two existing ponds on Site, however these have been infilled in 2019.

### 3.2. Existing Surface Water Runoff Rates

3.2.1. In accordance with the policy guidance outlined in Section 2.0, new development should not increase flood risk on the Site and the surrounding area. Therefore, surface water runoff rates leaving the Site should not exceed the existing runoff rate.

3.2.2. The existing greenfield surface water runoff rate for the Main Development Area within the Site has been calculated using FEH Web Service (Centre for Ecology and Hydrology) catchment data and Depth Duration Frequency (DDF) FEH2013 rainfall model data for the local catchment area at OS NGR 523150, 413350.

3.2.3. Table 2 details the existing runoff rates calculated during the 1%, 3.3% and >99% AEP events.



**Table 2: Calculated ReFH2 greenfield surface water runoff rates for the Main Development Area within the Site**

<b>RAINFALL EVENT (AEP / 1 IN X YEARS)</b>	<b>REFH2 GREENFIELD RUNOFF RATES (L/S/HA)</b>	<b>TOTAL RUNOFF (7.3 HA) (L/S)</b>
>99% (1 in 1)	0.5	3.7
3.3% (1 in 30))	1.2	8.8
1% (1 in 100)	1.6	11.5

## 4.0 PROPOSED SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT

### 4.1. Un-attenuated Proposed Surface Water Runoff Rates

- 4.1.1. The runoff rate from the proposed land use within the Main Development Area will increase due to an increase in impermeable area (hardstanding and roofing). In practice, 100% of the Main Development Area will not be changed from greenfield to impermeable, however, it has been assumed at this stage that up to 6.5 ha will become impermeable as a worst-case scenario. The anticipated un-attenuated surface runoff rates, were calculated using the HR Wallingford Rational Method Procedure in MicroDrainage software:

$$Q = 2.78 \times C I A$$

Where            Q = runoff rate (l/s)  
                      C = runoff coefficient (0.9 used to represent hard standing)  
                      I = Rainfall intensity (mm/hr)  
                      A = Site area (ha)

- 4.1.2. An assumed runoff coefficient of 0.9 has been used for the calculations. These runoff rates, plus those with allowances for climate change as defined by the EA's latest guidance (EA, 2020) (refer to Section 3.0 of the FRA at Appendix 14A in ES Volume III, Document Ref. 6.4), are provided in Table 3.

### 4.2. Surface Water Volume Attenuation Requirements

- 4.2.1. In order to not increase flood risk elsewhere, in accordance with the NPPF, EA, NELC, and NELIDB requirements, discharge of surface water runoff from the Main Development Area will be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rates and volumes (with on-site attenuation for all events up to the 1 in 100 (1% AEP) rainfall event, taking into account a 40% allowance for climate change (EA, 2020)) to prevent an increased risk of flooding downstream. A surface water attenuation solution will therefore be implemented on Site to ensure the greenfield runoff rates presented in Table 2 are not exceeded.
- 4.2.2. The minimum achievable discharge from outfall control structures, for example a HydroBrake, is usually 5 l/s. Consultation with the NELIDB (refer to Annex 2 of the FRA in Appendix 14A in ES Volume III, Document Ref. 6.4) concluded with an agreement in principle that a maximum discharge rate of 5 l/s during the 1 in 1 year event is acceptable for the total runoff from the Main Development Area of the Site.
- 4.2.3. The MicroDrainage Source Control quick storage estimate tool was used to calculate the necessary storage volumes, presented in Table 4 and Annex 2 of this report. FEH 2013 DDF rainfall data for the local catchment area (OS NGR) 523150, 413350 was used in the calculations. A conservative assumption of zero infiltration has been made, in the absence of permeability data for the site.

