

Engineers Comments Regarding Surface Water Drainage

Application Reference:	M/65/26/HH	Reviewer Reference:	ADC/KW/PC
Planning Officer:	Silvie Steiningerova	Date of Review:	12/10/2026
Site Name:	The Nook, Ancton Lane, PO22 6NN		
Application Description:	Construction of a single-storey rear/side infill extension adjoining the existing conservatory, replacement of the existing conservatory roof with a new lightweight pitched roof incorporating two rooflights, and associated external alterations.		
Assessment Number:	1 of 1		

Policy and Guidance Information	
Arun District Council Surface Water Drainage Guidance (including design checklists) - https://www.arun.gov.uk/surfacewater Land Drainage Consent – https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/fire-emergencies-and-crime/dealing-with-extreme-weather/flooding/flood-risk-management/ordinary-watercourse-land-drainage-consent/ Arun District Council Land Drainage Byelaws - https://www.arun.gov.uk/byelaws/ Arun District Council surface water pre-commencement conditions - https://www.arun.gov.uk/planning-pre-commencement-conditions The National Standards for SuDS - https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-standards-for-sustainable-drainage-systems/national-standards-for-sustainable-drainage-systems-suds The SuDs Manual [C753] by CIRIA	

Response	Objection
----------	-----------

References
The NPPF states that when determining any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere (paragraph 181, 182 and 187e). The PPG guides local planning authorities to refer to 'Sustainable drainage systems: non-statutory technical standards' [NsTS] and detailed industry guidance like The SuDS Manual [C753] by CIRIA to guide decisions about the design, maintenance, and operation of sustainable drainage systems for non-major development. The NsTS have been superseded by the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems [NSfS] from 19 June 2025. This consultation has been primarily informed by the NSfS and The SuDS Manual.

Summary

This summary highlights if critical items aligning with each of the standards have been met. Critical items are highlighted in **bold** on our surface water drainage design checklist (linked above). A failure to address these will likely result in an **objection** to an objection to a full or reserved matters planning application.

If any of these items are inadequately addressed by the submission, then their correction may result in a redesign of the surface water drainage scheme. A redesign is likely to have site wide implications such as the potential for storage structures to increase in volume or plan area, or the provision of other important infrastructure to satisfy the NSfS set out below.

A full written explanation of the assessment and response is given in the consultation comments to the planning officer.

Standard	Assessment	Response
1. Runoff destination	Insufficient	Objection
2. Interception drainage	Insufficient	No objection subject to conditions
3. Extreme Rainfall and Flooding	Insufficient	Objection
4. Water Quality	Insufficient	No objection subject to conditions
5. Amenity	Insufficient	No objection subject to conditions
6. Biodiversity	Insufficient	No objection subject to conditions
7. Construction, operation, maintenance, decommissioning and structural integrity	Insufficient	No objection subject to conditions

Reviewed Plans

The following documents have been submitted and reviewed to inform this consultation with reference to surface water drainage:

**Lidsey Drainage Impact Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Information (Drainage Strategy)
Flood Risk Assessment**

Consultation comments to the planning officer

0. General

- 0.1. Insufficient information regarding surface water drainage has been submitted to evidence that flood risk will not be increased as due to the proposed development.

