

FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE RESPONSE STATEMENT

Response to MSDC Flood Risk and Drainage Team Consultation Comments

122 High Street, Hurstpierpoint, West Sussex

Backland Development — Proposed 1/2 Bedroom Dwelling | Nupur Indian Restaurant

Site address:	122 High Street, Hurstpierpoint, West Sussex
Description:	Backland development — proposed 1 or 2 bedroom dwelling to the rear of the Nupur Indian Restaurant
Previous consent:	Planning consent previously granted for a dwelling on this site
Prepared for:	Mr Choudhury
Version / Date:	1.0 23-3-2026
Planning reference:	DM/25/2155
Local Planning Authority:	Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC)
Attenuation system:	Storm crate tank — 4.0m x 4.25m x 0.4m deep (6.8 m³ total / 6.5 m³ usable)
Controlled discharge rate:	0.825 l/s via 25mm orifice plate to existing combined sewer
In response to:	MSDC Flood Risk and Drainage Team consultation response 19-3-2026

1. Introduction

This statement has been prepared in response to the consultation comments issued by the Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) Flood Risk and Drainage Team in connection with the proposed backland development of a new 1 or 2 bedroom dwelling to the rear of 122 High Street (Nupur Indian Restaurant), Hurstpierpoint, West Sussex.

It is noted at the outset that this represents the third attempt to provide sufficient information in respect of drainage and flood risk at application stage. This response has been prepared carefully and in good faith to address each of the specific points raised by the Flood Risk and Drainage Team, and to provide the council with sufficient information to allow the drainage objection to be resolved.

It is also noted that a planning consent has previously been granted for a dwelling on this site. The principle of residential development in this location has therefore already been established. This response seeks to demonstrate that the proposed development can be made safe and compliant in respect of flood risk and drainage, and that the outstanding concerns raised by the council can be addressed.

The council's objection raises concerns under two main headings — Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage — and each is addressed in turn in the sections that follow. Where specific bullet-point requirements are listed in the council's response, each is addressed individually to ensure nothing is overlooked.

2. Site Context and Key Constraints

Before addressing the individual points raised, it is important to set out the specific character and constraints of this site clearly, as they are central to understanding why the drainage strategy takes the form it does.

Site type:	Urban backland plot, accessed from High Street, Hurstpierpoint
Existing use:	Rear garden / service area & storage building to the Nupur Indian Restaurant, 122 High Street
Proposed development:	1 or 2 bedroom dwelling with associated garden, access, and parking
Flood Zone:	Flood Zone 1 (very low risk of fluvial flooding)
Surface water flood risk (RoFSW):	Very Low to Medium — principally affecting the rear garden area. The footprint of the proposed dwelling itself falls outside the mapped surface water flood risk area.
Groundwater:	See Section 3.3
Soakaways:	Not feasible — urban location, proximity to existing buildings and highways prevents use of infiltration drainage. Gault Clay geology confirms low permeability.
Greywater / rainwater harvesting tank:	Not feasible — insufficient space within site layout for below-ground storage tank
Total impermeable area:	167 m ² (0.0167 ha) — dwelling roof 83 m ² + hard-standing 84 m ²

Attenuation system:	Below-ground storm crate system — 4.0m x 4.25m x 0.4m deep, 6.8 m ³ total / 6.5 m ³ usable
Flow control:	25mm diameter orifice plate — controlled discharge rate 0.825 l/s to existing combined sewer
Drainage engineer:	Hemsley Consulting Ltd — Job No. 6481, calculations dated 24/02/2026
Discharge route:	Attenuation then controlled discharge to existing combined sewer — only viable route given site constraints

The site presents genuine and significant constraints to conventional SuDS drainage solutions. It is an urban backland plot bounded by existing buildings and highway infrastructure. As set out in the MSDC Detailed Drainage Design Technical Summary (v2.0), the drainage hierarchy requires infiltration to be explored first; however, where this is demonstrably not feasible, discharge to a watercourse or sewer is the appropriate fallback. The council's own consultation response acknowledges discharge to the existing combined sewer connection as the proposed route and notes it warrants further assessment rather than outright rejection.

This response demonstrates that the drainage strategy — attenuation of surface water runoff with discharge at a controlled rate to the existing combined sewer — is the only viable option for this site, that it can be made to work within policy requirements, and that the development as a whole can be demonstrated to be safe for its lifetime.

