

Applications - Surface Water Drainage Statement

In order to provide the required information on surface water drainage from the proposed development this pro-forma must be completed in full and be submitted with any planning application which seeks permission for 'minor' development. This information contained in this form will be used by the LPA and / or Hertfordshire County Council to ensure that the development does not increase flood risk from surface water. The pro-forma is supported by the [Defra/EA Guidance on Rainfall Runoff Management](#). The pro-forma should be considered alongside other supporting SuDS Guidance, but focuses on ensuring flood risk is not made worse elsewhere. The SuDS solution must operate effectively for as long as the development exists. This pro-forma is based upon current industry standard practice.

1. Site Details

Site Name	Land north-east of Harpenden
Address & post code or LPA reference	Land north-east of Harpenden, between Lower Luton Road, Bower Heath Lane and Common Lane, Harpenden
Grid reference (or easting and northing)	E514435 N216015
Is the existing site developed or Greenfield?	The majority of the site is predominately open with no existing development. The south-west corner currently comprises an equestrian centre.
Total Site Area (Ha)* served by drainage system excluding open space	9.228ha
Topographical survey plan showing existing site layout, site levels and drainage system	Please refer to Survey Solutions drawing no. 65958BWLS-05

* The Greenfield runoff off rate from the development which is to be used for assessing the requirements for limiting discharge flow rates and attenuation storage from a site should be calculated for the area that forms the drainage network for the site whatever size of site and type of drainage technique. Please refer to the Rainfall Runoff Management document or CIRIA manual for detail on this.

2. Impermeable Area

	Existing	Proposed	Difference (Proposed-Existing)	Notes for developers & Local Authorities
Impermeable area (ha) (catchment areas to be shown on a drawing)	1.106	9.228	See Appendix D of JPP Consulting Ltd FRA (report ref. R-FRA-28236-01-E)	If the proposed amount of impermeable surface is greater, then runoff rates and volumes will increase. Section 6 must be filled in. If proposed permeability is equal or less than existing, then section 6 can be skipped & section 7 filled in.
Urban Creep area (ha)	N/A	0.922	N/A	10% urban creep should be included for future modifications under permitted development rights for householders. Only to be used on future storage calculations not runoff rates.
Drainage Method (infiltration/watercourse/sewer)	N/A	Infiltration	N/A	If different from the existing, please fill in section 3. If existing drainage is by infiltration and the proposed is not, discharge volumes may increase. Fill in section 6.

PPG Paragraph 055 and 056

3. Surface Water Discharge

	Yes	No	Evidence that this is possible	Notes for developers & Local Authorities
Existing and proposed calculations	Yes		For soakaway test results please refer to Southern Testing Environmental & Geotechnical Project ID: JN1933-PERM	Please provide Hydraulic modelling calculations of existing and proposed run-off rates and volumes in accordance with a recognised methodology or the results of a full infiltration test (see line below) if infiltration is proposed.
Rainwater Reuse	Yes		Rainwater butts will be implemented for dwellings on a plot-by-plot basis.	If rainwater reuse is provided, significant detail supporting calculations are needed if it is proposed to be used for flood risk management
Interception of first 5mm of rainfall	Yes		To be treated within a number of methods throughout site – permeable paving, swales, gullies, rainwater harvesting, filter drains. Locations to be confirmed at detailed design.	If green roofs or bioretention areas are not provided, how will the first 5mm of rainfall be intercepted?
To Infiltration	Yes		Both soakaways and infiltration basins are to be used.	e.g. soakage tests. Section 6 (infiltration) must be filled in if infiltration is proposed.
To watercourse		No	Draining the site via infiltration techniques is a viable option.	e.g. Is there a watercourse nearby? Please provide details of any watercourse to which the site drains including cross-sections of any adjacent water courses for appropriate distance upstream and downstream of the discharge point (as agreed with the LLFA and/or EA).
To surface water sewer		No	Draining the site via infiltration techniques is a viable option.	Confirmation from sewer provider that sufficient capacity exists for this connection.
Combination of above		No	Draining the site via infiltration techniques is a viable option.	e.g. part infiltration part discharge to sewer or watercourse. Provide evidence above.
Has the drainage proposal had regard to the SuDS hierarchy?	Yes		Tanked permeable paving and infiltration techniques will be used to provide interception and treatment of surface water flows.	Evidence must be provided to demonstrate that the proposed Sustainable Drainage proposal has had regard to the SuDS hierarchy.
Layout plan showing where the sustainable drainage infrastructure will be located on site.	Yes		See Appendix D of JPP Consulting Ltd FRA (report ref. R-FRA-28236-01-E)	Please provide drawing reference numbers showing the details of the site layout and where the sustainable drainage infrastructure will be located on the site. If the development is to be constructed in phases this should be shown on a separate drawing and confirmation should be provided that the sustainable drainage proposal for each phase can be constructed and can operate independently and is not reliant on any later phase of development.

Technical Standards S2 and S3

4. Peak Discharge Rates – This is the maximum flow rate at which surface water runoff leaves the site during a particular storm event.