**Table 3: Calculated impermeable surface water runoff rates for the proposed land use within the Main Development Area (assuming up to 6.5 ha impermeable area); un-attenuated (including allowances for climate change (EA, 2020))**

FLOOD EVENT (% AEP / 1 IN X YEARS)	TOTAL SITE (6.5 HA) RUNOFF (L/S) FOR A RANGE OF RAINFALL DURATION								
	15 mins	30 mins	1 hr	2 hr	3 hr	5 hr	12 hr	24 hr	48 hr
<b>50% (2)</b>	440	289	181	127	100	71	39	23	14
<b>20% (5)</b>	775	503	316	201	151	104	53	31	18
<b>10% (10)</b>	1,008	660	416	254	188	127	63	36	21
<b>3.3% (30)</b>	1,390	917	579	340	247	163	80	45	26
<b>2% (50)</b>	1,561	1,036	656	381	275	181	88	50	28
<b>1% (100)</b>	1,811	1,207	766	439	316	207	100	57	32
<b>1% (100) + 20% CC</b>	2,173	1,448	919	527	379	248	120	68	38
<b>1% (100) + 40% CC</b>	2,535	1,690	1,072	615	442	290	140	80	45

**Table 4: Calculated surface water runoff attenuation volumes and areas for storage required for the Main Development Area (assuming up to 6.5 ha impermeable area)**

<b>SCENARIO</b>	<b>RAIN-FALL EVENT (AEP / 1 IN X YEAR)</b>	<b>TOTAL STORAGE VOLUME (m<sup>3</sup>) – MINIMUM</b>	<b>TOTAL STORAGE VOLUME (m<sup>3</sup>) – MAXIMUM</b>	<b>TOTAL STORAGE PLAN AREA (ASSUMING 2 m DEPTH) (m<sup>2</sup>) - MINIMUM</b>	<b>TOTAL STORAGE PLAN AREA (ASSUMING 2 m DEPTH) (m<sup>2</sup>) - MAXIMUM</b>
<b>Free Discharge</b>	<b>1% (100) + 40% CC</b>	7,535	7,935	3,768	3,968
<b>No Discharge</b>	<b>1% (100) + 40% CC</b>	8,106		4,053	

4.2.4. Table 4 also provides plan areas for each of the calculated volumes to indicate the area of land that is required for these storage areas. A 2 m depth was assumed for these calculations, based on the assumed depth of the land drains around the perimeter of the Site. These storage volumes are preliminary estimates, and further detailed surface water modelling will be undertaken as part of a detailed design phase to more accurately assess the storage volume requirements once the exact extent of proposed impermeable area is confirmed.

**4.3. Proposed Surface Water Attenuation Solution**

Consideration of Appropriate SuDS Techniques

4.3.1. In line with the NPPF, Defra, EA and NELIDB advisory recommendations, best practice guidelines and local planning policy, SuDS should be used as a preferential option. A summary of SuDS defined in the CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753) is given (CIRIA, 2015) in Table 5. This is not an exhaustive list and other options should be considered. It can be seen that the proposed storage pond is a preferable option, but other techniques should also be considered during the detailed design phase.

**Table 5: Sustainable drainage systems**

TECHNIQUE	DESCRIPTION	RESTRICTIONS OF USE
<b>Storage Pond</b>	Storage ponds can be used to attenuate overland runoff and slowly release it into a watercourse or sewer. These systems do not offer water quality benefits unless additional water quality measures are added such as filters or sedimentation volume.	Storage ponds may require substantial earthworks and thus incur high costs during the construction phase. Additionally, large ponds which store water above ground level may be classified as reservoirs which are subject to a range of legislative requirements. Land take requirements for storage ponds are likely to be substantial.
<b>Permeable Paving</b>	Permeable paving allows rainwater to infiltrate through a hard-standing surface to underlying soil or drainage infrastructure, from which it may infiltrate or be directed to a local watercourse or sewer.	Permeable pavements may be restricted by the presence of basements or groundwater levels as well as high imposed loads.

TECHNIQUE	DESCRIPTION	RESTRICTIONS OF USE
<b>Rainwater Harvesting</b>	Rainwater from roofs and hard surfaces can be stored and used for non-potable purposes. This can provide a reduction of surface water runoff through control at source as well as reducing the demand on the water supply system.	Rainwater harvesting is dependent on a consistent supply of rainwater which cannot be ensured. As such it will be used as a supplement to conventional water supply only.
<b>Below Ground Attenuation</b>	Below ground storage tanks will attenuate surface water flows in much the same way as surface water ponds, although with reduced land take. Storage tanks will typically require a hydro brake to ensure a steady and controlled discharge.	Upfront costs are likely to be high for buried storage tanks. The maintenance regime may be onerous or involve heightened health and safety risks due to enclosed spaces.

