

Sarah Valentine

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 January 2026 12:03
To: planninginfo
Subject: DM/25/1434 Land Rear Of Chesapeake Reeds Lane Sayers Common Hassocks
West Sussex BN6 9JG

Dear Sirs

DM/25/1434 Land Rear Of Chesapeake Reeds Lane Sayers Common Hassocks West Sussex BN6 9JG

I am looking for some clarification from the case officer Stuart Malcolm and West Sussex LLFA with regards to the issue of the drainage of the northern catchment area of the Chesapeake site, as it relates to a culverted watercourse that runs under our property 1 Kingsland Cottages.

The applicant is now proposing to discharge the surface water from their site's northern catchment area into the culverted watercourse that runs under Reeds Lane and then continues northwards. As I have mentioned in my previous submission to this application of 08/01/2026, pages 4-6, MSDC Drainage Department had identified capacity issues with this culverted watercourse when they reviewed the planning application for the former Brickyard site (DM/22/0640). The solution which they agreed with the developer of that site was to reroute the culverted watercourse so that it ran instead through their site, thereby increasing its capacity.

Please could you clarify if it is this agreed new rerouted culverted watercourse through the Brickyard site that the applicant now wants to discharge their surface water through?

I ask because although the Brickyard developer, Elivia Homes, have finished their access road with the final brick and tarmac surface, and the new residents have now starting to occupy their homes, they do not appear to have rerouted the culverted watercourse through their site as they agreed in their accepted Planning Application. There has been no reduction in the waterflow going through the existing culvert under our property, which there would have been if a new culvert had been built diverting the water away from it.

Are Elivia Homes still going to reroute this culverted watercourse through their site? If so, is this why WSCC LLFA have not questioned its capacity to take the additional surface water discharge now proposed to come from the Chesapeake site?

If Elivia Homes are not now going to reroute it, and in view of MSDC Drainage comments about the lack of capacity and the flooding caused by the existing culverted watercourse, will the additional discharge from this Chesapeake site increase the risk of the land north of Reeds Lane and beyond flooding? Have WSCC LLFA obtained information, not published on the planning portal, to confirm that it would not?

I would be grateful if you could clarify the above issues to provide confirmation and reassurance as our property is directly affected by this matter and flooding is an established issue in Reeds Lane.

I thank you for your help with this matter.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]
1 Kingsland Cottages, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common, Hassocks, BN6 9JG

(below is a copy of the relevant extract from my submission of 08/01/2026 from the planning portal for reference)

b) Discharge of northern surface water to the culverted watercourse in Reeds Lane

The applicant continues to show a poor knowledge of the drainage systems that actually exist in Reeds Lane.

The applicant advises in point 2.1.5 that in respect of excess surface water in the northern part of their site that *“an alternative discharge point has been identified for the site, therefore discharge to the highway drain is no longer proposed. The culverted watercourse in Reed’s Lane is presented in the Plan of Existing Watercourses at The Old Brickworks drawing (reference 680344-10-01 P1) in Planning Application DM/22/0640 at Land North of Lyndon, Reed’s Lane, Sayers Common. The drawing is located in Appendix A of the ‘Agent – Additional drainage information’ document. The drawings demonstrate that the culverted watercourse has continuity towards the north”*

The applicant has prior knowledge of this watercourse as it is the one that they used to discharge into the overflow from their Klagester, for the next door Meadowview estate, when it broke down. This caused pollution and flooding.

It is noted that they have not surveyed the watercourse for its condition and capacity to be able to take their surface water at the discharge rate they are requesting without increasing flooding elsewhere. If they had they would see that it has capacity issues which were identified when MSDC Drainage officers examined it with regards to the planning application DM/22/0640, which the applicant has mentioned above.

In the drainage section of the MSDC Planning Officer’s Delegated Report for application DM/22/0640 they advised that:

“The Councils Flood Risk and Drainage team note that they are aware of instances of flooding associated with the eastern watercourse. It is their opinion that many of the flood instances are caused by / exacerbated by variations in bed level and lack of maintenance along this eastern watercourse.”

To resolve this situation and reduce the risk of flooding in Sayers Common they then went on to advise that the DM/22/0640 application:

“Includes the rerouting of an ordinary watercourse which flows south to north. The existing watercourse is formed by a mix of culverted sections and open channel. The culverted section comes from the south, across Reeds Lane and through 1 Kingsland Cottages. The watercourse then daylight into an open channel in the garden of 1 Kingsland Cottages before flowing north along the densely vegetated eastern boundary of the site. Due to the level differences between the culverted section and the open channel to the north the falls on this section of the watercourse are poor, in addition maintenance of the open channel in some areas has been lacking. This can result in increased chance of flooding as water is hindered in its downstream flow.”

MSDC then went on to explain further that the applicant for DM/22/0640 had confirmed that:

“It is proposed that the development reroutes this watercourse away from the site’s boundary and further into the site to allow for better maintenance and management of the system. The aim of this approach is to help mitigate / reduce flood risk to both the site and surrounding area caused by the existing system. The culverted watercourse would be picked up within Reeds Lane and rerouted, away from 1 Kingsland Cottages, into the access road of the site. The watercourse would then be daylighted into an open channel within the open space located along the eastern boundary of the site before discharging into the pond on site.”

This proposal was agreed and accepted as part of the planning permission for DM/22/0640 as it was *“thereby considered to comply with policy DP41 of the District Plan and policy SA30 of the Site Allocation DPD”*



Above is an image showing as a blue line the new route of the culverted watercourse diverted westwards from Reeds Lane in front of Kingsland Cottages and then down along the access road to the DM/22/0640 development which is opposite the site of this application. Image taken from the Flood Model report provided for DM/22/0640 on the Planning Portal.

WSCC LLFA advised in point 2 of their consultation response *“that we require evidence that the owner of the Page 1 of 5 system accepts in principle connection to their system, and that the receiving system has capacity for additional flows.”* The applicant should therefore have been entering into discussion with the developer of site DM/22/0640, Elivia Homes, to seek permission to for them to connect to their watercourse and confirmation that it will have the capacity to take their extra discharge at the rate that the applicant is requesting.

It should also be considered by the applicant as to whether it would be more beneficial for them to construct a new culverted water course link, south to north straight across Reeds Lane, to instead join the rerouted watercourse at the entrance to the new access road into the Elivia Homes Woodlands estate.



Yellow arrow demonstrating a more direct link between the applicant's watercourse and that of Elivia Homes

This would reduce the length of the route the water would have to take between the two sites and remove the meandering route that it would have originally taken, firstly east to in front of Kingsland Cottages and then going west and back again on itself to reach the access point of the Elivia Homes Woodlands estate. This would reduce the risk of silt building up in the bends of the culvert and therefore reducing the overall risk of blockages in the culvert causing flooding in the applicant's site and in Reeds Lane.