	Existing Rates (l/s)	Proposed Rates (l/s)	Difference (l/s) (Proposed-Existing)	Notes for developers & Local Authorities
Greenfield QBAR	N/A	N/A	N/A	Mean annual Greenfield peak flow - QBAR is approx. 50% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) storm event. Use that figure in Section 7a.
100% AEP	N/A	N/A	N/A	Proposed discharge rates (with mitigation) should be as close as reasonably practicable to predevelopment greenfield run-off rates with long term storage or QBAR, they must be no greater than existing rates for all corresponding storm events. e.g. discharging all flow from site at the existing 1% AEP storm event increases flood risk during smaller storm events. If discharging to watercourse post development results need to be with and without a surcharged outfall. The critical results need to be provided for both the critical storm by level and critical storm by outflow.
3.33% AEP	N/A	N/A	N/A	
1% AEP	N/A	N/A	N/A	
1% AEP plus climate change	N/A	N/A. Surface water flows generated by the proposed development will be managed via infiltration techniques. See JPP Consulting file ref. 28961 – Harpenden SW Drainage Calculations, for full surface water draiage calculations.		To mitigate for climate change the proposed 1% AEP plus climate change must be no greater than the existing 1% AEP runoff rate. If not, flood risk increases under climate change as it is added to the peak rainfall intensity. EA Guidance - Flood Risk Assessments: Climate Change Allowances https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances

Technical Standards S4 to S9

5. Calculate Discharge Volumes –The total volume of water leaving the development site for a particular rainfall event. Introducing new impermeable surfaces increases surface water runoff and may increase flood risk outside the development.

	Existing Volume (m³)	Proposed Volume (m³)	Difference (m³) (Proposed-Existing)	Notes for developers & Local Authorities
100% AEP	N/A	N/A	N/A	Proposed discharge volumes (without mitigation) should be no greater than existing volumes for all corresponding storm events. Any increase in volume increases flood risk elsewhere. Where volumes are increased section 6 must be filled in.
3.3% AEP	N/A	N/A	N/A	
3.3% AEP plus climate change	N/A	N/A	N/A	
1% AEP	N/A	N/A	N/A	To mitigate for climate change the volume discharge from site must be no greater than the existing 3.33% AEP or the 1% AEP storm event. If not, flood risk increases under climate change.
1% AEP plus climate change	N/A	N/A	N/A	

6. Calculate Attenuation Storage – In order to minimise the negative impact on flood risk resulting from increased volumes runoff from the proposed development, storage must be provided.

		Notes for developers & Local Authorities
Storage volume required to retain discharge rates as existing (m ³)	7,933m ³	Volume of water to attenuate on site if discharging at existing runoff rates. Volumes must be calculated using additional impermeable area including urban creep where appropriate. If using infiltration storage, then appropriate safety factors must be applied for storage features with infiltration through the base (CIRIA SUDS Manual C753). Can't be used where discharge volumes are increasing
Where will the storage be provided on site?	Infiltration basins/tanks and attenuation basins/tanks.	

7. How is Storm Water Stored on Site?

Storage is required for the additional volume from site but also for holding back water to slow down the rate from the site. This is known as attenuation storage and long term storage. The intention is to not discharge that volume into the watercourses so as not to increase flood risk elsewhere.

			Notes for developers & Local Authorities
Infiltration	State the Site's Geology/drift material overlaying)	Superficial deposits, Clay-with-Flints -Formation. Bedrock geology, Lewis Nodular Chalk Formation and Seaford Chalk Formation.	Avoid infiltrating in made ground.
	Does the site have a high ground water table? Yes/No?	No No significant groundwater was encountered in any of the trial pits during the soakaway testing.	Groundwater level monitoring level should be undertaken for ideally year to assist with this assessment. If this is not achievable, at least 3 months data should be provided, capturing the seasonally high level e.g. Jan through to March. It may depend on the aquifer characteristics to determine when the seasonal high levels are most likely to occur. If yes, please provide details of the site's hydrology.
	Is the site within a known Source Protection Zones (SPZ)? Yes/No?	SPZ3	Infiltration rates are highly variable and refer to Environment Agency website to identify and source protection zones (SPZ). Avoid infiltrating to SPZ1.
	Are infiltration rates suitable?	9.80 x 10 ⁻⁴ m/s to 1.77 x 10 ⁻⁶ m/s	Infiltration rates should be no lower than 1x10 ⁻⁶ m/s.
	Is the site contaminated? If yes, consider advice from others on whether infiltration can happen.	No	Water should not be infiltrated through land that is contaminated. The Environment Agency may provide bespoke advice in planning consultations for contaminated sites that should be considered.
	State the distance between a proposed infiltration device base and the ground water (GW) level	Minimum of 1m clearance.	Need a minimum of 1m clearance between the base of the infiltration device and the water table to protect GW quality & ensure no GW enters infiltration structures. Avoid infiltration where this isn't possible.
	Were infiltration rates obtained by desk study or infiltration test?	Infiltration (Soakage) testing	Infiltration rates can be estimated from desk studies for outline planning permission if achievable alternative proposal. Site specific BRE 365 tests should be provided for Full planning Permission
Is infiltration feasible?	Yes/No?	Yes	If infiltration is not feasible how will the additional volume be stored?. The applicant should then consider the following options in the next section.