3. Flood Risk

The council's Flood Risk and Drainage Team has raised the following specific concerns regarding flood risk, each of which is addressed below.

3.1 Climate Change Allowances for Surface Water Flood Risk

Council's Objection Point:

Climate change allowances for surface water flood risk (2023 EA uplift) have not been provided.

Response:

Climate change has been taken into account in the attenuation design. Hemsley Consulting Ltd's calculations (Job No. 6481, 24/02/2026) apply a 40% rainfall intensity uplift for climate change, in accordance with EA guidance for the South East region.

The Environment Agency's Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) mapping has also been reviewed for both present day and future climate change scenarios. As noted in the council's own response, the mapping shows the site at 'Very Low' to 'Medium' surface water flood risk.

Crucially, the footprint of the proposed dwelling itself falls outside the mapped surface water flood risk area for all scenarios, including with climate change. It is the rear garden area that falls within the mapped risk zone, not the building.

The dwelling is therefore not at direct surface water flood risk even accounting for future climate change. The attenuation system has been sized using the climate-adjusted 100-year rainfall, producing a critical storage requirement of 5.91 m³ (60-minute storm), increased to 6.5 m³ after

the hydraulic adjustment factor and 6.8 m³ total including crate void ratio.

3.2 Floor Levels Relative to Predicted Flood Depths

Council's Objection Point:

Design plans showing floor levels relative to predicted flood depths with appropriate freeboard levels have not been provided.

Response:

As set out above, the footprint of the proposed dwelling falls outside the mapped surface water flood risk area entirely. The EA RoFSW mapping confirms that surface water flood risk is limited to the rear garden area behind the dwelling, not the building footprint itself.

The finished floor level of the proposed dwelling will be set at a minimum of 150mm above the surrounding external ground level, which is the standard freeboard requirement and is consistent with MSDC guidance. Given that the dwelling sits outside the flood risk zone, this standard threshold is more than sufficient to provide protection against any residual surface water risk in the vicinity of the building.

3.3 Groundwater Flood Risk

Council's Objection Point:

An assessment of groundwater flood risk has not been provided.

Response:

Hurstpierpoint sits on the Lower Greensand and Gault Clay geological sequence. Gault Clay is a low-permeability formation that does not readily transmit groundwater, and the area does not have a significant history of groundwater flooding.

The British Geological Survey (BGS) groundwater flooding susceptibility mapping for central Hurstpierpoint indicates low susceptibility to groundwater flooding at this location, reflecting the clay-dominated geology.

The proposed dwelling is a modest above-ground structure with no basement or below-ground habitable space, meaning there are no below-ground elements that could be affected by groundwater. The finished floor level is to be set above external ground level as described in Section 3.2.

Given the geology, the absence of any basement, and the modest scale of the development, groundwater flooding is not considered a material risk to this proposal and no further assessment is considered necessary or proportionate.

3.4 Sewer Flood Risk

Council's Objection Point:

An assessment of sewer flood risk has not been provided.

Response:

The existing combined sewer serving the High Street area is a long-established public sewer maintained by Southern Water.

The development proposes to attenuate all surface water runoff on site before discharging at a controlled rate of 0.825 l/s via a 25mm orifice plate to the existing combined sewer connection. This controlled rate is far lower than would be discharged from the site in an uncontrolled manner under existing conditions, meaning the development does not increase loading on the sewer and does not increase the risk of sewer flooding.

The applicant acknowledges the council's recommendation to re-consult Southern Water regarding the surface water connection and confirms this will be undertaken as part of the building regulation submissions.

Southern Water's formal response confirming acceptance of the connection in principle can be provided to the council as a supplementary document once received. The development is a single small dwelling with a total impermeable area of just 167 m², making the drainage loading on the sewer extremely modest.

3.5 Flood Risk to Neighbouring Properties

Council's Objection Point:

Evidence that the proposed development and flood mitigation measures will not increase flood risk outside the development site, and evidence that the development will not increase flood risk elsewhere, have not been provided.

Response:

The proposed development has been designed to ensure that it does not increase flood risk to neighbouring properties or beyond the site boundary.

Surface water runoff from the new dwelling will be attenuated on site and discharged at a controlled rate of 0.825 l/s to the existing combined sewer — a rate lower than the uncontrolled discharge from the existing yard and garden area.

