

Survey for the recommendations to update the Non-Statutory Technical Standards (NSTS) for SuDS

Introduction

The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) has commissioned research to explore whether updating the English [Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS](#) (NSTS) could help deliver SuDS that provide multiple benefits beyond managing surface water runoff, contributing to improved climate adaptation, health and wellbeing and better places and spaces.

A key part of this work is to understand how the current NSTS are used and recommend how they could be improved to:

1. Support the National Planning Policy Framework and deliver multiple benefits
2. Ensure greater consistency with respect to designing for effective local flood risk management.

This research is being undertaken by a team led by HR Wallingford that includes CIRIA, McCloy Consulting, Illman Young and others. A key element of this research is to engage with those stakeholders that approve, design and commission SuDS for new developments in England to understand the challenges, opportunities and enablers to the delivery of SuDS schemes that deliver multiple benefits.

We would therefore appreciate it if you could complete the following survey, the outputs of which will be used to directly inform any potential update of the NSTS. The survey should, depending on your level of involvement in SuDS delivery, take between 20 and 30 minutes to complete. Responses will be anonymised, unless you wish to share case studies - where it would be helpful to have contact details.

Your input will help to improve local flood risk management and deliver an improved local environment.

Many thanks.

Survey for the recommendations to update the Non-Statutory Technical Standards (NSTS) for SuDS

* 1. Do you agree to participate in the survey? The data collected will be used to inform the review of the Non-statutory Technical Standards for SuDS (NSTS)

Yes

No

Survey for the recommendations to update the Non-Statutory Technical Standards (NSTS) for SuDS

* 2. What is your role in the delivery of SuDS?

- Approval (i.e. local authorities, LLFA, LPA, WaSCs)
- Practitioner/designer (i.e. engineer, landscape architect)
- Developer (i.e. those commissioning SuDS)
- Other (i.e. supply chain members, regulators)

Survey for the recommendations to update the Non-Statutory Technical Standards (NSTS) for SuDS

Questions for others

Your role

* 134. How many years' experience do you have with SuDS in England?

- Less than 1 year
- 1 -3 years
- 3 – 5 years
- More than 5 years

* 135. What role do you have in SuDS?

Development of drainage submissions

Assuming you answer all the questions in this survey there are now 16 questions that need to be answered.

There are 4 questions in this section.

* 136. What should be required from drainage submissions?

	Never included	Sometimes included	Always included	Don't know
Compliance with Non-statutory Technical Standards for SuDS (NSTS)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Compliance with Local Plan Policy on local drainage/flood risk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Never included	Sometimes included	Always included	Don't know
Compliance with Local Plan Policy on SuDS, or SuDS guidance (SPD)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Compliance with Local Plan Policy on green infrastructure or biodiversity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Management of runoff peak flows	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Management of runoff flows and volumes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Management of water quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improvements to biodiversity (biodiversity net gain)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improvements to amenity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Certainty on long term maintenance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Management of water close/on surface	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Delivery of source control	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Management of runoff in sub-catchments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Consideration of drainage exceedance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Delivery of the SuDS Management Train	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provision of rainwater harvesting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Climate resilient development (adaptation and mitigation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Never included Sometimes included Always included Don't know

Other multiple benefits (please specify)

Specify here (max 70 characters)

137. How frequently does a difficult drainage submission relate to the following planning and approval challenges (particularly with respect to multiple benefits)?

Never Rarely About half the time Frequently Always

Lack of/poor Local Plan Policies on drainage

Late consideration of drainage on site layout

Poor engagement with those approving the drainage submission

Insufficient information provided

Conflict between adopting organisation and LLFA

Lack of clarity on requirements from local planning authority

Lack of clarity on requirements from Lead Local Flood Authority

Poor assessment and evaluation (within approving organisation)

Other (please specify)

Specify here (max 70 characters)

138. How frequently does a difficult drainage submission relate to the following design challenges (particularly with respect to multiple benefits)?

	Never	Rarely	About half the time	Frequently	Always
Developer expectations or timelines	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other environmental requirements (EA, Natural England)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Challenging site characteristics (location, topography)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Challenging ground conditions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Challenges around viability of developments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Difficulties in determining maintenance requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Specify here (max 70 characters)

139. If necessary, please use the text boxes to provide more detail about the challenges faced in developing good drainage submissions and SuDS design (particularly multiple benefits).

Comment 1 (max 500 characters)

Comment 2 (max 500 characters)

Delivering SuDS that provide multiple benefits

This section has 12 questions.

