

From: Andrew Clarke
Sent: 10 April 2026 13:11:45 UTC+01:00
To: "Dan" <dan@studiohere.com>
Subject: RE: 0332 Little Reed - DM/25/0590 Mid Sussex
Attachments: 20251031 NH HR NH-25-10773 DM-25-0590 - Little Reeds Farm London Rd Hickstead W Sussex.pdf, Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Consultee Comments for Planning Application DM/25/0590

Dear Dan,

Apologies for the further delays with the determination of this application. There does appear to have been an issue with the re-consultation with Place Services both in November and more recently in March. I'm afraid I cannot provide a full explanation for this at the current time but have asked our Service Support Team to look into it further. Suffice to say I am now content that they have all the documentation, esp in relation the BNG and are seeking to provide a full response asap.

On the wider matters relating to the application, we have received comments from our Tree Officer and Archaeologist (also at Place Services so they seem to have received the consultation) who have not raised objections to the application. I am still awaiting comments from the EA (as advised by our Drainage Officers and will forward them on when received).

On the 'live' consultations, please see below:

Highways - we still have a holding objection from National Highways. There was ongoing dialogue between NH and GTA on your side up until October last year, but no subsequent response in relation to NH latest set of queries (attached). As it stands therefore the holding recommendation remains and could be a reason to refuse the application. I'd be grateful if you could request GTA re-engage with the NH and copy me into any correspondence.

Drainage – I have received the following comments from our Drainage Officers:

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.

Can the above queries be addressed in a revised drainage submission please.

MSDC EHO – The comments of our EHO are attached. As you will note whilst they are not raising an objection a number of queries have been raised regarding the purpose of the bund and that it doesn't really achieve its stated objectives. They also note the baseline for the noise recordings may not be robust. Your comments in respect of this would be welcomed.

MSDC Landscapes – I await further comments on the revised LVIA but note the revision to the harm from none to medium (low with mitigation). This confirms the potential for harm to the character and appearance of the rural area even with potential mitigation and planting. I too also retain concerns regarding the length of the bund to the north which is not necessary for the given reasons for the application (to mitigate the road noise) and potentially adds to the visual impact, drainage issues and highways concerns. A full re-consideration of this element would be requested.

With respect to the wider principle of the development, as your planning statement concerns, the development is not necessary for the purposes of agricultural and whilst the content of policy DP29 are noted this does not provide support for additional mitigation (the mitigation is internal sound insulation as secured through Building Regulations.) and the site has historically had a residential dwelling upon it. It therefore falls to determine the application primarily against the policy DP12 of the District Plan and in the absence of any other policy support, and noting the current concerns

regarding the impact upon the character and appearance of the area and the excessive length of the bund then, and notwithstanding the addressing of issues around BNG, highway safety and drainage, that the development is unacceptable in principle in respect to its scale and impact upon the character and appearance of the rural area.

I'm happy to accept further comments, representation and evidence but would now be seeking to bring the matter to a conclusion within the next 6 weeks.

In respect of the procedural issues with this application, for this I apologise in relation to the delay undertaking consultation following the submission of additional information in late 2025. I acknowledge this has delayed the determination of the application, albeit it is unlikely to have had an impact upon the determination of the planning merits of the application. With respect to escalating any complaint details of our complaints procedure can be found at the following link: <https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/about-us/your-feedback/>

I hope the above addresses all aspects of the current application and your concerns regarding the determination of the application.

Kind regards

Andy Clarke BSc (Econ), PGDip
Senior Planning Officer
Planning Investigation and Enforcement
Mid Sussex District Council, Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 1SS
Tel: +44 (0)1444 477332
Andrew.Clarke@midsussex.gov.uk <http://www.midsussex.gov.uk>

Working together for a better Mid Sussex

From: Dan <dan@studiohere.com>
Sent: 09 April 2026 08:01
To: Andrew Clarke <andrew.clarke@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: planningvalidation <planningvalidation@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: 0332 Little Reed - DM/25/0590 Mid Sussex

Hello Andy,

Why did you not come back to us?

Dan McEwan
07827 012317
studiohere.com

On 8 Apr 2026, at 09:28, Andrew Clarke
<Andrew.Clarke@midsussex.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Dan,

Thanks for the email. Apologies I have only just picked it up. I'll have a full response to you by the end of the day.

Kind regards

Andy Clarke BSc (Econ), PGDip
Senior Planning Officer
Planning Investigation and Enforcement
Mid Sussex District Council, Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 1SS
Tel: +44 (0)1444 477332

Andrew.Clarke@midsussex.gov.uk <http://www.midsussex.gov.uk>

Working together for a better Mid Sussex