The attenuation system compensates for the loss of permeable garden land within the building footprint, ensuring there is no net increase in runoff volume or peak flow rate leaving the site.

Exceedance flows will be contained within the rear garden area of the site, directed away from the neighbouring restaurant building and away from the High Street. No alteration is proposed to the existing drainage arrangements serving the restaurant, meaning there is no risk of any displaced flood risk to adjacent premises or the highway.

The development is a single small dwelling and its overall hydrological impact on the surrounding

area is negligible.

3.6 Reducing Flood Risk On Site

Council's Objection Point:

Evidence that the development will reduce flood risk on site where possible has not been provided.

Response:

The proposed development includes a number of measures that will actively reduce surface water flood risk on the site compared to the existing situation.

In the existing condition, surface water falling on the rear yard and service area drains in an entirely uncontrolled manner with no formal attenuation.

The proposed development introduces a formal managed drainage system for the first time, providing controlled attenuation and discharge. Beyond the attenuation system itself, flood risk on site is further reduced through: the installation of water butts on roof downpipes, capturing runoff from frequent smaller rainfall events and reducing the volume entering the formal drainage system; the use of permeable surfacing for any parking or access areas, managing rainfall at source; the retention of the rear garden as soft-landscaped permeable ground, maintaining natural infiltration across the majority of the site; and the setting of the finished floor level a minimum of 150mm above external ground level, ensuring the dwelling itself is protected from any residual surface water risk. Collectively, these measures represent a clear and demonstrable improvement in on-site drainage management compared to the existing unmanaged situation.

3.7 Flood Resistance and Resilience Measures

Council's Objection Point:

Details of resistance and/or resilience measures to address flood risk have not been provided.

Response:

Given that the footprint of the proposed dwelling falls outside the mapped surface water flood risk area, the residual flood risk to the building itself is low. Nonetheless, the following proportionate flood resistance and resilience measures are proposed, appropriate to the site's Flood Zone 1 location and the modest residual surface water risk in the wider garden area:

the finished floor level will be set at a minimum of 150mm above external ground level, providing a primary barrier against shallow surface water; external door thresholds will incorporate a positive step-up from external ground level; ground floor construction will include a continuous waterproof membrane at slab level as standard; all below-floor service entry points will be sealed against water ingress; and ground floor finishes will be specified as water-resilient materials such as ceramic or porcelain tiles to allow rapid recovery in the unlikely event of any minor ingress. These measures are consistent with the guidance in the NPPF, PPG, and CIRIA C790 and are proportionate to the actual level of flood risk at this location.

3.8 Flood Warning, Evacuation, and Emergency Plan

Council's Objection Point:

A flood warning, evacuation, and emergency plan, including safe access and egress, has not been provided.

Response:

A flood warning, evacuation, and emergency plan is set out at Appendix A of this document. In summary: the proposed dwelling is in Flood Zone 1 with a very low probability of fluvial flooding; the dwelling footprint is outside the mapped surface water flood risk area; and the site is not within an EA formal flood warning area.

Occupants will be advised to monitor Met Office weather warnings during periods of heavy rainfall and to follow the actions set out in the flood plan if significant surface water ponding occurs in the rear garden.

Safe access and egress is available at all times via the existing access from the High Street, which is at a higher level than the rear garden and is not itself at surface water flood risk. The flood plan at Appendix A sets out the specific actions for occupants, emergency contact numbers, and the evacuation route in full.

4. Surface Water Drainage

The council's Flood Risk and Drainage Team has raised the following specific concerns regarding surface water drainage, each of which is addressed below.

4.1 Drainage Hierarchy — Justification for Discharge to Combined Sewer

Council's Objection Point:

Confirmation that the drainage hierarchy has been followed, with justification for discharge to a combined sewer, is required.

Response:

The drainage hierarchy set out in the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) (Defra, June 2025) requires that drainage schemes seek to infiltrate first, then discharge to a watercourse, before discharging to a sewer as a last resort.

This hierarchy has been followed and considered in full for this site. Infiltration (Step 1): Infiltration to ground via soakaways is not feasible at this site. The site is an urban backland plot tightly bounded by the existing restaurant building, the rear boundary wall, and neighbouring buildings. There is insufficient distance from any of these structures to site a soakaway safely — a minimum of 5 metres separation from any building is required, and this cannot be achieved within the available space.

The proximity of the highway on the High Street further constrains any infiltration option towards the front of the site. Ground conditions in central Hurstpierpoint, which sits on Gault Clay, are also generally regarded as low permeability, making soakaway drainage inherently unlikely to be effective.

Discharge to watercourse (Step 2): There is no surface water watercourse within or adjacent to the site to which discharge could be made. The High Street is a public highway and the surrounding area is fully built out urban frontage. No watercourse connection is available.

Discharge to combined sewer (Step 3): With infiltration and watercourse discharge both ruled out, discharge to the existing combined sewer is the only available option. The council's own consultation response acknowledges this proposed approach. The applicant confirms that Southern Water will be re-consulted, as recommended, and their formal position on the surface water connection will be provided. The discharge rate is controlled by on-site attenuation to ensure that the rate of discharge does not exceed the existing situation.

4.2 Existing Surface Water Drainage Arrangements

Council's Objection Point:

A plan showing the site's existing surface water drainage arrangements has not been provided.

Response:

The existing site comprises the rear yard, service area & storage building of the Nupur Indian Restaurant. In the existing condition, surface water falling on the yard & storage building drains in an entirely uncontrolled manner — partly infiltrating into the ground, partly running off overland, and partly entering the existing combined sewer via a yard gully or grating.

There is no formal attenuation or flow control in the existing arrangement. The proposed development will introduce a formal drainage system for the first time, with controlled discharge to the existing combined sewer at a rate of 0.825 l/s via a 25mm orifice plate — significantly lower than the current uncontrolled discharge from the same area during storm events.

A plan showing the existing drainage arrangements cannot be included on the drainage layout drawing accompanying this submission as it is currently unknown.

4.3 Updated Drainage Calculations — FEH Data, Cv, Climate Change, Urban Creep

Council's Objection Point:

Updated drainage calculations are required demonstrating: use of FEH rainfall data (not SAAR-based methods); a runoff coefficient (Cv) of 1.0 applied to impermeable areas; design for the 1 in 100-year event plus appropriate climate change allowance and urban creep.

Response:

Updated drainage calculations by Hemsley Consulting Ltd (Job No. 6481, 24/02/2026) accompany this submission as Appendix B. The key parameters are: SAAR 720mm for Hydrological Region 7; a 40% climate change uplift applied to rainfall intensity in accordance with

EA guidance; a runoff coefficient of 1.0 applied to all impermeable surfaces; total contributing impermeable area 167 m²; and a critical 60-minute storm producing a storage requirement of 6.8 m³ total (6.5 m³ usable).

It is acknowledged that MSDC requires FEH-based rather than SAAR-based rainfall data. Hemsley Consulting have been requested to provide a supplementary note confirming that the SAAR approach produces equivalent or conservative results for this location, or to re-run using FEH Web Service data. For a site of this size in this rainfall region the difference between the two methods is expected to be marginal and the attenuation volume is not anticipated to change. That supplementary note will be provided to the council as soon as it is received.

4.4 Detailed Drainage Layout Plan

Council's Objection Point:

A detailed, scaled drainage layout plan is required showing: SuDS components and storage features; catchment areas and flow paths; discharge points; site constraints (root protection areas, utilities, level constraints, offsets).

Response:

A detailed, scaled drainage layout drawing accompanies this submission. This shows the proposed below-ground storm crate attenuation system (4.0m x 4.25m x 0.4m deep, 6.8 m³ total) and its location within the site; the 25mm diameter orifice plate flow control chamber discharging at 0.825 l/s to the existing combined sewer; the overflow pipe positioned 0.5m above the orifice; the silt trap and debris screen on the feed to the tank; the roof catchment area with flow directions; water butt positions; permeable paving areas; exceedance flow routing; and site constraints including proximity to existing buildings and boundary walls.

4.5 Feasibility of Attenuation Within the Site Layout

Council's Objection Point:

Demonstration that the proposed attenuation features are feasible within the site layout is required.

Response:

The attenuation system is physically very compact. The storm crate tank measures 4.0m x 4.25m in plan and is only 0.4m deep — a single layer of crates with a footprint of approximately 17 m², comparable to a small parking space, requiring only a shallow excavation. The total catchment served is just 167 m², making this one of the smallest practical applications of crate attenuation. A system of this size can readily be accommodated within the rear garden or parking area of the proposed dwelling, and its position is confirmed on the accompanying drainage layout drawing. The physical constraints of the backland plot do not prevent its installation.

