

**From:** drainage <drainage@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 07 January 2026 17:07:26 UTC+00:00  
**To:** "Katherine Williams" <Katherine.Williams@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** "drainage" <drainage@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** 2025.01.07 Re: DM/25/2473 - Warninglid Primary School Slaugham Lane  
Warninglid Haywards Heath West Sussex RH17 5TJ

Dear Katherine,

Thank you for re-consulting the Flood Risk and Drainage Team on the above application. We have reviewed the submitted Drainage Design Strategy – Surface and Foul (date December 2025) by EAS Ltd and have the following comments:

Further to the Flood Risk and Drainage Team's initial comments dated 14 October 2025, the submitted information is currently insufficient and doesn't meet the minimum requirements as set out in the MSDC Flood Risk and Drainage Information Check List.

The applicant should refer to the MSDC Flood Risk and Drainage Information Check List (Application Stage) and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Map - <https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/planning-building/flood-risk-and-drainage-for-planning/>

Given the scale of the proposed development, further information is required at this stage of planning

**Flood Risk Assessment:**

The site is in flood zone 1 and is at low fluvial flood risk (risk of flooding from Main Rivers).

The Risk of Flooding from Surface Water mapping suggests the site is shown to be at very low surface water flood risk (comparable to flood zone 1) for the present day (2025) and to be at very low surface water flood risk (comparable to flood zone 1) within the climate change range of 2040 – 2060.

**Surface Water Drainage:**

**Infiltration Feasibility**

Percolation testing was undertaken at the site on 28 November 2025. Three trial pits were excavated to a depth of approximately 1 metre below ground level at locations across the site. No groundwater was encountered during excavation. The underlying geology was identified as Weald Clay, overlain by a thin layer of topsoil, with a shallow layer of made ground present in the northern part of the site.

Percolation testing was carried out in all trial pits; no reduction in water level was observed over time, and as such no infiltration rate could be derived. On this basis, infiltration-based SuDS features are not considered to be feasible at this site. An alternative strategy was proposed.

However, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed attenuation and surface water sewer discharge strategy is acceptable in principle at this stage. Additional clarification is required:

### **FEH Rainfall Data**

The drainage calculations must be confirmed to be based on the latest Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH) rainfall data.

### **Discharge Rate Justification**

The proposed discharge rate must be clearly justified based on the actual impermeable areas being drained, including confirmation of how permeable areas have been treated within the calculations.

### **Urban Creep Allowance**

The drainage calculations must include an allowance for urban creep 10%.

### **CV Value**

A CV value of 1.0.

### **Exceedance Flow Routing**

A clear plan-based exceedance flow route drawing is required to demonstrate that flows will be safely managed during events exceeding the design standard without increasing flood risk.

### **Water Quality Treatment**

The drainage strategy must demonstrate how appropriate water quality treatment will be provided, in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753).

### **Discharge to Surface Water Sewer**

It is understood that the existing formal surface water drainage at the site comprises of rainwater pipework serving the former school building and two surface water gullies located along the perimeter of the southern playground. These drain to an existing surface water sewer.

As discharging to a surface water sewer via an existing connection is proposed, written correspondence from the owner of the surface water sewer must be provided confirming that they would find it acceptable in principle for surface water from the site to discharge into the system at the proposed rate. Evidence needs to be provided that sufficient capacity exists within the receiving network. If new connections to the surface water sewer are proposed, written correspondence from the owner of the surface water sewer must be provided at this stage of planning.

### **Foul Water Drainage:**

The report confirms that foul flows are proposed to connect to the existing private sewer and onward to the public foul sewer. However, the following information is still required:

#### **1. Water Authority Confirmation**

Written confirmation from the Water Authority is required to demonstrate that:

- Sufficient capacity exists within the receiving network.

### **Shared Systems**

The applicant is advised that if a shared surface and foul water drainage system is proposed, a maintenance and management plan which identifies responsible parties for the lifetime of the dwellings will be required at this stage of planning.

Once the required information has been received, we will be able to comment further.

Receipt of the requested additional information does not mean further information will not be requested, nor does it guarantee that the Flood Risk and Drainage Team will not object to the development. Neither does it prevent the team from recommending a flood risk or drainage condition.

Best Wishes

**Flood Risk and Drainage Team  
Estate Services and Building Control  
Mid Sussex District Council**  
[drainage@midsussex.gov.uk](mailto:drainage@midsussex.gov.uk)