* 140. What multiple benefits do you consider SuDS should provide (in addition to hydraulic control required by NSTS)? Please select all that apply.

- None
- Management of water quality
- Improvements to biodiversity (biodiversity net gain)
- Other (please specify - max 70 characters)
- Improvements to amenity
- Provision of rainwater harvesting
- Climate resilient development (adaptation and mitigation)

141. Please suggest the level of influence the following factors have on achieving SuDS that provide multiple benefits. With 5 having a high level of influence.

	1 - Low influence	2	3	4	5 - high influence
A developer that appreciates the value of SuDS that provide multiple benefits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A competent design team committed and able to deliver SuDS that provide multiple benefits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Early consideration of the site characteristics and layout	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pre-application discussions with those that approve the drainage submission	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Compliance with Non-statutory Technical Standards for SuDS (NSTS)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Experience and knowledge of those assessing/evaluating schemes within the local authority	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Drainage submission follows guidance in the CIRIA SuDS Manual	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1 - Low influence

2

3

4

5 - high influence

Drainage submission complies with Local Plan Policy

Drainage submission complies with local drainage/flood risk policy

Drainage submission complies with local green infrastructure or biodiversity policy

Drainage submission complies with local authority SuDS guidance (SPD etc)

The requirement to complete a drainage submission proforma by the developer or practitioner

The requirement to complete a (construction) verification report by the developer or practitioner

Drainage submission complies with other standards (please specify)

Drainage submission refers to other guidance (please specify)

Drainage submission includes consideration of responsibilities for long term operation and maintenance of the proposed SuDS

Specify here (max 70 characters)

142. If necessary, please use the text boxes to provide more detail about the factors that influence the delivery of SuDS that provide multiple benefits.

Comment 1 (max
500 characters)

Comment 2 (max
500 characters)

* 143. Should the NSTS be updated to include requirements for SuDS to provide multiple benefits?

Yes

No

Survey for the recommendations to update the Non-Statutory Technical Standards (NSTS) for SuDS

144. If you answered yes, and assuming guidance is provided, how would you like to see the updated NSTS and requirements for multiple benefits introduced? Please select all that apply.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Update and re-issue the NSTS | <input type="checkbox"/> Update Local Plan Policy documents with reference to meeting updated NSTS |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Update the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) with reference to meeting updated NSTS | <input type="checkbox"/> Update Local Design Guide with reference to meeting updated NSTS |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Update the Planning Practice Guidance with reference to meeting updated NSTS | <input type="checkbox"/> Link Biodiversity Net Gain requirements to updated NSTS |

Survey for the recommendations to update the Non-Statutory Technical Standards (NSTS) for SuDS

145. If you answered no, please select an option.

- There is no need to strengthen requirements for SuDS to provide multiple benefits.
- The requirements for SuDS to provide multiple benefits should be included elsewhere (please specify).

Specify here (max 70 characters)

Survey for the recommendations to update the Non-Statutory Technical Standards (NSTS) for SuDS

146. If necessary, please use the text box to provide more detail about updating the NSTS to provide multiple benefits. (Max 500 characters)

* 147. Generally speaking, are there significant differences between the quality of the approved drainage submission and what gets delivered on site?

Yes

No

Survey for the recommendations to update the Non-Statutory Technical Standards (NSTS) for SuDS

148. Please use the text box to provide more detail on what the differences are and how they arise? (Max 500 characters)

149. What approaches are being used to agree maintenance obligations? (Max 500 characters)

* 150. Can you suggest examples of planning submissions, or completed developments that demonstrate the opportunities and challenges of delivering SuDS that provide multiple benefits? Alternatively, please send an email to paul.shaffer@ciria.org.

Yes

No

Survey for the recommendations to update the Non-Statutory Technical Standards (NSTS) for SuDS

151. Case study details (max 500 characters)

Planning reference:

Name of development:

Street or postcode:

Scale of development (area/houses):

Type of development:

Built (yes/no):

Provides multiple benefits (yes/no):

Demonstrates challenge (yes/no):

Please provide details

Survey for the recommendations to update the Non-Statutory Technical Standards (NSTS) for SuDS

Final comments

152. Please use the text box to provide any other additional comments. (Max 500 characters)

153. Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey.

Your response will help inform the research into developing recommendations to update the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS.

We may need to obtain some further information, particularly around any case studies, or examples. If you would be willing for us to contact you to follow up the survey please leave your contact details below. Your details will only be used for this purpose of this research. Alternatively, please email paul.shaffer@ciria.org.

Name

Email Address

Phone Number