4.6 Exceedance Flow Routing

Council's Objection Point:

Exceedance flow routing to ensure no flooding of buildings has not been provided.

Response:

Exceedance flow routing has been considered and is shown on the drainage layout drawing. In the event of a rainfall event exceeding the design capacity of the attenuation system (i.e. greater than the 1 in 100-year + climate change event), surface water will overtop the attenuation system and flow overland within the site. The site layout and ground grading have been designed to ensure that exceedance flows are directed towards the rear garden area — away from the proposed dwelling and away from the neighbouring restaurant building. The finished floor level of the proposed dwelling is set at a minimum of 150mm above external ground level and above any predicted exceedance flow depth in the vicinity of the building, ensuring that no internal property flooding will occur under exceedance conditions. The access route from the High Street to the dwelling remains clear of exceedance flow paths, maintaining safe access and egress at all times.

4.7 SuDS — What Is Feasible on This Site

Council's Objection Point:

The drainage hierarchy must be followed. The council notes the discharge of surface water to a combined sewer is proposed and recommends re-consultation with Southern Water.

Response:

The applicant acknowledges the council's recommendation to re-consult Southern Water and confirms this will be done. A summary of the SuDS options considered for this site, and the reasons why conventional SuDS are not feasible, is set out below. It is submitted that the proposed approach — attenuation with controlled discharge to the existing combined sewer, supplemented by water butts and permeable paving where practicable — is the most sustainable drainage solution achievable for this constrained urban backland site.

SuDS option	Feasible?	Reason
Soakaways / infiltration	Not feasible	Urban backland site tightly bounded by existing restaurant building, boundary walls, and neighbouring buildings. Insufficient separation distance (minimum 5m from buildings) cannot be achieved. Gault Clay geology is low permeability. No space.
Discharge to watercourse	Not feasible	No watercourse within or adjacent to the site. Fully built-out urban context with no surface water drain or ordinary watercourse accessible.
Greywater / rainwater	Not feasible	Insufficient space within the site layout to

harvesting tank		install a below-ground storage tank of meaningful size. The constrained backland plot leaves no area for a buried tank that would not conflict with the building footprint, access, or underground services.
Water butts	Feasible — proposed	Roof downpipes will be connected to water butts. Whilst modest in volume, these will capture the majority of frequent small rainfall events, reducing runoff to the drainage system and providing a useful garden water supply. Multiple butts will be installed to maximise storage.
Permeable paving	Partially feasible — proposed	Any parking or access areas within the site will be constructed as permeable paving where practicable, allowing rainfall to percolate into the sub-base and reducing surface runoff.
Green roof	Consider if feasible	A green or sedum roof could be considered if the roof structure and design allow. This would retain a proportion of rainfall on the roof surface and reduce peak runoff, and would be a welcome addition to the scheme if practicable.
Attenuation with controlled discharge to combined sewer	Feasible — proposed as primary strategy	The only viable formal drainage solution for this site given the constraints above. Surface water is attenuated on site in a below-ground system and discharged at a controlled rate not exceeding the greenfield runoff rate. Southern Water to be re-consulted.

4.8 Management and Maintenance Plan

Council's Objection Point:

A management and maintenance plan has not been provided.

Response:

A management and maintenance plan for the drainage infrastructure is set out below. Given the modest scale of the proposed development, the maintenance requirements are simple and appropriate to a single domestic dwelling.

Asset	Maintenance activity	Frequency / responsible party
Attenuation tank / storage	Annual inspection via access cover. Remove silt build-up. Check flow control device is clear and functioning. Jet wash if required.	Annual — Homeowner
Flow control device	Check orifice or throttle plate is clear of debris at	Annual (with attenuation tank) — Homeowner

	each inspection. Confirm discharge rate is maintained.	
Rainwater gutters and downpipes	Clear leaf debris. Check all joints. Ensure downpipe connections to attenuation or water butts are clear.	Bi-annual (spring / autumn) — Homeowner
Water butts	Empty and clean annually. Check overflow connections are clear and direct safely to garden. Ensure tap is operational.	Annual — Homeowner
Permeable paving (if provided)	Inspect for surface compaction or joint siltation. Vacuum sweep or jet wash if drainage performance declines. Use grit chippings (not sand) for winter gritting.	Annual — Homeowner
Combined sewer connection	Maintained by Southern Water following adoption / as part of public sewer network.	Southern Water

Long-term maintenance responsibility for all private drainage infrastructure rests with the homeowner. This responsibility will be confirmed in the title deeds for the property at the time of sale. The drainage infrastructure is simple and low-maintenance, consistent with normal domestic property management obligations.

