

Date: 30 January 2026
Application: 260049



**WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL**

WBC Drainage

Development Management &
Compliance

P.O. Box 157

Shute End, Wokingham

Berkshire, RG40 1BN

Tel: (0118) 974 6000

Minicom No: (0118) 974 6991

Dear WBC Drainage,

Full Planning Approval Consultation

Application Number: 260049

Applicant: Mr D Phillips

Site Address: Pound Lane Cottage, Pound Lane, Hurst, RG10 0RS

Parish: St. Nicholas, Hurst

Grid Reference: Easting - 480967, Northing - 172236

Type of Development: Other Change of Use

Proposal: Full application for the proposed change of use of land to mixed used comprising of agriculture (keeping of goats) and storage of building materials together with the erection of 2no. storage buildings.

Case Officer: Kieran Neumann

Development Management has received the above application, and we require your comments on the proposal using the recommended memorandum below. The documents associated with this are available to view in NEC DM using the application number 260049. Alternatively, public documents are available to view on the Council's planning application search page: [Wokingham Borough Council Online Planning](#).

Please index your response into NEC DM against the application. If you are recommending conditions, you should give a reason with reference to relevant policies. A list of standard conditions can be requested from the case officer.

Your observations are required in respect of this application by **20 February 2026**.

Yours sincerely,
Development Management & Compliance

MEMORANDUM

From:	NT		
Service	WBC Drainage	App No:	260049
Address:	Pound Lane Cottage, Pound Lane, Hurst, RG10 0RS.		
Proposal:	Full application for the proposed change of use of land to mixed used comprising of agriculture (keeping of goats) and storage of building materials together with the erection of 2no. storage buildings.		
Type of Development:	Other Change of Use		
Site Visit Made:	No		

Summary Of Recommendations

- ☐ No comment
☐ No objection
☐ No objection subject to conditions (and reasons) **stated below**
☐ Request further information before determination as **stated below**
☒ Objection due to the reason(s) **stated below**

Comments On Proposal

LLFA received Full application for the proposed change of use of land to mixed used comprising of agriculture (keeping of goats) and storage of building materials together with the erection of 2no. storage buildings on 30th January 2026.

1) Key acceptability points

- The strategy recognises the site is underlain by London Clay and that infiltration is not viable (trial pit water rise/high groundwater). The proposal indicates attenuation within permeable subbase and restricted discharge to a ditch using a 20mm orifice. Storage is designed for 1 in 100 year + 40% climate change (stated). Those principles are broadly aligned with a SuDS-led approach provided the scheme is corrected/clarified and demonstrated to be hydraulically robust.

Matters requiring clarification / correction/ Internal inconsistencies / likely copy-paste errors

There are several statements that do not match the application description and undermine confidence in the design narrative:

- The report refers to “residential flats” and “greenroofs” in the treatment section/summary. The summary also references a different site address (“374 Ewell Road, Tolworth”) which is not this location.

Ditch location / outfall description conflicts

- Existing drainage section states an open ditch along the eastern boundary.
- Proposed drainage text/drawing indicates discharge to ditch to the west.

Confirm which ditch is proposed as the outfall (east or west), provide the exact outfall location, and include evidence of positive fall from the control chamber to the outfall.

Infiltration not viable, but roofs said to soak to ground/soakaway

The report concludes infiltration testing was abandoned due to high water table and infiltration is not viable, yet also states the timber sheds will discharge to ground and soak... or over ground and soakaway.

This is contradictory. Roof drainage should be captured into the same attenuated system (or otherwise justified with a robust method). Please confirm no soakaways are proposed given groundwater constraints, unless supported by compliant testing and groundwater level data.

Runoff rate restriction / greenfield rate justification

- The report notes IH124 returned 0.0 l/s greenfield rate and therefore proposes a 20mm orifice as minimum under new National Standards

Please Provide:

1. the greenfield runoff calculations inputs/outputs (catchment area, soil index/SAAR etc.); the proposed restricted discharge rate (l/s) achieved by the 20mm orifice (with head assumptions); and confirmation that the rate is as close as reasonably practicable to greenfield

Also confirm whether the ditch is ordinary watercourse and whether any third-party constraints limit the discharge rate.

3) Hydraulic performance / modelling concerns

The MicroDrainage outputs show FLOOD RISK at nodes (e.g., S1/S2) across return periods including 100 year + 40% CC. Even if “flood volume” is shown as 0.0000 in the table, the “FLOOD RISK” status needs explaining/rectifying.

Please provide:

- the model assumptions (node types, cover levels, flood type settings, surcharge settings), confirmation of no on-site flooding in 1:30 (unless confined to designated storage features), and an exceedance routing plan for 1:100 + CC demonstrating flows route away from buildings, stored materials, and neighbouring land, and do not increase offsite risk.

Water quality and land use risk (goats + building materials)

The current water quality section classifies hardstanding as medium and uses permeable paving as treatment. However, the proposed use includes:

- storage of building materials (potential for silt-laden runoff, cement fines, wash-off from aggregates, accidental spills), and goat keeping (risk of nutrient/pathogen loading if runoff contacts fouled areas).

Please update the pollution risk assessment to reflect the actual land use and include source control measures, for example:

- designated bunded/covered areas for fine materials/cementitious products, silt management (management controls to prevent contaminated runoff entering the ditch (especially during wash-down or wet-weather handling),
- confirmation that any areas subject to animal fouling are not hydraulically connected to the outfall without appropriate treatment/containment.

Permeable surfaces can clog rapidly where sediments are present; maintenance proposals should be strengthened accordingly.

Constructability and specification gaps - What surface is actually proposed: the report describes “permeable gravel surface” and “permeable paving”; the drawing references permeable paving with 300mm and elsewhere 500mm subbase thickness.

Ordinary watercourse consent / third-party approvals

Discharge to a ditch will typically require riparian owner permission, and potentially ordinary watercourse consent for the outfall/works (depending on the consenting authority locally). Add an informative/condition requiring evidence of right to discharge and any necessary consents prior to commencement.

LLFA recommendation

At this stage, LLFA recommends objection on surface water drainage grounds due to the material inconsistencies and the need for further evidence on outfall location, hydraulic performance (flood risk flags), and water quality controls for the proposed mixed use.

Conditions & Reasons (if required)

Date:	03/02/2026	Signed:	NT
--------------	------------	----------------	----