

From: drainage <drainage@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 30 July 2025 12:53:21 UTC+00:00
To: "Andrew Clarke" <Andrew.Clarke@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: "drainage" <drainage@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: 2025.07.30 Re: DM/25/0590 - Little Reeds Farm London Road Hickstead
Haywards Heath West Sussex RH17 5LY - Request for further information

Dear Andrew,

Thank you for consulting the Flood Risk and Drainage Team on the above application. The application has gone through an initial review and can provide the following comments.

Flood Risk

The application is supported by a Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy dated 30/08/2024. Surface water modelling has been undertaken as part of the application.

Since the 2024 report was produced the Environment Agency released updated flood risk mapping following the new National Flood Risk Assessment (NaFRA2) in early 2025.

The updated mapping uses new and improved methods to assess flood risk. Given the sites proximity to the River Adur we would expect the Environment Agency's fluvial flood data to be included within the report to demonstrate no land raising is to occur below the 1:100+CC flood level.

The submitted surface water modelling is not acceptable, as it fails to demonstrate that the proposed development will not increase flood risk both on-site and off-site, in particular:

- The LiDAR used from 2014 is outdated. The applicant should use the EA LiDAR 1m DTM from 2022.
- The climate change allowance used for the modelling has not been specified (we would expect increasing rainfall amounts by the proportion associated with the Upper End allowance for the Adur and Ouse Management Catchment for the 2070s epoch (development with a lifetime between 2061 and 2125): 3.3% AEP - rainfall increased by 40% and 1% AEP - rainfall increased by 45%.)
- The catchment area used for the TuFLOW model has not been sufficiently justified. The catchment extent should be defined based on the LiDAR, and be sufficient to demonstrate that surface water flows both upstream and downstream of the site are not affected by the development.
- The surface water modelling results have only been presented at discrete points. The modelled flood depths should be presented for both the whole site and the wider area, for the existing scenario (baseline), the proposed scenario, and a comparison / difference of flood depths pre-post development to demonstrate the impact of both the land raising and the proposed swale.
- The boundary conditions of the model are not discussed, we would expect a water level versus flow boundary (HQ) to be applied at the downstream extent of the model domain at the River Adur, with a gradient derived from the EA LiDAR DTM. HQ boundaries with general slope values should be applied to the rest of 2D domain to prevent glass-walling.

- Results of sensitivity testing have not been presented (for example Sensitivity testing of Manning's 'n' roughness values, critical storm duration, 1D representations)
- Modelled flood hazard mapping has not been provided for the 1:100 year +CC event to demonstrate that safe escape routes for the residents will not be affected by the proposed works.

It has not been demonstrated that there will be no land raising within the surface water 1:100 year plus climate change extent.

The applicant needs to provide evidence that the proposed development will not increase flood risk on site or elsewhere.

At this time, we will require the following further information:

- Revised surface water modelling for the 1:100 year + climate change event to demonstrate that the development design ensures;
 - Site users are safe in the event of a flood
 - There is no loss of floodplain storage
 - There is no impedance of overland flows
 - There is no increase in flood risk

Surface Water Drainage

We would advise the applicant that at this stage of planning the following additional information in relation to the provided surface water drainage strategy will be needed to be provided.

- Pre- and post-development discharge rates
- Cross-section drawings do not show the existing ditch, National Highways (NH) boundary and site boundary.
- Evidence that the western boundary ditch exists.
- Evidence that the receiving ditch has capacity, a wider connection to the drainage / watercourse network in the area and it's inverts support the proposed drainage system.
- Evidence that WSCC Highways would accept the principle of surface water drainage connecting to their system.

The team do not consider the 2024 Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy sufficient to address the flood risk and drainage requirements at this stage of planning.

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