1. Runoff destination

- 1.1. The proposed drainage strategy seeks to dispose of surface water from the roof of the proposed extension via a new soakaway system. The new roof to the existing conservatory will continue to drain to the existing surface water drainage system. Whilst the use of infiltration is supported in principle as the second highest priority disposal option within the drainage hierarchy, no infiltration testing results or supporting evidence have been submitted to demonstrate that infiltration is feasible at the site. As the viability of the proposed soakaway cannot be established, **we object** to the proposal.
- 1.2. To achieve an infiltration design, winter groundwater levels must be monitored to ensure that 1m of unsaturated ground is allowed for between the base of the soakaway or infiltration structure and the peak groundwater level. Ground conditions and infiltration potential are very variable in Middleton-on-Sea. Infiltration can be possible, but in parts, groundwater can be high or infiltration rates so low as to make infiltration unviable. This must be demonstrated by the applicant.
- 1.3. Standard 1 of the NSfS states that runoff from development shall be discharged to the final destination in accordance with the following hierarchy:
- 1 – Collected for non-potable use – Not proposed but encouraged in order to help achieve Standard 2 of the NSfS.
 - 2 – Infiltration to the ground – Proposed but not proven.
 - 3 – Discharge to an above ground surface water body – An Ordinary Watercourse (nearest) can be found running behind properties in Silver Birch Drive, approx. 100m to the west
 - 4 – Discharge to a surface water sewer – A public highway drain can be found in the verge to the front of the property.
 - 5 – Discharged to a combined sewer – None available.
- 1.4. It is essential that each discharge destination is considered in strict priority order, with higher priority options fully explored and demonstrably exhausted before progressing to lower priority alternatives. Robust evidence must be provided to discount a higher priority destination. In this case, no groundwater monitoring or infiltration testing has been submitted, meaning infiltration to ground, being a higher priority discharge method, has not yet been ruled out and must be properly assessed before considering subsequent options.
- 1.5. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA - WSCC) is the risk management authority for the ordinary watercourse. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed discharge rates, volumes or flow parameters have been agreed with them. This is an expectation of the NSfS. Consent may also be required from the LLFA for any proposed works to the watercourse.
- 1.6. In addition Arun District Council consent relating to the Land Drainage Bylaws may also be required. Please contact ADC at land.drainage@arun.gov.uk.

- 1.7. Also a public highway drainage system is present within Ancton Lane. The applicant should provide evidence from WSCC confirming that a connection to the highway drainage network is acceptable and has been approved in principle. In the absence of this information, any proposed connection cannot be verified as achievable.
- 1.8. With either of these options, it should be ensured that a gravity led solution can be achieved as a pumped solution would be strongly resisted.
- 1.9. The applicant has not provided any further information on how they may drain the site if infiltration is later found to be unviable.
- 1.10. The application site is in the Lidsey Wastewater Treatment Catchment Area. This catchment is the subject of a surface water management plan due in part to the recognised history of foul sewer flooding. It is important to ensure that future development does not exacerbate this problem.

2. Interception drainage

- 2.1. The applicant has not proposed any interception measures as part of the submitted drainage strategy. However, recognising that the National Planning Policy Framework advises that SuDS should be proportionate to the nature and scale of the development, we consider that the inclusion of the following interception features would be sufficient to demonstrate compliance in this instance, without the need for further detailed assessment.

- infiltration features designed to meet extreme rainfall standards.
- water butts or other means of reuse that are not designed for regular daily demand attached to all new downpipes.
- raingardens and bioretention features attached to all new downpipes.
- permeable surfacing.

- 2.2. These features will not affect the scale or layout of development and as such can be secured by condition.

3. Extreme rainfall and flooding

- 3.1. The site is entirely within a future Flood Zone. The source of future flood risk has not been identified; Product 4 data should be requested from the Environment Agency. The SuDS design may need to account for the additional volume of water entering site during a flood event. Furthermore, SuDS are only compatible in certain flood risk area i.e. in area which are entirely at risk of tidal flooding. Further guidance on designing SuDS in tidal areas can be found at www.arun.gov.uk/surfacewater.
- 3.2. At present, no modelling or supporting evidence; such as ground investigations or drainage plans have been submitted for engineering assessment. In the absence this evidence, we cannot assess if flood risk will be increased by the proposed development. Therefore, this application does not accord with the NPPF as set out above and for this reason **we object** to the proposal.

4. Water quality

4.1. Insufficient evidence of water quality benefits has been provided, and as such, Standard 4 of the NSfS has not been met. However, the submission of this evidence is unlikely to affect the scale or layout of the development. Therefore, we do not object to the proposal on these grounds, subject to a condition securing the provision of details demonstrating water quality benefits.

