

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] >
Sent: 09 February 2026 09:58
To: Amy.Furness; Sam.Whitehouse; Planning; [REDACTED]
Cc: Slinfold Clerk; Cllr Roberts; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Cllr Skeates
Subject: Re: FW: DC/25/2006 Outline application with all matters to be reserved except for access and layout, for the erection of 38no. dwellings
Attachments: Draft to WSCC (1).docx
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Good morning Sam, Eleanor and Amy

DC/25/2006 - Land East of 1 To 25 Hayes Lane Slinfold West Sussex

Residents of Slinfold are extremely concerned about the surface water drainage through the village and have made numerous objections to this planning application in Hayes Lane.

The applicant has had the opportunity to discuss matters directly with the relevant Authorities and we would welcome a similar opportunity.

I have tried to distill advice from people in Slinfold with specific drainage knowledge which is attached below. Rather than this disappear into a black hole, not knowing the LLFA nor HDC response, we would like to have a detailed response or better still to meet with the appropriate officers.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

On Mon, 2 Feb 2026 at 15:39, Amy.Furness [REDACTED] wrote:

Good afternoon,

This is regarding **DC/25/2006** - Land East of 1 To 25 Hayes Lane Slinfold West Sussex

Outline application with all matters to be reserved except for access and layout, for the erection of 38no. dwellings, (including 13no. on-site affordable housing units), together with access from Hayes Lane, vehicle and cycle parking, landscaping, open space and play provision, sustainable drainage, and re-alignment of Public Right of Way No.3782

On the 21st of January, due to the scale and nature of the proposed development, I requested that the LLFA at WSCC be consulted. I should have followed with an email highlighting concerns brought to my attention by Mr Feltham, who I spoke with on the 22nd of January, regarding surface water flooding in the area of Slinfold and failures of existing drainage infrastructure in the area.

Please review correspondence below from Mr Keith Feltham to Eleanor Read at the LLFA. Mr Feltham is a former HDC colleague and Director of Environmental Services at the council. The issues below, which Mr Feltham brings to the attention of the LLFA, I believe, are worth communicating directly with the Planning Team. In addition, I will shortly arrange to discuss this case with the LLFA and inform you of any outcome.

Kind regards,

Amy Furness
Drainage Officer

[REDACTED]



Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton

[REDACTED]

Sent: 02 February 2026 14:50

[REDACTED]

Cc: Amy.Furness [REDACTED]

Subject: DC/25/2006 Outline application with all matters to be reserved except for access and layout, for the erection of 38no. dwellings

Good afternoon Eleanor,

HDC have responded to this application by saying - "Given the scale of the proposed development, please consult the LLFA at WSCC"

I am therefore writing to you to ensure that the objections due to surface water flooding onsite, across and on downstream properties and the public highway at Lyons Road are carefully considered before you respond to the application consultation.

Slinfold Parish Council have adopted a "Management Statement" updating their neighbourhood Plan that says:

- Parish will support no more than 15 dwellings here
- **Surface water drainage improvements are a prerequisite condition**

Resident's objections include:

1. Existing flooding of properties downstream
2. The developer's technically unsound drainage strategy
3. Existing surface water flooding of the applicant's site and incorrect statements that this maybe due to blockages of the culvert under the Downs Link
4. Overloaded receiving stream uphill and onsite from Hayes Hill

The proposed surface water drainage strategy for this development is technically unsound and presents a material increase in flood risk both on and off site.

The applicant's agent has repeatedly asserted that a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) with an attenuation basin and hydrobrake flow control will adequately limit discharge to the receiving ditch. This assertion fails to take proper account of the real hydraulic conditions in the receiving watercourse during periods of significant rainfall.

The receiving ditch/stream is demonstrably at or beyond its conveyance capacity during heavy rainfall events. At such times the downstream water level rises to the point that the outfall becomes partially or fully submerged. A hydrobrake (vortex flow control) is critically dependent on a free, unsubmerged outfall in order to generate the vortex that restricts discharge to the designed rate.

When the outlet is submerged, the hydraulic behaviour changes fundamentally:

- * The vortex cannot form correctly because the required air core is suppressed by the tailwater.
- * The control no longer behaves as a calibrated flow restrictor.
- * Instead, it effectively becomes a drowned orifice, allowing significantly greater discharge than the design flow.

In other words, at precisely the time when attenuation is most needed (peak rainfall and high downstream levels), the control device will lose its regulating function and permit increased, not reduced, outflow.

This is not a theoretical concern. An existing hydrobrake serving the nearby six-acre site already exhibits this failure mode during major storm events. When the downstream ditch surcharges, that hydrobrake is drowned out and the attenuation system rapidly empties, transferring peak flows directly into the already overloaded watercourse.

Replicating this approach upstream will compound the problem by:

1. Increasing peak discharges to the ditch during extreme rainfall rather than attenuating them.
2. Raising water levels further downstream due to coincident surcharging of multiple “attenuated” systems.
3. Increasing the likelihood of overtopping of the ditch and flooding of adjacent land and property, including homes downstream and the carriageway of Lyons Road.

A SuDS scheme that relies on a vortex flow control without guaranteeing a permanently free outfall (or without designing explicitly for submerged tailwater conditions) cannot be relied upon to limit discharge during critical storm events. The design as proposed therefore underestimates peak flows to the receiving watercourse at the very times that flood risk is highest.

