

MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NUMBER	70079268	MEETING DATE	12 December 2022
PROJECT NAME	Manchester Victoria North – Redbank Area	VENUE	Microsoft Teams
CLIENT	Far East Consortium	RECORDED BY	JEB
MEETING SUBJECT	Wastewater Proposals Update		

PRESENT	Jack Brimblecombe, Stephen Mostyn (WSP); John Sherrington, Timea Nisca (FEC); Nicola Hall, Andrew Leyssens, Adam Brennan, Shoaib Tauqeer, John Cartledge (UU)
APOLOGIES	
DISTRIBUTION	As above

UU comments made 09.01.23

UU comments made 23.02.23

Highlighted comment indicates point discussed 20.03.23

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION	DUE
1	Overview – Existing Drainage Regime and Proposed Improvements		
1.1	Foul and surface water drainage currently drains to existing United Utilities (UU) combined sewers site wide. UU comment – any existing surface water runoff from your site draining to public sewers would need to be evidenced if surface water is considered to drain to the public sewers, but it is understood all surface water is proposed to ultimately drain to the river. All surface water run-off from proposed development to discharge to the River Irk at greenfield run-off rates. UU comment - Noted		
1.2	As part of the HIF infrastructure package a dedicated surface water drainage system is being installed with a proposed discharge into the River Irk. UU comment – Noted this is currently being pursued under S104 application.		
1.3	On plot foul drainage to connect into primary foul water network designed by Arup as part of HIF package which connects on to existing UU combined Sewers. WSP to develop high level foul discharge rate plan. UU comment – Noted, please provide foul discharge rate plan for assessment to be carried out by UU. WSP to provide a foul discharge rate plan for approval as part of forthcoming planning submission (March 2023).	WSP	

	Please ensure this corresponds with Arups design proposals <i>Foul discharge rate plan applies 4000l/d/dwelling and 0.6l/s/ha for commercial space in parallel with the foul calculations carried out by Arup as part of the HIF Works.</i>		
2	Surface Water Discharge Rate and Plot Connection Points		
2.1	Discharge across the development is to be limited to 22l/s/ha limited to a minimum of 5l/s for each individual plot. On plot attenuation is proposed. UU comment – It is understood all surface water is to ultimately drain to the River, please confirm. 1) The restricted rate for each plot must correspond with the S104 main drainage design which is being carried out by Arup. 2) Any new surface water drainage not part of the HIF package is requested to drain to the river and therefore all discharge rates must be agreed with the LLFA and EA. 3) S104 technical assessment will be required for drainage network to be put forward for adoption. Item 1: Yes, all surface water drainage is to discharge to the River Irk. Item 2: It is proposed that surface water run-off from the plots will discharge into the S104 sewers provided by HIF/Arup at a rate not exceeding 22l/s/ha. This flow rate was agreed by Arup with LLFA and EA as part of the HIF infrastructure planning application. WSP will also seek approval for this discharge rate as part of the outline/detailed planning applications for the plots. Item 3: Noted and agreed. A section 104 has been submitted by HIF/Arup for the primary sitewide foul and surface water drainage infrastructure. Any additional adoptable sewers (i.e Dantzic Street) required to support the development will be identified and a strategy agreed for these prior to the forthcoming outline/detailed planning applications – associated section 104 applications will be progressed following planning approval. UU comment – Understood a full drainage strategy will be submitted in advance of the planning application. <i>Agreed.</i>		
2.2	On-plot surface water drainage will connect to the HIF installed new dedicated surface water drainage network which ultimately discharged into the River Irk. FEC team will provide surface water carrier drain for plots NT02 – 04 and RB16 & 17 i.e all plots along Dantzic Street. UU comment – Noted. It is requested any new surface water sewers should also drain to the River and in line with the surface water hierarchy. The new adoptable carrier drain in Dantzic Street and any other new surface water drainage that is required to support the development will discharge to the River Irk. UU comment – Noted please see comment below regarding highway drainage		
2.3	Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) – UU indicated that SuDS should be implemented on the development plots wherever possible.		