7a. Storage requirements

Where infiltration is not possible, then the developer must confirm that either of the two options below will be implemented for dealing with the amount of water that needs to be stored on site.

Option 1 Simple – Store both the additional volume and attenuation volume in order to make a final discharge from site at **QBAR**. This is preferred if no infiltration can be made on site. This very simply satisfies the runoff rates and volume criteria.

Option 2 Complex – If some of the additional volume of water can be infiltrated back into the ground, the remainder can be discharged at a very low rate of 2 l/sec/hectare. A combined storage calculation using the partial permissible rate of 2 l/sec/hectare and the attenuation rate used to slow the runoff from site.

		Notes for developers & Local Authorities
Please confirm what option has been chosen and how much storage is required on site.	N/A	The developer at this stage should understand the site characteristics and be able to explain what the storage requirements are on site and how it will be achieved.

8. Additional Consideration to Comply with the Technical Standards and PPG

		Notes for developers & Local Authorities
Which Drainage Systems / SuDS features have been used?	Tanked permeable paving and infiltration techniques will be used to provide interception and treatment of surface water flows. Where appropriate, proprietary treatment will be implemented.	SUDS can be adapted for most situations even where infiltration isn't feasible e.g. impermeable liners beneath some SUDS devices allows treatment but not infiltration. See CIRIA SUDS Manual C753.
How will exceedance events be catered on site without increasing flood risks (both on site and outside the development)?	In such an event the proposed drainage systems will become overwhelmed and overland flows could occur. Overland flows will be directed to follow the path that overland flows currently follow.	Safety: not causing property flooding or posing a hazard to site users i.e. no deeper than 100mm on roads (of 30mph) if standard kerb height of 150mm is present or 200mm in car parks.
How are rates being restricted?	Draining the site via infiltration techniques is a viable option.	Hydrobrakes to be used where rates are between 2l/s to 5l/s. Orifices should not be used below 5l/s as the pipes may block. Pipes with flows < 2l/s are prone to blockage.
Drainage during construction period	Construction drainage to be in line with SuDS manual Chapter 31. Appointed contractor to provide upon appointment.	Provide details of how drainage will be managed during the construction period including any necessary connections, impacts, diversions and erosion control or temporary measures.
Key Drainage components / Features	N/A	Which component if blocked (even partial) will lead to flooding?

Technical Standards S10 to S12

9. Management and Maintenance of SuDs

Details are required to be provided of the management and maintenance plan for the SUD, including for the individual plots in perpetuity.

How is the entire drainage system to be maintained in perpetuity?	The drainage system will be designed to minimise maintenance requirements, however, a full maintenance scheme will be established for those elements not being offered for adoption. Maintenance Areas - Surface Water: Private Drains - Home owner SUDS – Private Home owner SUDS – Communal Management Company Adopted Sewers Thames Water Maintenance Areas – Foul Water: Private Drains Home owner Adopted Sewers Thames Water Both surface and foul water drainage maintenance is outlined within Section 7.0 of the FRA prepared by JPP Consulting (report ref. R-FRA-28236-01-E). Maintenance and management to be in line with SuDS manual Chapter 22.12 – Table 22.1. Management company to provide upon appointment	Clear details of the maintenance proposals of all elements of the proposed drainage system must be provided to show that all parts of SuDs are effective and robust. Provide a management plan to describe the SUDS scheme and set out the management objectives for the site. It should consider how the SuDs will perform and develop over time anticipating any additional maintenance tasks to ensure the system continues to perform as designed. — Specification notes that describe how work is to be undertaken and the materials to be used. — A maintenance schedule describes what work is to be done and when it is to be done using frequency and performance requirements as appropriate. — A site plan showing maintenance areas, control points and outfalls. Responsibility for the management and maintenance of each element of the SUDS scheme will also need to be detailed within the Management Plan. Where open water is involved please provide a health and safety plan within the management plan.
Please confirm the owners/adopters of the entire drainage systems throughout the development. Please list all the owners.	N/A. Client Input	If these are multiple owners then a drawing illustrating exactly what features will be within each owner's remit must be submitted with this Pro-forma. Please give details of each feature and how it will be managed in accordance with the details in the management plan.
Please provide details demonstrating that any third party agreements required using land outside the application site have been secured.	N/A. All surface water infiltration will occur within the development.	

The above form should be completed using evidence from information which should be appended to this form. The information being submitted should be proportionate to the site conditions, flood risks and magnitude of development. It should serve as a summary of the drainage proposals and should clearly show that the proposed discharge rate and volume as a result of development will not be increasing. Where there is an increase in discharge rate or volume, then the relevant section of this form must be completed with clear evidence demonstrating how the requirements will be met.

This form is completed using factual information and can be used as a summary of the surface water drainage strategy on this site.

Form Completed By..Katherine.Rose

Qualification of person responsible for signing off this pro-forma BSc.(Hons).CEnv.MIEnvSc.MCIHT.....

Company..JPP Consulting Ltd,.....

On behalf of (Client's details) Crest Nicholson Ltd

Date:..06.02.2026