For the system to be technically robust, it would need either:

* A demonstrably non-surcharging outfall level for all design storm events including climate change allowances, or

* A control structure specifically designed and modelled to operate correctly under submerged tailwater conditions, with hydraulic calculations proving that discharge will still be limited to greenfield rates when the ditch is in flood.

No such evidence has been provided. Instead, the applicant relies on idealised, free-outfall assumptions that are contradicted by observed real-world behaviour of the existing downstream system. Indeed the applicant stated last night that there has been some local flooding precisely where the SUDS outfall would be. This was blamed on the pipe under the Downs Link blocking. As no one has responsibility for the maintenance of this pipe, a trash screen would only exacerbate the situation, there is every likelihood that this will be a yearly occurrence.

Approving this scheme as it stands would therefore create a foreseeable and avoidable increase in flood risk to downstream properties and infrastructure.

On these technical grounds, the proposed drainage strategy is unsound and the application should be refused unless and until a revised design is submitted that demonstrably and reliably limits discharge under fully surcharged downstream conditions.

***Please also read the objection statements from

Representation letter	18/01/2026	6 MITCHELL GARDEN
-----------------------	------------	-------------------

***and please take account of the following Gov surface water flood risk for my property Two Oaks, Lyons Road, Slinfold, RH13 ORY from the proposed outfall ditch for this application

***I have also attached a couple of photographs that show the flooding of properties downstream and of Lyons Road by this ditch

Kind regards,

[Redacted signature]

Yearly chance of flooding

Very low Low Medium **High**

Yearly chance of flooding between 2040 and 2060

Very low Low Medium **High**

What surface water is

Surface water flooding is sometimes known as flash flooding. It happens when rainwater cannot drain away through normal drainage systems.

Why surface water flooding is a problem

- -
 -
-

Disclaimer

IMPORTANT NOTICE This e-mail might contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; you may not use or pass it to anyone else. Whilst every care has been taken to check this outgoing e-mail for viruses, it is your responsibility to carry out checks upon receipt. Horsham District Council does not accept liability for any damage caused. E-mail transmission cannot guarantee to be secure or error free. This e-mail does not create any legal relations, contractual or otherwise. Any views or opinions expressed are personal to the author and do not necessarily represent those of Horsham District Council. This Council does not accept liability for any unauthorised/unlawful statement made by an employee. Information in this e mail may be subject to public disclosure in accordance with the law. Horsham District Council cannot guarantee that it will not provide this e mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with the law. If this e-mail message or any attachments are incomplete or unreadable, please telephone 01403 215100 or e-mail customer.services@horsham.gov.uk. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**.

The application is in outline with all matters reserved except for access and layout.

The applicant however has submitted a detailed Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy (FRA&DS) that will be agreed in outline if this application were approved. It is the responsibility therefore of the LLFA to carefully consider what is in the outline drainage application and comment on its accuracy. Horsham District Council's drainage officer has referred the matter to WSCC for this purpose.

The FRA&DS doesn't take account of the flooded outlets into which the proposed SUDS will discharge. The receiving watercourse is usually at max. capacity in heavy rainfall and the proposed two outlets will be drowned; the FRA&DS is therefore unsound. Hydrobreaks, proposed to control discharge flow in this outline scheme will not limit the outfall flow during heavy rainfall as they require a free flowing outlet in order to develop the vortex flow and operate as intended.

Calculations made of runoff are also incorrect as the applicant's engineers have used the total area of the site as discharge runoff from their piped system. The unbuilt area of the site will continue to contribute green field runoff in addition to the piped runoff. The piped SUDS "attenuated system", as outlined, is capable of delivering excess flows and is unsound. Greenfield runoff (QBAR) of 5.9l/s has been taken (p24 doc 1 of 3) as flow from the SUDS system. This would be the runoff from the whole 3.9ha. If 5.9l/s is discharged from the built up area plus the natural runoff from the remaining part of the 3.9ha it would be far too high.

No urban creep allowance has actually been applied in the drainage software (parameter A% is set to zero in all calcs) even though their report says they would use 10% they have not) - applying it will increase the volume to be retained accordingly; the calculations are wrong

The application in its present form fails the conditions required by the LLFA nor does it show, at this outline stage, that they can theoretically be met. Indeed, they would as outlined in their application; fail these conditions, as the outfall arrangements are regularly flooded and hydrobreaks will not limit flow. In addition to the natural runoff from the remainder of the site excess flows are calculated to flow from the SUDS area.

On the question of the current high flood risk downstream we should remind ourselves that WSCC rules say "The LLFA will seek to ensure that all new development... provides a net reduction in flood risk (betterment) where possible " This betterment has not been mentioned or achieved in this outline proposal and should be required by WSCC (LLFA)

The application can therefore be rejected as unsound by the LLFA until such time as the outline drainage arrangements show that there is a workable solution to prevent increased flows to the already overloaded and surcharged surface watercourse and some betterment of flood risk downstream is achieved.

The proposed receiving waters already threaten and flood property and the public highway downstream. The local community would expect the LLFA to rigorously interrogate and challenge the information presented in this outline proposal. All parties need to be accountable at this outline stage.

We would welcome a meeting with WSCC/HDC drainage and flood management teams to discuss these proposals and present our case.