

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 30 January 2026 10:52:25 UTC+00:00  
**To:** "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application DC/25/2006  
**Categories:** Comments Received

## Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 30/01/2026 10:52 AM.

### Application Summary

**Address:** Land East of 1 To 25 Hayes Lane Slinfold West Sussex

---

**Proposal:** 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

---

**Case Officer:** Sam Whitehouse

---

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

**Address:** Greenacres Lyons Road Slinfold

---

### Comments Details

**Commenter Type:** Member of the Public

---

**Stance:** Customer objects to the Planning Application

---

**Reasons for comment:** - Other

**Comments:** I wish to register a further strong objection to the proposed surface water drainage strategy for this development on the basis that it 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.

---

Kind regards

**Telephone:**

**Email:** [planning@horsham.gov.uk](mailto:planning@horsham.gov.uk)



---

**Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB**  
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) [www.horsham.gov.uk](http://www.horsham.gov.uk) Chief Executive: Jane E aton