Attenuation Storage

- 4.3.2. Surface water runoff is to be collected on Site and conveyed to a surface water attenuation pond SuDS feature via the use of gullies, drainage ditches/ swales where possible. Site topography is conducive for flows to be gravity drained to a surface water attenuation area located at the eastern edge of the Main Development Area within the Site where opportunity is presented for attenuation based SuDS (see Figure 2). The extent of this pond illustrated in Figure 2 will accommodate the total storage plan area required (as presented in Table 4) assuming a 2 m depth.
- 4.3.3. It is proposed that this attenuation pond will outfall into one of the existing land drainage ditches located along the southern or northern boundary of the Site using a flow control mechanism such as a Hydro-Brake to limit the discharge to greenfield rates. The detailed drainage design stage will confirm that the bed levels of the local land drains into which the attenuation solution will discharge are appropriate relative to the bed levels of the storage solution to ensure they are positively drained by gravity (i.e. to confirm that no additional pumping is required).
- 4.3.4. These drains flow east towards the Humber Estuary, and divert water either north to Middle Drain pumping station located approximately 550 m north of the Site, or south-eastwards to Oldfleet Drain that outfalls via a flapped culvert into the Estuary approximately 450 m south-east of the Site. The two additional outfalls located north of the Site along one of these drains also enable runoff to discharge whilst tide levels are low enough and the flaps are open.
- 4.3.5. As the Middle Drain pumping station discharges into the tidal Humber Estuary, it may be the case that during some high tide events, discharges into either the southern or northern drains become restricted. The detailed design will allow for this. To illustrate the effect that this may have on the storage volume, a conservative assumption that no discharge is allowed into the drain during the

duration of the critical storm has been applied in this Outline Drainage Strategy. An indicative storage volume for this scenario was calculated and is also presented in Table 4.

- 4.3.6. A detailed drainage design phase will confirm the storage volumes required once the exact impermeable area of the proposed land use is confirmed, and it will confirm the exact location and feasibility of the proposed outfall from the attenuation pond into the existing land drainage network.
- 4.3.7. This proposed Outline Drainage Strategy is in accordance with the principles defined by the NPPF, PPG, EA, NELC, NELIDB and Anglian Water as defined in Section 2.0. Further consultation will be undertaken at the detailed design phase with NELC to obtain their approval for the provision, implementation and future maintenance of the surface water drainage (SuDS) scheme, and with NELIDB to obtain their discharge consent into either of the land drains on the southern or northern boundaries of the Site.

## **5.0 PROPOSED FOUL DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT**

- 5.1.1. Options for the disposal of foul drainage from the Proposed Development comprise: discharge to foul sewer; septic tank and tankering off Site; or treatment on Site using a package treatment plant discharging with the surface water.
- 5.1.2. At this stage, a connection to foul sewer appears to be unfeasible due to the distance from the Site to the nearest existing foul sewer (over 1 km). As septic tanks are not favoured by the Environment Agency due to the potential risk of soil and groundwater pollution, it is currently considered that an on Site package treatment plant is the most likely preferred solution for foul drainage. Treated flows would be discharged to one of the surface water ditches on Site, and ultimately to the Humber Estuary. The volume contribution is expected to be too small to require a Permit. The package treatment plant would be located within the Main Development Area. Details will be developed and agreed at the detailed design stage in accordance with a DCO requirement.



## **6.0 RESIDUAL RISK MITIGATION**

### **6.1. Drainage System Failure and Maintenance**

6.1.1. Following the completion of the Proposed Development, an additional residual risk relates to maintenance of the on Site drainage infrastructure. Failure, blockage and capacity exceedance above that of the design events for the drainage system are a potential risk to the Site and the surrounding area.

6.1.2. In order to reduce the risks, maintenance of the system will be incorporated in general site management and remains the responsibility of EP Waste Management Ltd. A manual will be prepared detailing each drainage feature on Site, the maintenance required, timescales for maintenance and who is responsible for undertaking the maintenance. Maintenance of the Site drainage system will include all pipes, discharge structures and any SuDS implemented on Site in accordance with the recommendations in the SuDS Manual.

### **6.2. Design Capacity Exceedance**





6.2.1. CIRIA C635 provides guidance on measures that can be incorporated into the detailed design of developments to steer surface water that has exceeded the capacity of the drainage system away from buildings and route it towards the intended point of attenuation and discharge (for example along swales and roads using raised kerbing and through parking areas). The overspill feature of the surface water attenuation solution on Site will be designed to convey water towards either of the land drains found along the southern or northern boundaries of the Site following further consultation with the NELIDB to obtain their agreement, in the event of overtopping.