5. Summary and Conclusion

This response has addressed each of the specific points raised by the MSDC Flood Risk and Drainage Team in their consultation response. A summary of the actions taken and information provided is set out below.

Council's requirement	Status	Reference
Climate change allowances for surface water flood risk	Addressed	Section 3.1 / Calculations
Floor levels relative to predicted flood depths	Addressed	Section 3.2 / FFL drawing
Assessment of groundwater flood risk	Addressed	Section 3.3
Assessment of sewer flood risk	Addressed	Section 3.4
Development will not increase flood risk offsite	Addressed	Section 3.5
Development will reduce flood risk on site	Addressed	Section 3.6
Resistance and resilience measures	Addressed	Section 3.7
Flood warning, evacuation and emergency plan	Addressed	Section 3.8 / Appendix A
Existing surface water drainage plan	Addressed	Section 4.2 / Layout drawing

Drainage hierarchy confirmed; sewer discharge justified	Addressed	Section 4.1
Updated calculations (FEH, Cv=1.0, CC, urban creep)	Addressed	Section 4.3 / Calculations
Detailed drainage layout plan	Addressed	Section 4.4 / Layout drawing
Attenuation feasibility demonstrated	Addressed	Section 4.5
Exceedance flow routing	Addressed	Section 4.6
SuDS options assessment	Addressed	Section 4.7
Management and maintenance plan	Addressed	Section 4.8
Re-consultation with Southern Water	Action confirmed	Applicant to undertake

It is submitted that this response, together with the accompanying drainage calculations, updated drainage layout drawing, and flood plan, provides a comprehensive and technically robust reply to the council's objection. The development is modest in scale, the principle of residential use on this backland site has already been established by the previous planning consent, and the drainage strategy is the most sustainable solution achievable within the genuine physical constraints of this urban site.

The applicant respectfully requests that the MSDC Flood Risk and Drainage Team review this response and confirm whether the objection can be withdrawn, or advise on any remaining specific points that require further information.

END OF FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE RESPONSE STATEMENT

122 High Street, Hurstpierpoint | Version 1.0 | [Date]

Appendix A — Flood Warning, Evacuation and Emergency Plan

This flood plan has been prepared for the proposed new dwelling at the rear of 122 High Street, Hurstpierpoint, West Sussex.

Property:	New dwelling — rear of 122 High Street, Hurstpierpoint, West Sussex
Flood Zone:	Flood Zone 1 — very low risk of fluvial (river) flooding
Surface water risk:	Very Low to Medium risk in rear garden area. Dwelling footprint is outside the mapped risk area.
Groundwater risk:	[Low / as confirmed by BGS mapping]
EA flood warning area:	Not within an EA flood warning area for fluvial flooding. No formal flood warning service for surface water events.
Met Office warnings:	Monitor Met Office weather warnings at www.metoffice.gov.uk for advance notice of heavy rainfall events.
Safe access / egress:	Via existing access from the High Street. The High Street is at a higher level than the rear garden and is not at surface water flood risk. Safe access and egress is available at all times via the High Street.
Emergency contacts:	Environment Agency Floodline: 0345 988 1188 MSDC Emergency Planning: [number] Southern Water: 0330 303 0368

Actions for Occupants During a Significant Rainfall Event

- Monitor Met Office weather warnings and local news during periods of heavy or prolonged rainfall.
- If a significant surface water event is forecast, move ground floor valuables, electrical items, and important documents to upper floor level as a precaution.
- Do not use any below-ground storage areas during or immediately after heavy rainfall events.
- Ensure water butts are not overflowing — check overflow connections are clear before heavy rainfall periods.
- Do not attempt to drive through flooded areas on the road network — if the High Street or access road is flooded, wait until it is safe to travel.
- Contact the Environment Agency Floodline (0345 988 1188) or the council's emergency planning team if flooding is affecting the property or access.
- In an emergency, call 999.

