Ground Floor
Northleigh
County Hall
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1RH

Stuart Malcom
Development Control
Mid Sussex District Council
Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath
West Sussex
RH16 1SS

Lead Local Flood Authority

Date 19 January 2026

Dear Stuart,

RE: **DM/25/1434 – Land Rear Of Chesapeke, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common, Hassocks, West Sussex BN6 9JG**

Thank you for your re-consultation on the above site. We have reviewed the application as submitted and wish to make the following comments.

This is a full planning application for the Proposed demolition of an existing dwelling house, stables and barn buildings and the proposed development of 27 dwellings, with a new vehicular access, associated landscaping, parking, open space, and all other associated development works.

This application was assessed using NPPF, PPG Flood Risk and Coastal Change, MSDC Local Plan and the National standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) (Updated 30th July 2025). The WSCC Policy for the Management of Surface Water is superseded, therefore the National Standards should be followed.

The updated comments can be seen in blue.

We raised concerns that there were several issues with the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy that could increase flood risk elsewhere and required further information to address the following:

1. ~~Flood storage for the ordinary watercourse in the south of the site will be lost as a result of the ground raising towards the west of the site. As stated in PPG Flood risk and coastal change, on-site level for level compensatory storage accounting for climate change for the lifetime of the development should be provided. This is to ensure surface water which naturally collects in the lower areas of the site currently (in the watercourse floodplain) is not displaced, as this would increase flood risk within the site or elsewhere.~~

The LLFA are satisfied that this has been adequately addressed.

2. **The LLFA acknowledges the northern catchment, as defined by the applicant, is proposed to discharge at a restricted rate to a culverted watercourse. Also at the northern outfall location, it has been clarified the existing watercourse falls from west to east. As there are proposals to construct additional surface water sewers outside the red line boundary, this will require third party agreements from the relevant asset owners.**

3. ~~The surface water drainage system should mimic natural drainage systems. The topographical survey infers more of the site drains north than where it is proposed that the new surface water drainage system north catchment begins.~~

   The LLFA is satisfied this has been adequately addressed.

4. ~~It also appears that there might be a shallow ditch on the right-hand side of the site, where the existing line of trees are roughly south of Buff Cottage. There is also an Invert level for what is assumed to be a pipe on the topographical survey, although it is unclear what this relates to.~~

   ~~If it is a watercourse that is connected to the wider network, this should be used for the northern part of the site instead of the highway drainage system. This is because discharge to an above ground surface water body is above discharge to a piped surface water system in the discharge hierarchy.~~

   The LLFA are satisfied this has been adequately assessed.

5. ~~Calculations for a 50% AEP and 3.3% AEP plus climate change are required. In the 3.3% AEP results, there shall be no flooding of the surface water drainage system, apart from areas designed to hold or convey surface water.~~

   This has been adequately addressed.

6. ~~The levels in the calculations and the drainage layout must match. There is currently instances where there are discrepancies, which means the system being modelling does not reflect plans.~~

   This has been adequately addressed.

7. ~~As several of the orifices have a diameter less than 50mm, we require additional information about how they will be protected from blockage risks. It is also noted that some of the orifices have no design flow.~~

This is adequately addressed.

8. An exceedance plan is required for 1% AEP plus climate change event.

   Thank you for this. If there are any further alterations to the drainage strategy or layout, the exceedance plan may need amending.

~~9. In the calculations, some of the permeable paving depths are missing.~~

   This is adequately addressed.

10. On the drainage strategy there is no details about the basin included. Cross sections of the basin are also required. The basin should be designed following the SuDS Manual and any relevant sections of the National SuDS Standards.

    Unable to locate on portal.

~~11. To ensure there is capacity for consecutive events, attenuation features should half drain a 3.3% AEP event within 24 hours.~~

    This is adequately addressed.

12. To allow us to check the calculation parameters, send the FEH 2022 point data file for the site to the Flood Risk Management Team. This data will be dealt with in accordance with 5.1.7 of the FEH Web Service terms of use. Please send it to FRM@westsussex.gov.uk **not the case officer**, as this information must remain confidential to follow the terms of use. Please title the email: DM/25/1434 FEH Point File.

    This has been reviewed. The SAAR in the FEH point file does not match the SAAR used in the Greenfield Runoff Rate calculations.

We **maintain our objection** until such time as **sufficient detailed further information** is provided.

Yours sincerely,

Mat Jackson
Flood Risk Management Team
FRM@westsussex.gov.uk

Annex

The following documents were accessed from the planning portal and considered at the time in review of this application:

- Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Addendum No.1 Project 22-258 prepared by Odysey, November 2025.
- Dwg 22-258-015 Exceedance Flow Drawing November 2025.
- Dwg AH291 - PL.03 H Site Layout Plan 12.08.25