## 7.0 REFERENCES

- Anglian Water. (2018). *Surface Water Policy*. Available at: <https://www.anglianwater.co.uk/siteassets/developers/development-services/suds-drainage-policy.pdf>
- Centre for Ecology and Hydrology. (undated). *FEH Web Service*. Available at <https://fehweb.ceh.ac.uk/>
- Construction Industry Research and Information Association. (2006). *C635 Designing for exceedance in urban drainage - good practice*
- Construction Industry Research and Information Association. (2015). *C753 The SuDS Manual*
- Department of Energy & Climate Change. (2011a). *Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)*.
- Department of Energy & Climate Change. (2011b). *Overarching National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)*.
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. (2015). *Sustainable Drainage Systems: Non-Statutory Technical Standards*
- Environment Agency. (March 2020). *Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances*. Available at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances>
- Google. (2019). *Google Earth*
- Wallingford, HR. (1981). *The Wallingford Procedure - for design and analysis of urban storm drainage*
- Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. (2019). *Planning Practice Guidance: Flood risk and coastal change*
- Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. (2019). *National Planning Policy Framework*.
- North East Lincolnshire Council. (2016). *North East Lincolnshire Council Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems Guide*

## **ANNEX 1: EXISTING DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE DRAWINGS**

- DRG DS2500 – Site services Phase 1 and Phase 2
- DRG DS2506 – Surface, foul, oily water HRSG blowdown services
- DRG DS2507 – Surface waste Phase 1
- DRG DS2560 – Surface water Phase 2



- DITCH
- ABANDONED SURFACE WATER DRAIN
- EFFLUENT PUMPED MAIN
- GAS MAIN (ASB SPECIFICATION)
- RAW WATER MAIN (BLUE MOPS, SDR 17.8 WP 30m)
- POTABLE WATER MAIN (BLUE MOPS, SDR 17.6 WP 2.5bar)
- FIRE FIGHTING MAIN (BLUE MOPS, SDR 11 WP 10bar)
- DEMIN WATER MAIN (BLUE MOPS, SDR 17.6 WP 4bar)
- THIN COMPRESSED AIR LINES (BLUE MOPS, SDR 11 WP 9.5bar)
- EFFLUENT MAIN (BLACK MOPS, SDR 17.6 WP 21m)
- SURFACE WATER DRAIN AND MANHOLE
- BOILER BLOWDOWN DRAIN
- FOUL WATER DRAIN AND MANHOLE
- OILY WATER DRAIN AND MANHOLE
- COMBINED DRAINAGE AND KERB SYSTEM (150 UPVC-CS OUTLET)
- ROAD CHANNEL (150 UPVC-CS OUTLET)
- 8 No. CABLE DUCTS ARRANGED THUS: 150 DIA.
- CABLE DRAIN
- LIGHTING COLUMN (LC)
- BT CABLE DUCT & DRAIN
- FIRE HYDRANT
- PILED MONUMENT
- CABLE TRENCH
- FENCE


- A. BYPASS OIL INTERCEPTOR EAST, NORTH OF AUX. BOILER HOUSE.
- B. OIL SEPARATOR (LOCAL TREATMENT), NORTH OF AUX. BOILER HOUSE.
- C. FOUL TREATMENT UNIT F102, NORTH OF AUX. BOILER HOUSE.
- D. OIL SEPARATOR (LOCAL TREATMENT), SOUTH OF WORKSHOP.
- E. FOUL TREATMENT UNIT F101, WEST OF BRITISH GAS COMPOUND.
- F. FOUL PUMP STATION FPP1, NORTH OF OFFICE BLOCK.
- G. CLASS 1 OIL SEPARATOR, WEST OF OIL CONTAINMENT TANK.
- H. BP-PASS OIL INTERCEPTOR (LOCAL TREATMENT), NATIONAL GRID COMPOUND.
- J. BP-PASS OIL INTERCEPTOR (LOCAL TREATMENT), NATIONAL GRID COMPOUND.
- K. CESS POOL, NATIONAL GRID COMPOUND.
- L. CONDENSATE COLLECTING TANK, L.V.O. GAS COMPOUND.
- M. REGENERATION PHE, NORTH WEST CORNER STEAM TURBINE BUILDING.
- N. FILTER TRAP EAST SIDE WORKSHOP & STORE.

