

Ground Floor  
Northleigh  
County Hall  
Chichester  
West Sussex  
PO19 1RH



**Lead Local Flood Authority**

Date 27<sup>th</sup> October 2025

Nicola Pettifer  
Development Control  
Albery House  
Springfield Road  
Horsham  
RH12 2GB

Dear Nicola,

**RE: DC/25/1155 Land East of Tilletts Lane Warnham**

Thank you for your reconsultation on the above site, received on 13th October 2025. We have reviewed the application as submitted and wish to make the following comments.

Please see below updated comments to our previous enquiries in [blue](#):

- 1) The exceedance routes appear to affect both existing properties and areas outside the red line boundary (in particular Robinsgreen and surrounding land south of the access road) and potentially plots 47 and 50. Please can the exceedance routes be checked and clarification provided for these areas in particular. It may be of benefit to overlay the exceedance plan over topographic data to demonstrate the exceedance flows will not impact these area.

[The Applicant has provided data to assert any exceedance of concern will be retained within the kerb, which is acceptable in principle.](#)

- 2) We will require further information regarding the ordinary watercourses on site, as their onward connectivity is not clear. Please can the Applicant provide updated drawings showing the precise locations of each watercourse with hard bed and bank levels. It is important for us to understand how they connect to the wider network, and any existing structures (culverts, outfalls etc) should also be marked with their invert levels and pipe diameters where applicable. We will need to see how the surface water discharge could affect flood risk offsite as we are aware of known flood concerns in the area. A CCTV survey of the wider system may be required to demonstrate this.

[We thank the Applicants for their work on this point to date, however our understanding is still incomplete. See point 4 below.](#)

- 3) 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 this email: **“DC/25/1155 FEH Point File”**


This has been reviewed, however the coordinates given do not appear to be within the site boundary, please could this be clarified or amended accordingly. We would generally receive the data in an XML file format, if possible.

- 4) It is noted that there is only one discharge point within the site, however the evidence provided shows there is more than one catchment within the site. The surface water drainage system will need to mimic the natural drainage of the site, for example it is unclear why there is not a direct outfall from basin 1 to the adjacent watercourse. This could increase flood risk elsewhere as the distribution of surface water runoff will not be as existing, rather concentrated in one location. Please can this be reviewed and clarified.

We have read the Applicant’s submissions and additional evidence on the watercourse and drainage systems at this site, which are complex and some of which is assumed in terms of location, connectivity and ability to function. The evidence is helpful however we have further queries in this regard. The current design is discharging all surface water to a private surface water sewer on the southeastern boundary. Please can justification be given as to why the Western portion of the catchment cannot discharge to the watercourse that runs approximately centrally North to South? We are concerned flood risk will increase in the Easterly section and offsite if one discharge location is used. Discharge to watercourse is higher in the SuDS hierarchy and as such should be discounted before surface water sewers are used. It is noted that the previous strategy proposed a discharge to watercourse, we will require further clarification for the reason this has now been discounted as an outfall.

- 5) Please revise calculations utilising a surcharged outfall to the top of bank level.

We note that Appendix D as directed in the response is the Maintenance and Management Plan, and therefore we have reviewed appendix E which is the Infodrainage report. Please could the Applicant direct us to the page number of the amendment they have made that evidences this? We understand this would normally be denoted in the ‘outfall details’ section of the Infodrainage report. (Example below from another report):

Project:	Date:			
Report Details: Type: Outfall Details Storm Phase: Phase	Designed by: User	Checked by:	Approved By:	
	Company Address:			

Outfalls			
Outfall	Outfall Type	Fixed Surcharged Level (m)	Level Curve
	Free Discharge		
	Free Discharge		

*surcharged outfall details infodrainage*

We note the change in basin design, this does not appear to follow requirements in the SuDS manual for freeboard, further explanation as to the reasoning for this would be helpful.

- 6) The drainage plan needs to evidence a 3m easement buffer (from top of bank) for all SuDS basins and watercourses to allow for maintenance access.

It is noted that there are some restrictions to access due to necessary BNG hedging requirements, specifically at basin 1 where the southerly inlet location is not accessible from the adjacent bank. Please can we be provided with a note as to how maintenance will be achieved on the southerly portion of basin 1.

- 7) We would recommend Southern Water are consulted regarding the foul pumping station to ensure the appropriate standoff distances/easement buffers have been included in the layout, if not already established.

*This is an advisory only and has been addressed.*

- 8) As an advisory, as with previous applications we would flag that the policy referred to at 7.10 is no longer valid and not in effect. The latest National Standards for SuDS (July 2025) should be followed.

*Addressed.*

Upon receipt of the above we will be in a position to comment further.

Yours sincerely,

Natalie Biddulph  
**Flood Risk Management Team**

**Annex:**

**Documents considered as part of this response:**

- Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy 9 May 2025 1lbwar/ 2404044
- Technical Note 2: Resolving LLFA Objection to Horsham District Council Planning 8 October 2025