	WSP confirmed that as part of the outline planning application the types of SuDS that are appropriate for the development plots will be identified and set out in the drainage strategy report. Future detailed planning applications should then use that as a basis on which to develop the drainage strategies for the individual plots. UU comment – Noted.		
2.4	UU advised that conversations on the adoption of proposed drainage infrastructure should be held as early as possible. FEC to ensure consultations are being held as part of the HIF works. UU comment – Noted and agreed.	FEC	
3	Dantzic Street Highway Drainage		
3.1	Currently, road gullies draining dantzic street discharge into the combined sewer the runs beneath it. As it stands, the proposals are to continue as such. UU raised that this could be a lost opportunity to remove surface water discharge from the combined sewer. FEC indicated that they thought that it would be technically difficult to achieve SuDS in Dantzic Street but committed to consider further options. UU comment – all existing highway drainage draining to the combined sewer is requested to be removed as part of the development and new surface water drainage works. Consideration should be made for SuDS features. Consideration of highways drainage to drain to the proposed surface water sewer serving NT02-04 and RB16-17 should be made. Design strategy will be for a carrier drain to accept connections from plot drainage only. Further discussion can then take place to confirm whether to size for Dantzic Street gully connections. We will discuss separately with the EA whether it would be acceptable to discharge the Dantzic Street gullies directly to the River Irk via the carrier drain but would comment that it may not be desirable from a water quality perspective to do this and also that flows from the gullies would discharge to the river unattenuated – both of these points may not be acceptable to the EA. UU comment – Noted – please advise on with the discussions to be had with the EA regarding highway drainage. Could swales be used to permit this? Also spill reduction from CSOs may be sufficient benefit to the EA / LLFA to allow highway drainage discharge? <i>Current drainage strategy is to provide a new adoptable surface water carrier drain in Dantzic Street to take surface water discharge at 22 l/s/ha from the proposed development plots and also from the proposed SuDS zones in Dantzic Street. The Dantzic Street SuDS zones are currently being designed take runoff from footpaths only and not the carriageway, which will continue to drain as existing to the combined sewer. Swales are not considered to be feasible due to spatial constraints. There is scope to review this strategy in conjunction with UU with a view to re-routing the existing Dantzic Street highway gullies into the carrier drain but this would need a more detailed discussion with UU. EA have indicated that they have no objection in principle to discharge of Dantzic Street carriageway drainage to the new outfall but have requested that attenuation would need to be provided. LLFA have indicated that SuDS (raingarden) could be included within the design</i>	FEC	

	<i>subject to the necessary approvals as part of a future section 278 agreement.</i> UU advised that the drainage strategy for planning can be submitted based on existing Dantzic Street highway gullies being drained to the existing UU combined sewer in Dantzic Street as per the current arrangements. Further discussions and development of this strategy with a view to rerouting the gully connections to the surface water carrier drain to be progressed following planning submission.		
4	Dantzic Street Carrier Drain and Outfall to River Irk		
4.1	Proposed new Surface Water Carrier on Dantzic Street is to take connections from proposed widened portion of highway and also surface water drainage connections from adjacent plots. UU comment – Noted. Please submit for assessment.		
4.2	The surface water carrier drain is likely to be offered for adoption and will discharge to the River Irk via a new outfall. Can UU confirm their minimum requirement for the level of the outfall i.e is there a requirement to set above 30-year river flood level? Type, details and location of outfall structure(s) to be agreed with UU / EA. FEC advised UU that MCC do not now intend to carry out any civils works in the river channel to amend water levels. UU comment – The outfall invert level should be set 300mm above the 30 year river top water level. As part of a S104 technical assessment we would request bed level and surveyed/observed/modelled water levels of watercourse Noted. We will confirm the 30 year river level and work to these requirements where possible and contact UU to agree the way forward if this is not possible. We will seek to obtain the necessary survey information related to the river to support any future section 104 application. UU comment – Noted. Please ensure the river surcharge levels are considered in the drainage strategy. This will likely impact your pass forward flow rate at the outfalls if submerged. <i>We are currently awaiting modelled 30 yr river level but note that data provided for a neighbouring development indicates that it may be difficult to achieve an outfall level which is above the 30 yr river level without pumping which is not desirable.</i> WSP confirmed to UU that the outfall to the River Irk at Dantzic Street will be significantly below the 30 year river level. Proposed outfall level is proposed to be 27.227mAOD in line with the neighbouring consented development of Victoria Riverside. Modelled 30 year river level is 30.46mAOD. UU advised that they will comment through the planning process that a surcharged outfall should be modelled at detailed design stage and that any impact on the system is mitigated as required.	UU	
5	Sewer Diversions, Abandonments and Build Over Agreements		
5.1	Diversion of existing combined sewer across the Plateau agreed in principle by UU – subject to section 185 application at the time of detailed planning applications.		

	UU comment – The existing combined sewer running north to south around through proposed plots RB04/RB03 is classed a critical sewer and contains a CSO outfall at the north side of the river bank. We are not able to agree any diversion proposals without a S185 application and assessment being carried out. Due to the criticality of the sewer, the S185 diversion proposal would need to be assessed by our engineering team and may require hydraulic modelling to be undertaken. Therefore it is requested that a S185 diversion proposal is submitted as soon as possible to avoid future delays. Noted that the existing combined sewer that crosses plots RB03/RB04 is a critical sewer associated with a local CSO. S185 application to be progressed when these plots are brought forward for development. UU comment – Noted. Please also consider CSO which discharges through the retaining wall on the north bank of the Irk - downstream of the sewer for diversion. Noted		
5.2	FEC indicated that they would like to explore possibility of a build over agreement for the existing combined public sewer in Warford Street (Plots RB16 & RB17) due to depth of existing sewer which passes beneath the River Irk and the technical difficulty / limited options for a diversion. UU confirmed that they will consider a build over agreement if this is put forward as a proposal. UU comment – Our expectation would be to divert or amend the site layout to avoid building over or near to the existing public sewers. One factor in considering a build over agreement is the availability of a diversionary route in the event of failure. This location does not appear to have an appropriate diversionary route for use in the event of failure and any diversion would take significant planning and liaison to execute. Due to the nature of the location and constraints such as the depth of the sewer, adjacent watercourse and that the only manhole upstream is across the river; building over this sewer would introduce further constraints to access, repair or excavate down to the sewer which would not be acceptable. You are welcome to submit a build over proposal for consideration, but we would like to set expectations at this stage to highlight that any application to build over or near to the sewer/s is likely to be rejected. Therefore any build over designs/plans etc would likely result as being abortive work. Early discussions on any diversion proposals are requested to be made. If a submission is made and an assessment carried out we would like to highlight that this would not indicate that we accept the principle of building over or near to the sewer, rather be only a basis to review the proposals. It is essential that this process/discussion is carried out prior to planning as it is a material consideration. It is requested that all sewers are surveyed and accurately located through on site investigations carried out by the developer prior to submitting design proposals. Noted – Current development proposals include a no build zone between plots RB16 & 17 to take account of the easement zones associated with the existing public sewers. Therefore we are not going to propose a build over.	FEC/UU	

	A 6 metre easement (from centreline of sewer) has been assumed for both the combined sewer and the CSO overflow pipe, although the actual location of the existing sewers needs to be confirmed by survey. UU to confirm that a 6m easement is acceptable for both the CSO overflow pipe and the deeper combined sewer. UU comment – The sewers should be accurately located and although a minimum 6m standoff easement would be required in all cases, once the depth of the sewers is determined, we may request additional standoff distance in addition to the 6m easement in order to access and maintain the sewers post development. Surveys should be provided to determine the condition of the existing sewers and any construction from buildings nearby would need to take measures to ensure the sewers are protected. <i>Noted – Surveys will be undertaken following planning approval to accurately locate and determine the level of the sewers prior to establishing the easement requirement in each case.</i>		
5.3	John S requested as-built information for the existing combined sewer and overflow (CSO) from UU who confirmed that they will check and provide any available information. If this is not available a survey will be required. Following abortive surveys we have requested that MCC highways remove surface dressing which is covering the manholes in this section of Dantzic Street. They have agreed to do this and surveys can then be undertaken. United Utilities will not fund surveys of sewers, however will request that the scheduled cyclic survey be undertaken. <i>Noted. Surveys have not currently progressed in Dantzic Street. We will keep UU informed of any updates on this and will take into account any impact of the surveys on the development masterplan when received.</i> UU comment – Noted.	UU	
5.4	Wetlands and reprofiling of the existing river bank are being proposed on Travis Island. Existing UU assets included overflow pipe from CSO in Dantzic Street to be reviewed to check how they sit in relation to the proposed reprofiling works. Risk that overflow pipe could be daylighted. FEC also raised that a CSO outfall within the wetlands so close to a new residential development may not be appropriate. Strategy for positioning of CSO overflow in Travis Island to be agreed with UU. UU comment – Please submit strategy or initial plans for relocating the overflow pipe and cross section plans where river bank levels are being profiled along with accurate surveyed line and level of the sewer/overflow for further consideration. <i>Sections through Travis Island wetlands and riverbank to be provided as and when they are available. Position of CSO outfall in relation to the residential development to be reviewed when all relevant information (sections, survey information etc is available.</i> UU Comment – Any alterations would need to be assessed through our network team – please provide plans when available. <i>Noted - Drawings to be provided when available.</i>		

5.5	There is a further CSO on north bank of River Irk, to the south of plot RB03. UU remind team to not lose sight of this asset due to its vulnerability to a change in levels. UU comment – Please provide plan/sections of river bank changes to understand the impact on existing wastewater assets and CSO overflow outfalls. Any proposals would need to consider protection of this and all assets. Sections through north bank of River Irk to be provided when available. UU Comment – Any alterations would need to be assessed through our network team – please provide plans when available. <i>Noted - Drawings to be provided when available.</i>		
5.6	Some river walls on the northern side are to be removed to create terracing as part of the existing consented HIF infrastructure planning application. UU request to be consulted before commencement of this work due to proximity of assets such as the CSO mentioned above. FEC to be cognisant of need to engage with UU on this matter. UU comment – Please provide plans showing proposed works and measures to ensure protection of all existing assets is made. All existing wastewater assets would need to be located accurately through on site investigations. Location of existing UU wastewater assets to be confirmed by survey and impact of proposed works assessed. UU Comment – Consideration should be given for access and maintenance off all CSO during and after development. <i>Noted</i>	FEC	
5.7	FEC & WSP to look into rationalising the proposals surrounding CSOs and sewer diversions. UU comment – noted.		
5.8	Can UU confirm the likelihood/frequency of spillages occurring from existing CSOs in the vicinity of the site. UU comment – See comment in email.	UU	
6	Any Other Business		