NOTE: SERVICES (OTHER THAN CABLES) CROSS ROADS INSIDE SERVICE SLEEVES.

- 2500 REFERENCE DRAWINGS, PHASE ONE
- 2010/06/001 LAYOUT OF ROADS AND EXTERNAL SERVICES - SHEET 1 OF 12
  - 2010/06/002 LAYOUT OF ROADS AND EXTERNAL SERVICES - SHEET 2 OF 12
  - 2010/06/003 LAYOUT OF ROADS AND EXTERNAL SERVICES - SHEET 3 OF 12
  - 2010/06/004 LAYOUT OF ROADS AND EXTERNAL SERVICES - SHEET 4 OF 12
  - 2010/06/005 LAYOUT OF ROADS AND EXTERNAL SERVICES - SHEET 5 OF 12
  - 2010/06/006 LAYOUT OF ROADS AND EXTERNAL SERVICES - SHEET 6 OF 12
  - 2010/06/007 LAYOUT OF ROADS AND EXTERNAL SERVICES - SHEET 7 OF 12
  - 2010/06/008 LAYOUT OF ROADS AND EXTERNAL SERVICES - SHEET 8 OF 12
  - 2010/06/009 LAYOUT OF ROADS AND EXTERNAL SERVICES - SHEET 9 OF 12
  - 2010/06/010 LAYOUT OF ROADS AND EXTERNAL SERVICES - SHEET 10 OF 12
  - 2010/06/011 LAYOUT OF ROADS AND EXTERNAL SERVICES - SHEET 11 OF 12
  - 2010/06/012 LAYOUT OF ROADS AND EXTERNAL SERVICES - SHEET 12 OF 12


- 2500 REFERENCE DRAWINGS, PHASE TWO
- 2010/06/013 CW PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION DETAILS - SHEET 1
  - 2010/06/014 CW PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION DETAILS - SHEET 2
  - 2010/06/015 CW PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION DETAILS - SHEET 3
  - 2010/06/016 STANDARD DETAILS
  - 2010/06/017 GA EFFLUENT BASH EAST
  - 2010/06/018 GA EFFLUENT BASH WEST
  - 2010/06/019 GA & RC DETAILS OF BYPASS OIL INTERCEPTOR WEST
  - 2010/06/020 GA & RC DETAILS OF BYPASS OIL INTERCEPTOR EAST
  - 2010/06/021 GA & RC DETAILS OF RAW WATER BREAK TANK

- DRAWING REFERENCE DRAWINGS
- 025200 SITE PLAN, COMBINED SITE SERVICE LAYOUT, PHASE 1 & 2.
  - 025201 BLOCK PLAN, COMBINED SITE SERVICE LAYOUT, PHASE 1.
  - 025202 BLOCK PLAN, GAS & COMPRESSED AIR MAINS, PHASE 1.
  - 025203 BLOCK PLAN, GAS & COMPRESSED AIR MAINS, PHASE 2.
  - 025204 SITE PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 1 & 2.
  - 025205 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 1.
  - 025206 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 2.
  - 025207 SURFACE WATER, FOUL, OILY & BLOWDOWN DRAINAGE, PHASE 1 & 2.
  - 025208 BLOCK PLAN, SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE, PHASE 1.
  - 025209 BLOCK PLAN, SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE, PHASE 2.
  - 025210 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 1 & 2.
  - 025211 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 1.
  - 025212 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 2.
  - 025213 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 1.
  - 025214 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 2.
  - 025215 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 1.
  - 025216 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 2.
  - 025217 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 1.
  - 025218 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 2.
  - 025219 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 1.
  - 025220 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 2.
  - 025221 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 1.
  - 025222 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 2.
  - 025223 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 1.
  - 025224 BLOCK PLAN, POTABLE, RAW & DEMIN WATER MAINS, PHASE 2.



I.V.O. GENERATION SERVICES (UK) LTD SOUTH HUMBER BANK POWER STATION SITE PLAN COMBINED SITE SERVICE LAYOUT PHASE 1 & 2 DRG No. :- DS2500 'DRAWSIGN' 1997 ISSUE: A. SEPTEMBER 1997 B. JUNE 1998. ISSUE 'A'. PHASE ONE. ISSUE 'B'. PHASE TWO ADDED.

