From: Andy Watt
Sent: 26 February 2026 15:07:28 UTC+00:00
To: "Landivar (martin@landivar-architects.com)" <martin@landivar-architects.com>
Subject: FW: 2026.02.19 Re: DM/25/1921 - Site of Former East Lodge Farm, Malthouse Lane, Hurstpierpoint
Attachments: ViewDocument (1).pdf, MSDC002 - Detailed Drainage Design Checklist - v2.0 issued 071125.pdf, MSDC002 - Flood Risk and Drainage Information Checklist - Application Stage - v2.0 issued 071125.pdf

Dear Mr Landivar

Please see below comments from the council's Drainage consultant. Apologies for the delay in forwarding due to catching up from leave, but I look forward to your response in due course.

Many thanks

Andy Watt, BSc (Hons), MTPL, MRTPI
Senior Planning Officer
Development Management
01444 477517
andy.watt@midsussex.gov.uk
www.midsussex.gov.uk

Working together for a Better Mid Sussex

From: drainage <drainage@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 February 2026 15:45
To: Andy Watt <Andy.Watt@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: drainage <drainage@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: 2026.02.19 Re: DM/25/1921 - Site of Former East Lodge Farm, Malthouse Lane, Hurstpierpoint

Dear Andy,

We have reviewed the comments from Martin Landivar dated 30 January 2026 in relation to our previous comments.

We respond to the points raised as follows.

Surface Water Drainage

Climate Change and Urban Creep

We note confirmation that:

- A 45% climate change allowance has been applied;

- A 10% urban creep allowance has been included.

The applicant has confirmed that the runoff coefficient (Cv) can be amended to 1.0. The calculations will therefore need to be updated and formally reissued to reflect this requirement. This can be secured at detailed design stage, provided the strategy is otherwise demonstrated to be achievable in principle.

Infiltration and Groundwater
The strategy relies entirely on infiltration via proprietary ECO-90 devices for both surface water and treated foul effluent discharge.

The infiltration testing referenced within the report was undertaken in May 2020. It was not clear from the falling head test data if groundwater was encountered during the testing process. Please could the applicant confirm?

While these results provide falling head data, the submission does not include:

- Confirmation of the seasonal high groundwater level;
- Evidence that a minimum 1m separation between the base of the infiltration device and groundwater can be achieved;

Where infiltration is proposed as the sole method of surface water and foul disposal, confirmation of adequate groundwater separation is required to demonstrate that the system is viable in principle and will function effectively over the lifetime of the development.

Without this information, we cannot be satisfied that the proposed drainage solution is deliverable.

Foul Drainage
We note the intention to provide individual package treatment plants per dwelling, discharging to secondary treatment trenches and ECO-90 arrays.

Whilst discharge volumes may fall within General Binding Rules thresholds, compliance with GBR also requires:

- Suitable ground conditions;
- Appropriate separation distances;
- No unacceptable risk of groundwater contamination..

As with surface water drainage, confirmation of groundwater levels is fundamental where infiltration is proposed.

Layout Constraints and Offsets
The drainage layout drawing (EC49-25-20-E-01) is currently not dimensioned to demonstrate compliance with minimum stand-off distances from buildings, boundaries and other relevant features.

We note your comment that certain plots may be constrained in achieving offsets from buildings and boundaries. If adequate offsets cannot be achieved within the individual plots, the layout may require amendment or an alternative drainage approach may need to be considered.

Drainage constraints are a material planning consideration and must be resolved at this stage to demonstrate that the development can be appropriately serviced.

A drainage condition can only be recommended where the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that drainage is achievable in principle.

At present:

- Cv values do not align with MSDC requirements (The calculations can be updated and formally reissued at the detailed design stage);
- Groundwater levels are unconfirmed;
- Offset compliance is not demonstrated;
- The strategy relies wholly on infiltration without robust validation of seasonal groundwater separation.

Accordingly, we cannot currently confirm that the drainage strategy is acceptable in principle.

If the applicant considers groundwater monitoring disproportionate, an alternative surface water and foul water disposal strategy would need to be explored. However, if infiltration remains the preferred approach, evidence demonstrating adequate groundwater separation will be required.

The applicant is advised, the 'Detailed Drainage Design Checklist'. https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/yyxere1u/msdc002-detailed-drainage-design-checklist-v20-issued-071125.pdf was updated in Dec 2025. This level of information will be required to address any recommended drainage condition moving forward.

Best Wishes

Flood Risk and Drainage Team
Estate Services and Building Control
Mid Sussex District Council
drainage@midsussex.gov.uk