5. Amenity

5.1. Insufficient amenity benefits arising from the proposed SuDS have been identified, and therefore Standard 5 of the Systems NSfS has not been met. However, the submission of such evidence is unlikely to affect the scale or layout of the development. Accordingly, we do not object to the proposal on these grounds, subject to a condition securing details of amenity benefits.

6. Biodiversity

6.1. Insufficient biodiversity benefits arising from the proposed SuDS have been identified, and therefore Standard 6 of the Systems NSfS has not been met. However, the submission of such evidence is unlikely to affect the scale or layout of the development. Accordingly, we do not object to the proposal on these grounds, subject to a condition securing details of biodiversity benefits.

7. Construction, operation, maintenance, decommissioning and structural integrity

7.1. Insufficient information regarding the construction, operation and maintenance of the SuDS system, and therefore Standard 8 of the Systems NSfS. However, in the absence of significant existing trees which could impact the scale and layout and location of SuDS features, most elements of this standard can normally be secured via condition. The submission of a Management and Maintenance Plan is unlikely to affect the scale or layout of the development. Accordingly, we do not object to the proposal on these grounds, subject to a condition securing the detailed surface water drainage design.

8. Suggested conditions / Overcoming the objection

8.1. As this is not a holding objection or a request for further information, requested conditions are not listed. If you are minded to approve this application, please reconsult engineers for a list of suggested conditions to ensure that the development is adequately drained and does not increase flood risk elsewhere.

8.2. The imposition of conditions at this stage rather than overcoming the objection could result in a circumstance where the condition cannot be discharged. In the event of attaching a condition that cannot be discharged, permission may be invalid or that condition could be deemed to be unreasonable.

8.3. If you are minded to allow the applicant additional time to submit further documents to support this application, then further evidence may overcome our objection. Please do not allow the applicant to submit further documents without prior discussion as to whether it will be possible for these to be assessed or influence your determination.

This application has been assessed with regards to surface water drainage design only, together with land drainage aspects if deemed necessary.

Other planning matters occasionally effect the surface water drainage design. If plans relating to other matters have been assessed for their impact on the proposed drainage, then it must not be assumed that they have been assessed for any other purpose. The planning officer is advised to check for conflicts with any existing approved plans and to consult any relevant consultees as appropriate.

It has been identified that the following consultees may have comments about the plans that have been submitted and reviewed for this application:

- ☐ Landscaping officer (proposed trees and landscaping)
- ☐ Tree officer (existing trees)
- ☒ Environment Agency (main rivers and fluvial/tidal flood risk, River Arun internal drainage board, groundwater source protection zones)
- ☐ Southern Water (foul drainage and surface water disposal to public sewer network/groundwater source protection zones)
- ☐ Portsmouth Water (groundwater source protection zones)
- ☐ Lead local flood authority (all other sources of flooding and ordinary watercourses)
- ☐ Other: Specify
- ☒ None

www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to <https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>

Our priorities...

- Improving the wellbeing of Arun
- Delivering the right homes in the right places
- Supporting our environment to support us
- Fulfilling Arun's economic potential
- Our core foundations

ARUN
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Connect with us: [Facebook](#) | [X](#) | [Instagram](#)

From: Kathryn Welch <Kathryn.Welch@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 October 2026 16:17
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>; Silvie Steiningerova <Silvie.Steiningerova@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Joe Dixon <Joe.Dixon@arun.gov.uk>; Paul Cann <Paul.Cann@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: M/65/26/HH

Please find attached the engineers response, an objection.

Kind regards,

Kathryn Welch
Senior Planning Officer, Planning Department

Please note: My working hours are currently split between Development Management and ADC Engineers, which may result in extended response times. **Development Management:** Tuesdays and Thursdays **ADC Engineers:** Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays

T: 01903 737789

E: kathryn.welch@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF

www.arun.gov.uk



Our priorities...				
 Improving the wellbeing of Arun	 Delivering the right homes in the right places	 Supporting our environment to support us	 Fulfilling Arun's economic potential	 