# I.V.O. GENERATION SERVICES (UK) LTD SOUTH HUMBER BANK POWER STATION



NOTE:  
SERVICES (OTHER THAN CABLES)  
CROSS ROADS INSIDE  
SERVICE SLEEVES.


NOTE:  
REFER TO COMBINED SERVICE  
SITE PLAN DRG. No DS2500 FOR  
'ABB' & 'DRAWSIGN' REFERENCE  
DRAWINGS.

- DITCH
- UNGRAVELLED SURFACE WATER DRAIN
- EFFLUENT PUMPED MAIN
- EFFLUENT MAIN (BLACK HOSE, SDR 17.6 MP 2004)
- SURFACE WATER DRAIN AND MANHOLE
- BOILER BLOWDOWN DRAIN
- FOUL WATER DRAIN AND MANHOLE
- OILY WATER DRAIN AND MANHOLE
- COMBINED DRAINAGE AND REB SYSTEM (150 JPCV-CS OUTLET)
- ROAD CHANNEL (150 JPCV-CS OUTLET)


SR: SURFACE WATER MANHOLE e.g. SR020 0 DENOTES SHEET No OF ORIGINAL 'A1011 & L2041' e.g. 20104/0202  
FD: SURFACE WATER MANHOLE FORMER EXISTING e.g. FD220

- A. BYPASS OIL INTERCEPTOR EAST, NORTH OF AUX. BOILER HOUSE.
- B. OIL SEPARATOR (LOCAL TREATMENT), NORTH OF AUX. BOILER HOUSE.
- C. FOUL TREATMENT UNIT F102, NORTH OF AUX. BOILER HOUSE.
- D. OIL SEPARATOR (LOCAL TREATMENT), SOUTH OF WORKSHOP.
- E. FOUL TREATMENT UNIT F101, WEST OF BRUSH GAS COMPOUND.
- F. FOUL PUMP STATION F103, NORTH OF OFFICE BLOCK.
- G. CLASS 1 OIL SEPARATOR, WEST OF OIL CONTAINMENT TANK.
- H. BY-PASS OIL INTERCEPTOR (LOCAL TREATMENT), NATIONAL GRID COMPOUND.
- J. BY-PASS OIL INTERCEPTOR (LOCAL TREATMENT), NATIONAL GRID COMPOUND.
- K. KEES PITS, NATIONAL GRID COMPOUND.
- L. CONDENSATE COLLECTING TANK, LOCAL GAS COMPOUND.
- M. NEUTRALISATION PIT, NORTH WEST CORNER STEAM TURBINE BUILDING.
- N. FILTER 100V 100V SLAG WASHWATER & STORE.



NOTE 'A'  
FOR PHASE ONE SURFACE WATER REFER TO DRG No. DS 2507  
FOR PHASE ONE FOUL, OILY WATER & BLOW DOWN DRAINAGE REFER TO DS 2508  
FOR PHASE TWO SURFACE WATER REFER TO DRG No. DS 2509  
FOR PHASE TWO FOUL, OILY WATER & BLOW DOWN DRAINAGE REFER TO DS 2502



SITE CONTINUATION  
FROM X - X





ENLARGED AREA



I.V.O. GENERATION SERVICES (UK) LTD  
SOUTH HUMBER BANK POWER STATION  
SITE PLAN  
SURFACE WATER, FOUL, OILY & BOILER BLOWDOWN DRAINAGE. PHASE 1 & 2  
DRG No. :- DS2506  
'DRAWSIGN' 1997  
ISSUE: A. SEPTEMBER 1997  
B. JUNE 1998.

ISSUE 'A'. PHASE ONE.  
ISSUE 'B'. PHASE TWO ADDED.