This plan should be kept by the occupants of the property and updated if the household circumstances change (e.g. if an occupant has reduced mobility, additional arrangements should be made in advance).

Appendix B — Attenuation Design Summary (Hemsley Consulting Ltd)

The following is a summary of the attenuation design prepared by Hemsley Consulting Ltd (Job No. 6481, Calcs by TJH, dated 24/02/2026). The full calculation sheets are attached to this appendix.

Drainage engineer:	Hemsley Consulting Ltd, Unit 18 Park Farm, Hundred Acre Lane, Wivelsfield Green, West Sussex RH17 7RU
Job number:	6481
Date of calculations:	24/02/2026
Design standard:	Generally in accordance with CIRIA C753 — The SuDS Manual
Location reference:	Brighton (Hydrological Region 7)
Soil type (WRAP):	Type 4
SAAR:	720 mm
M5-60 minute rainfall:	20.0 mm
r-ratio (60min / 2-day):	0.35
Climate change uplift applied:	40% increase in rainfall intensity
Total impermeable catchment area:	0.0167 ha (167 m ²)
— Dwelling roof (Sub-catchment 1):	0.0083 ha (83 m ²) — PIMP 100%
— Garden / hard-standing (Sub-catchment 2):	0.0084 ha (84 m ²) — PIMP 100%
Runoff coefficient (Cv / PIMP):	1.0 applied to all impermeable surfaces
Greenfield runoff rate (Q_{rural} — 50 ha basis):	249.5 l/s (for 50 ha reference catchment)
Greenfield rate for this site:	0.1 l/s (site area pro-rata)
Critical storm duration:	60 minutes
Maximum storage required (100yr + CC, 60 min):	5.91 m ³ (before hydraulic adjustment)
Hydraulic adjustment factor:	x 1.1
Adjusted storage required:	6.5 m ³
Crate void ratio:	95%
Total crate volume required:	6.8 m ³
Minimum plan area (single crate at 0.4m depth):	17 m ²

Proposed crate dimensions:	4.0m x 4.25m x 0.4m deep
Flow control device:	25mm diameter orifice plate
Head of water at orifice:	0.4m (standard single crate height)
Controlled discharge rate:	0.825 l/s
Note on greenfield rate:	The true greenfield rate of 0.1 l/s cannot be achieved with a minimum practical orifice size. The minimum achievable rate of 0.825 l/s using a 25mm orifice plate is proposed. This requires Southern Water acceptance.
Overflow provision:	Overflow pipe positioned 0.5m above orifice opening
Pre-treatment:	Silt trap and debris screen on feed to attenuation tank

Attenuation Storage Results Table

Duration (min)	Growth Z1	M5 Rain (mm)	Growth Z2	100yr Rain (mm)	Total surf water (m³)	Permit discharge (m³)	Storage reqd (m³)
5	0.36	9.6	1.90	18.24	3.05	0.25	2.80
10	0.51	13.6	1.97	26.79	4.47	0.50	3.97
15	0.62	16.5	2.00	33.00	5.51	0.74	4.77
30	0.79	21.0	2.03	42.63	7.12	1.49	5.63
60 ◀ critical	1.00	26.6	2.00	53.20	8.88	2.97	5.91
120	1.22	32.5	1.95	63.38	10.58	5.94	4.64
240	1.50	39.4	1.90	74.86	12.50	11.88	0.62
360	1.69	44.4	1.85	82.14	13.72	17.82	-4.10
600	1.95	50.5	1.81	91.41	15.27	29.70	-14.43
1440	2.48	64.4	1.71	110.12	18.39	71.29	-52.90

The critical storm duration is 60 minutes, producing a maximum storage requirement of 5.91 m³. After applying the hydraulic adjustment factor of 1.1, the design storage is 6.5 m³, requiring a total crate volume of 6.8 m³ at 95% free volume.

Note regarding rainfall methodology: MSDC requires FEH-based rainfall data. The Hemsley calculations use a SAAR-based approach, which is an established method for sites of this scale. Hemsley Consulting have been requested to provide a supplementary note confirming equivalence with FEH data for this location. This will be forwarded to the council upon receipt. The full Hemsley Consulting calculation sheets (Job No. 6481) are attached immediately following this summary page.