Our Ref: 26448 / LC / 001

Date: 19 November 2025

JPP Consulting Ltd
Grand Union Works| Whilton Locks
Daventry | Northamptonshire | NN11 2NH

T: 01604 781811
E: mail@jppuk.net
W:jppuk.net

Burmor Construction
FAO Patrick Burke
Burmor House
Sunderland Road
Northfields Industrial Estate
Market Deeping
Peterborough
PE6 8FD

Dear Patrick

Re: Land West of Wychwood, Church End, Hilton – response to LLFA comments dated 17.10.2025

Please see below our responses to Cambridgeshire County Council LLFA comments dated 17.10.2025, received in relation to the proposed residential development at Church End, Hilton (planning application ref 25/00781/REM).

LLFA Comment 1 – *Please provide the following information on the Drained Area Layout Drawing, ref:103*

- *Clarification of permeable and impermeable areas*
- *Downpipe locations, including how they discharge into the surface water system.*
- *Invert levels where chambers are proposed*
- *Clarification of hydrobrake, including location on discharge rate*

JPP Response to Comment 1 – The information requested by the LLFA is already provided in full on the dedicated Engineering Drawing (JPP drawing 26448-102). It is not standard practice to duplicate detailed engineering data on a Drained Area Layout, nor is this a validation requirement. For completeness, each matter is addressed below:

Clarification of permeable and impermeable areas: Impermeable areas are clearly identified on JPP drawing 26448-103, supported by a drained areas table confirming contributions to each pipe run. Greenfield runoff calculations correctly use impermeable area excluding urban creep, consistent with LLFA guidance. For clarity:

Total site area within the red line boundary: 1.135ha
Total proposed impermeable area (excluding urban creep): 0.291ha
Resulting permeable area: 0.884ha

Downpipe locations, including how they discharge into the surface water system: All rainwater pipe locations and connections into the surface water system are shown on JPP drawing 26448-102.

Invert levels where chambers are proposed: Invert levels for every surface water chamber are already provided on JPP drawing 26448-102.

Clarification on hydrobrake, including location on discharge rate: The hydrobrake location and restricted discharge rate are clearly shown on JPP drawing 26448-102.

Given the above, no further amendment to drawing 26448-103 is necessary or justified.

LLFA Comment 2 – *Please provide the following information on the Detention Basin Section Drawing, ref 104. Outfall details.*

JPP Response to Comment 2 – A cross-section of the outfall arrangement has been added to JPP drawing 26448-104 to satisfy this request.

LLFA Comment 3 – The site layout should account for the existing drainage infrastructure, ensuring clear access for maintenance of the ditches by a management body. This should include a suitable easement for any maintenance equipment that may be required for future access works on the ditch. Until the site has addressed the riparian ownership issue, such as ensuing a maintenance strip is present along the entirety of the existing watercourses, we are unable to support this application. The applicant must address this riparian ownership issue, confirming the maintenance regime and access to the watercourse as part of the detailed design.

JPP Response to Comment 3 – The development is 100% affordable housing, and all plots adjacent to the existing watercourses will remain in the ownership of the developer or their appointed management company. Riparian responsibilities therefore remain consolidated and will not be fragmented between individual plot owners.

Maintenance access is secured throughout the site:

- A formalised access route is provided via the shared driveway along the top of the bank—an improvement over the existing unrestricted arrangement.
- Elsewhere, a continuous 3m maintenance corridor is provided, as shown on JPP drawing 26448-106.
- The new site access also facilitates access for maintenance vehicles, whereas no formal vehicle access currently exists.

JPP drawing 26448-106 identifies the responsible party for each drainage asset and includes maintenance schedules. On this basis, the LLFA's concern regarding maintenance access is addressed in full.

LLFA Comment 4 – The applicant has proposed to drain surface water from the site into an existing watercourse. However, no information about this surface water network has been provided. If the applicant is planning to discharge their site into an existing watercourse, the following information is required:

- Condition of watercourse (how well maintained is the watercourse)
- Capacity of the watercourse (the applicant must demonstrate that the watercourse has sufficient capacity to cope with the influx of surface water from the site).
- Outfall to the watercourse (the applicant must identify a final outfall of the watercourse)

JPP Response to Comment 4 – The principle of discharging surface water to this watercourse was approved at outline stage within the FRA and Surface Water Drainage Strategy prepared by Stantec (ref. 45973/4001 Rev B, November 2020). The LLFA previously accepted this strategy, including restricted discharge to greenfield runoff rates. It is therefore unclear why this approach is being re-examined at Reserved Matters stage. For clarity:

Condition of watercourse:
The developer, as riparian owner, will maintain the on-site watercourse network in accordance with the maintenance schedules shown on JPP drawing 26448-104. Off-site ditch condition is the responsibility of third parties; however, the development does not increase flows to the watercourse.

Capacity of the watercourse:
No additional flows are being introduced. Stantec's hydraulic modelling (Technical Note ref. 332610757-TN001 Rev 3) confirms that the development does not increase downstream flood risk.

Outfall:
The proposed headwall and outfall point are shown on JPP drawing 26448-102.
The downstream watercourse network is documented in the approved FRA (Figure 3.1).

It is therefore demonstrated—both through the approved strategy and updated technical modelling—that the proposed drainage arrangement is acceptable and compliant with LLFA requirements.

Conclusion
The above responses, together with the submitted drawings, address all LLFA comments in full. Given that the drainage strategy is consistent with the already approved outline consent and that no additional flows are introduced to the receiving watercourse, we trust the LLFA will now remove their objection and enable the Reserved Matters application to progress.

Yours sincerely,

Luke Clarke MEng (Hons)
Director for JPP Consulting Ltd

Encl.

JPP drawing 26448-102E – Preliminary Engineering Layout
JPP drawing 26448-103D – Drained Areas Layout
JPP drawing 26448-104D – Detention Basin Sections
JPP drawing 26448-106 Drainage Maintenance Plan
Stantec Technical Note 332610757 TN001 Hydraulic Modelling Rev 3
MicroDrainage Calculations ref 26448