

Date: 21 August 2026

Your Ref:

Our Ref: 12237/17

Page: 1 of 3

Flood Risk and Drainage Team
Estate Services and Building Control
Mid Sussex District Council

Dear MSDC Flood Risk and Drainage team.

RUCKFORD HOUSE, HURSTPIERPOINT COLLEGE, HURSTPIERPOINT **Response to MSDC comments**

Introduction

The MSDC Flood Risk and Drainage team provided comment on the Ruckford House proposals in on 16th February 2026. The comments state “*The submitted information is considered insufficient to address the drainage condition requirements. The Application should refer to the MSDC Detailed Drainage Design Information Guide for Discharge of Condition Stage for further guidance*”.

On review of the above guidance, the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) by HOP Consulting dated 21st July 2025 provides the large majority of the information requested. We have since updated the calculations and incorporated a catchment and flow plan. This revised FRA, dated 21st August 2026, is appended. To simplify MSDC’s review, this letter report separates out the guidance and directs to the relevant information in the FRA. The completed MSDC guidance checklist is appended for convenience.

Surface Water

MSDC Guidance: Demonstrate compliance with the drainage hierarchy, with priority given to infiltration-based solutions.

HOP Response: The proposal is for an infiltration solution meeting this requirement. See Sections 4.6 to 4.15 of the FRA.

MSDC Guidance: Include hydraulic calculations based on the critical storm duration for the 1 in 30 and 1 in 100-year events, with appropriate climate change uplift applied to rainfall intensity in accordance with the latest Environment Agency guidance.

HOP Response: Calculations showing the 100 year storm event plus 45% Climate change allowance are provided. No flooding or ponding occurs. A 30 year event is a lesser storm event and will therefore also be accommodated by the proposals. See Appendix D of the FRA for the surface water calculations.

MSDC Guidance: Apply flow and volume control measures using FEH rainfall data, avoiding use of outdated methods such as FSR.

HOP Response: FEH-22 rainfall data is used – See Appendix D of the FRA.

MSDC Guidance: Use the Simple Index Approach to assess and provide appropriate water quality treatment.

HOP Response: The simple index approach has been used. See Sections 4.18 to 4.21 of the FRA.

MSDC Guidance: Maximise amenity and biodiversity through the use of above-ground, vegetated SuDS features where feasible.

HOP Response: The car park is a required element of the architectural proposals. Using it as a permeable paved surface to manage the surface water runoff is the logical option from both hydraulic and pollution mitigation perspectives. Therefore, further above ground features would not provide hydraulic benefit to the drainage scheme. As such, the inclusion of rain gardens or similar would not form part of the hydraulic proposals. Greater biodiversity and amenity can be provided through an enhanced planting scheme, provided by others.

MSDC Guidance: Provide a detailed layout showing catchments, flow paths, SuDS components, levels, and exceedance routing.

HOP Response: Provided in Appendix B of the FRA.

MSDC Guidance: Include a clear maintenance and management plan, including named responsible party and legal mechanism.

HOP Response: A maintenance and management plan is provided in Appendix E of the FRA.

MSDC Guidance: Avoid siting SuDS components (e.g. basins, permeable paving) within flood zones or mapped surface water risk areas unless resilience under flood conditions can be clearly demonstrated.

HOP Response: The site is within Flood Zone 1 and at a low risk of surface water flooding.

Foul Water

MSDC Guidance: Prioritise connection to the public sewer wherever viable.

HOP Response: Proposed connection is to public foul sewer via existing functional, maintained and surveyed private pumped system.

MSDC Guidance: Include evidence from the sewerage undertaker confirming availability or constraints to connection.

HOP Response: A reduction in flow to the public foul sewer is proposed due to the removal of surface water drainage from the foul drainage network. Capacity is therefore automatically granted by Southern Water. See Sections 4.3 to 4.4 of the FRA.

Date: 21 August 2026

Your Ref:

Our Ref:

Page: 3 of 3

MSDC Guidance: Where non-mains systems are proposed, provide justification for infeasibility of a mains connection and demonstrate full compliance with the General Binding Rules or applicable EA permit requirements.

HOP Response: Not applicable.

MSDC Guidance: Where an existing non-mains foul system (e.g. septic tank) is to be retained, include documented evidence that the system complies with the current General Binding Rules and any required discharge consents.

HOP Response: Not applicable.

MSDC Guidance: If the existing system is non-compliant, submit design proposals for an upgrade or replacement as part of the condition discharge submission.

HOP Response: Not applicable.

We would greatly appreciate if the current objection can be removed on the basis of the above and attached information.

Yours sincerely



Tom Butler
MEng CEng MICE
For HOP Consulting Limited
tomb@hop.uk.com

Enc: MSDC Detailed Drainage Design Information Guide for Discharge of Condition Stage.
Staff Accommodation at Ruckford House, Hurstpierpoint College – Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy.

cc: