

Engineers Comments Regarding Surface Water Drainage

Application Reference:	M/92/25/HH	Reviewer Reference:	ADC/KW/PC
Planning Officer:	Silvie Steiningerova	Date of Review:	09/01/2025
Site Name:	100 Ancton Way, Elmer, PO22 6JR		
Application Description:	Proposed front porch.		
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The NsTS have been superseded by the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems [NSfS] from 19 June 2025.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:

Flood Risk Assessment

Lidsey Foul Water Drainage Impact Statement

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 designer proposes to drain surface water to soakaways designed in accordance with Part H of the Building Regulations. We support the use of infiltration as the second-highest priority method of surface water disposal (after water reuse); however, the necessary evidence to demonstrate that infiltration is viable has not been provided. Fundamental information, such as groundwater monitoring data and infiltration testing results, have not been provided. Furthermore, should infiltration be proven unviable, no alternative discharge location has been identified. Consequently, it

has not been demonstrated that the site can be sustainably drained, and **we object to the proposal.**

1.2. 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.
- 2 – Infiltration to the ground – proposed but not proven
- 3 – Discharge to an above ground surface water body – none available.
- 4 – Discharge to a surface water sewer – private surface water sewer to highway.
- 5 – Discharged to a combine sewer – none available.

1.3. 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.

1.4. 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.

1.5. A private surface water drain has been identified to the front of the property in the highway. It may be, if infiltration is found to be unviable that discharge to this location is potentially possible. Permission from the owner of the drain will be required, as will the evidence to prove that the system is fit for purpose and has capacity to take the additional flow. Topographical information would also be required as pumped systems are only allowable under exceptional circumstances.

1.6. 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. The site is within a local flood risk zone identified within the surface water management plan [LFRZ_013]. The plan states that flood risk from pluvial water, groundwater and public sewers is high. It states that “hydraulic overload of the foul sewer system has been confirmed.

2. Interception drainage

2.1. The applicant has not proposed any interception features. In recognition that the National Planning Policy Framework states that SuDS should be proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal we are willing to accept that the following interception features can demonstrate compliance without 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 proposed development introduces new built form within an area at risk of flooding. The site is wholly located within flood zone 3a – the source of this risk has not been acceptably identified in the accompanying Flood Risk Assessment.

3.2. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has not provided robust or accurate hydraulic modelling to demonstrate the site's flood risk. It is not supported by product 4 data for the site which can be requested from the Environment Agency. It is important that this information is submitted as it will demonstrate accurately the flood risk on the site and its source. SuDS features should not be located in fluvial flood zones. (Please see our guidance relating to this at www.arun.gov.uk/surfacewater). Without an accurate understanding of the flood risk on the site, we cannot assess if the proposed drainage strategy is compliant. Therefore, **I object to the application.**

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.

Drainage Impact on Other Planning Matters

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

PL- Consultation- Engineers response

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

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

From: Kathryn Welch <Kathryn.Welch@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 January 2026 12:20
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>; Silvie Steiningerova <Silvie.Steiningerova@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Paul Cann <Paul.Cann@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Planning Consultation on: M/92/25/HH

Please find attached the engineer's 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



From: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>

Sent: 05 December 2025 15:19

To: Land Drainage <Land.Drainage@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: Planning Consultation on: M/92/25/HH

To: **Engineers (Drainage)**

NOTIFICATION FROM ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

Planning Permission for Works or Extension to a Dwelling

Application No: M/92/25/HH
Registered: 4th December 2025
Site Address: 100 Ancton Way Elmer Middleton-on-sea PO22 6JR
Grid Reference: 498916 100381
Description of Works: Proposed front porch.

The Council have received the above application.

[Click here to view the application and documents](#) The website is updated once a day in the evening, so you may need to wait until the day after this notification to view the documents.

Should you have any comments to make, these should be sent by replying to this email by 11th January 2026 . You can also monitor the progress of this application through the Council web site:

<https://www.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-search>

The application will be determined having regard to the development plan policies (if any are relevant) and other material considerations. The development plan can be accessed via the website

<https://www.arun.gov.uk/development-plan> as can information on what comments we can consider

<https://www.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-comments>

Please be aware that any comments you may make will be available on our website so please do not insert personal details or signatures on your reply.

Should the application go to appeal the Planning Inspectorate will publish any comments made to the Council on their website: <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/> but they will protect personal details.

When the appeal relates to a householder application there will be no opportunity to make further comments.

In the absence of a reply within the period stated, I shall assume that you have no observations to make.

Yours sincerely

Rhiannon Lloyd

Planning Officer- Arun District Council

Telephone: 01903 737637

Email: rhiannon.lloyd@arun.gov.uk

PLCONSULT (ODB) 2020