

From: drainage <drainage@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 June 2026 10:13:25 UTC+01:00
To: "Katherine Williams" <Katherine.Williams@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: "drainage" <drainage@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: 2026.06.09 Re: DM/25/3028 - West House Farm Henfield Road Albourne Hassocks West Sussex BN6 9DE

Dear Katherine,

Thank you for the submission of the additional drainage information, including the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum and supporting hydraulic modelling.

The additional information has addressed a number of the concerns raised in our previous consultation response. In particular, further details have now been provided regarding the proposed surface water drainage strategy, attenuation provision, exceedance routing and the use of permeable paving as part of the proposed SuDS design.

However, having reviewed the submitted information, we remain concerned that certain aspects of the drainage strategy have not been fully demonstrated and require further clarification before we can confirm that the proposal satisfies the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated guidance.

Safe Access and Egress

The submitted hydraulic modelling provides an assessment of flood risk associated with the culverted watercourse crossing beneath the access road. Whilst this work is welcomed, the modelling indicates flood depths of up to approximately 0.37m and identifies areas of elevated flood hazard in the vicinity of the culvert crossing.

The conclusion that the identified hazards are overstated appears to rely upon professional judgement regarding potential interpolation errors within the model. However, no revised modelling has been submitted to demonstrate the extent to which the results would change following correction of these issues.

As such, it has not been conclusively demonstrated that safe access and egress can be maintained during the relevant design flood events.

Furthermore, whilst the applicant has assessed the extent of flooding and associated hazard ratings, no Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan (FWEP) or equivalent emergency response procedure has been provided. In the absence of such information, it has not been demonstrated how future occupants would be made aware of flood events, what actions would be taken during a flood event, and how safe evacuation would be achieved should access become affected by flooding.

Surface Water Drainage Strategy

The submitted information confirms that infiltration is unlikely to be feasible due to the underlying clay geology and proposes discharge to the existing ditch at a restricted rate of 6.0 l/s.

The applicant has calculated a greenfield runoff rate (QMED) of 1.5 l/s and a QBAR rate of 1.7 l/s. However, the proposed discharge rate of 6.0 l/s significantly exceeds the calculated greenfield runoff rates.

Whilst the proposed discharge rate represents an improvement over the existing brownfield runoff regime, insufficient justification has been provided to demonstrate why discharge at, or closer to, the calculated greenfield runoff rate cannot be achieved. The applicant has not demonstrated that a lower discharge rate has been considered, nor has evidence been provided to show that site constraints prevent further attenuation and restriction of flows.

Further justification should therefore be provided to demonstrate that the proposed discharge rate is as close as reasonably practicable to the greenfield runoff rate, in accordance with SuDS principles and local policy requirements.

Surface Water Discharge Location and Capacity

The submitted information confirms the existence of the receiving ditch and its connection to the wider watercourse network. However, insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the receiving system has adequate capacity to accommodate the proposed discharge.

Further information should be provided regarding:

- the capacity of the receiving watercourse;
- confirmation of downstream conveyance arrangements;
- proposed outfall details, including levels and discharge arrangements; and
- evidence that the proposed discharge can be accommodated without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

Foul Drainage Strategy

We note the intention to serve the development via a package treatment plant. However, the submitted information does not adequately demonstrate that a viable foul drainage solution is achievable.

Whilst reference is made to compliance with the General Binding Rules and the potential for discharge either to ground or to a watercourse, no supporting evidence has been provided to demonstrate the feasibility of either option.

Further information should therefore be submitted, including:

- percolation testing where discharge to ground is proposed;
- confirmation of the proposed final discharge route;
- evidence that the relevant separation distances and regulatory requirements can be achieved; and
- confirmation that the proposed arrangement can operate in accordance with the General Binding Rules or, where necessary, the requirements of an Environmental Permit.

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