# BLOCK PLAN PHASE 1



- LEGEND**
- ABANDONED SURFACE WATER DRAIN
  - EFFLUENT PUMPED MAIN
  - EFFLUENT MAIN (BLACK MDPE, SDR 17.6 WP 2bar)
  - SURFACE WATER DRAIN AND MANHOLE
  - FOUL WATER DRAIN AND MANHOLE
  - OILY WATER DRAIN AND MANHOLE
  - COMBINED DRAINAGE AND KERB SYSTEM (150 uPVC-CS OUTLET)
  - ROAD CHANNEL (150 uPVC-CS OUTLET)
  - R = RAIN WATER PIPE
  - C = GULLEY
  - RE = RODDING EYE
  - BIG = BACK INLET GULLEY
  - SW: SURFACE WATER MANHOLE e.g. SW2.00 2 DENOTES SHEET No OF ORIGINAL 'ALLOTT & LOMAX' DRG. EG20106/1/002
  - OO DENOTES MANHOLE No EG OS
  - FD: SURFACE WATER MANHOLE FORMER EXISTING eg FD2.00


**NOTE:**  
SERVICES (OTHER THAN CABLES)  
CROSS ROADS INSIDE  
SERVICE SLEEVES.

PHASE 2.  
FOR BLOCK PLAN REFER  
TO DRG. No DS2560




I.V.O. GENERATION SERVICES (UK) LTD  
SOUTH HUMBER BANK POWER STATION  
BLOCK PLAN  
SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE. PHASE 1  
DRAWING No. DS 2507  
DRAWSIGN 1997  
ISSUE A: SEPTEMBER. 97 PHASE ONE  
ISSUE B: JUNE 98 UPDATES FOR PHASE TWO

# BLOCK PLAN PHASE TWO



PHASE 1.  
FOR BLOCK PLAN REFER  
TO DRG. No DS2507



\* CONNECTION TO  
TANKS FOR EMPTYING


SUPPORT STEELWORK AS PHASE ONE.  
OMITTED ON PHASE TWO FOR CLARITY.

- EFFLUENT MAIN (BLACK MDPE, SDR 17.6 WP 2bar)
- EFFLUENT PUMPED MAIN
- EFFLUENT MAIN (BLACK MDPE, SDR 17.6 WP 2bar)
- SURFACE WATER DRAIN AND MANHOLE
- FOUL WATER DRAIN AND MANHOLE
- OILY WATER DRAIN AND MANHOLE
- COMBINED DRAINAGE AND KERB SYSTEM (150 uPVC-CS OUTLET)
- ROAD CHANNEL (150 uPVC-CS OUTLET)

R - RAINWATER PIPE  
G - GULLEY  
RE - ROODING EYE  
BIG - BACK INLET GULLEY

SW: SURFACE WATER MANHOLE e.g. SW2.00 2 DENOTES SHEET No OF ORIGINAL 'ALLOT & LOMAX', DRG EG20106/8/002  
OO DENOTES MANHOLE No EG 08  
FD: SURFACE WATER MANHOLE FORMER EXISTING e.g. FD2.00

NOTE:  
SERVICES (OTHER THAN CABLES)  
CROSS ROADS INSIDE  
SERVICE SLEEVES.



I.V.O. GENERATION SERVICES (UK) LTD  
SOUTH HUMBER BANK POWER STATION  
SITE PLAN  
SURFACE WATER PHASE TWO  
DRG No. :- DS2560  
'DRAWSIGN' 1997  
ISSUE: A. JUNE 1998

ISSUE 'A'. PHASE TWO

## ANNEX 2: SOURCE CONTROL CALCULATIONS

**Quick Storage Estimate**

Micro Drainage

**Variables**

FEH Rainfall

Return Period (years) 100

Version 2013 Catchment ...

Site GB 523150 413350 TA 23150 13350

Cv (Summer) 0.750

Cv (Winter) 0.840

Impervious Area (ha) 6.500

Maximum Allowable Discharge (l/s) 1.6

Infiltration Coefficient (m/hr) 0.00000

Safety Factor 2.0

Climate Change (%) 40

Analyse OK Cancel Help

Enter Cv between 0.100 and 1.000

Figure 3: Source Control Input for Greenfield Run-off Discharge Rate

**Quick Storage Estimate**

Micro Drainage

**Results**

Global Variables require approximate storage of between 7535 m<sup>3</sup> and 7935 m<sup>3</sup>.

These values are estimates only and should not be used for design purposes.

Analyse OK Cancel Help

Enter Cv between 0.100 and 1.000

Figure 4: Source Control Output for Greenfield Run-Off Discharge Rate






Figure 5: Source Control Input for No Discharge




Figure 6: Source Control Output for No Discharge