
From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 08 August 2026 21:13
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0530

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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 08/08/2026 9:13 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Land at Hornbrook Farm Brighton Road West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application for up to 180 dwellings, open space and associated works and infrastructure with all matters reserved apart from access.
Case Officer:	Nicola Pettifer

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Address:	4 Ghyll Crescent Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	OBJECTION: FLOOD RISK, SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE AND HORN BROOK CAPACITY Application DC/26/0530 - Land at Hornbrook Farm Specific grounds of objection - The proposed drainage system relies upon discharge into Horn Brook, but the submitted FRA does not demonstrate the hydraulic capacity of the receiving watercourse during periods of high flow.

- The development substantially increases surface-water runoff volume, despite the proposed restriction of peak discharge to 27.5 l/s.
- The submitted drainage documentation does not clearly establish where the required attenuation/storage volume will be provided.
- The arrangements for exceedance events remain unresolved, with the drainage pro-forma recording "N/A" for how exceedance flooding will be accommodated.
- The consequences of a high-flow Horn Brook coinciding with development discharge have not been adequately demonstrated, particularly where downstream capacity may already be constrained.
- The reliance on Horn Brook is particularly significant because infiltration is identified as not feasible, while the site is acknowledged to have a high groundwater table.
- The proposed outfall and its effect on the receiving watercourse require further hydraulic assessment, including appropriate upstream and downstream cross-sections and consideration of the Brook under high-flow conditions.

Discussion

The applicant's drainage strategy proposes that the development ultimately discharges surface water into the Horn Brook. The five parcels have stated discharge rates totalling 27.5 litres/second, described as matching the greenfield runoff rate.

I do not suggest that restricting the discharge to 27.5 l/s is inherently unacceptable. The issue is whether that discharge has been demonstrated to be safe when added to an already elevated flow in the Horn Brook.

The submitted figures identify a substantial increase in runoff volume. The applicant's Surface Water Drainage Statement records an increase in runoff volume from 1,002 m³ existing to 2,381.9 m³ proposed for the 1-in-100-year event. For the 1-in-100-year event including climate change, the proposed volume is 3,454.6 m³.

The same document identifies 3,121 m³ of storage as required to retain discharge rates at existing levels, yet the location of that storage is recorded as "TBC".

This is significant because the development introduces approximately 4.85 hectares of impermeable area. The applicant therefore needs to demonstrate precisely how the additional runoff volume will be retained and prevented from increasing flood risk elsewhere.

Exceedance flooding remains unresolved

The drainage pro-forma specifically asks how exceedance events will be accommodated without increasing flood risk either within or outside the development. The response is "N/A".

The FRA itself acknowledges that an event greater than the 1% annual probability event could exceed the capacity of the SuDS system and cause flooding. It states that extreme flow routes are to be derived from the site contours and that measures to accommodate overland flows will need to be considered at detailed design stage.

In my view, this is an important matter to resolve before the drainage strategy can reasonably be regarded as demonstrating that flood risk will not be increased elsewhere.

Capacity of Horn Brook

This is the principal concern.

The drainage pro-forma states that where surface water is discharged to a watercourse, details should include

cross-sections of the adjacent watercourse for an appropriate distance upstream and downstream of the discharge point, as agreed with the LLFA and/or Environment Agency.

I have not identified within the submitted FRA a hydraulic assessment which demonstrates the capacity of the receiving reach of Horn Brook under conditions where the Brook is already carrying substantial flow.

A discharge of 27.5 l/s may be acceptable under normal conditions, but the relevant flood-risk question is whether the receiving watercourse can accommodate that additional flow when its own capacity is already substantially occupied.

The FRA records that the western and northern boundary of the site is within Flood Zone 3 associated with Horn Brook, although the proposed development parcels are stated to be within Flood Zone 1. The Flood Zone 1 classification therefore does not, in itself, resolve the separate question of whether the development could increase flood risk elsewhere through its drainage discharge.

Groundwater and infiltration

The proposed strategy cannot readily rely upon infiltration as an alternative means of managing the additional runoff. The drainage pro-forma records that the site has a high groundwater table and ultimately identifies infiltration as not feasible.

This makes the reliance upon the Horn Brook particularly important.

Conclusion

I ask the Local Planning Authority not to treat the drainage issue as resolved merely because the proposed dwellings are located within Flood Zone 1 or because the peak discharge has been restricted to 27.5 l/s.

Before determination, the applicant should provide evidence demonstrating:

- 1 the hydraulic capacity of the receiving reach of Horn Brook;
- 2 the effect of the proposed discharge when the Brook is already at high flow;
- 3 the precise location and adequacy of the proposed 3,121 m³ attenuation requirement;
- 4 how exceedance flows will be safely managed;
- 5 that downstream flood risk will not be increased; and
- 6 that the proposed outfall will not adversely affect the natural flow or capacity of Horn Brook.

This is particularly important because I am a riparian owner of the Horn Brook and any increase in water level or restriction in downstream capacity could have consequences beyond the application site.

I respectfully request that the application is not determined on the basis of the present drainage information until these matters have been satisfactorily demonstrated.

Evidence referenced: Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment, Project 62726, March 2026, including the Surface Water Drainage Statement and drainage calculations submitted with the application.

Where did you hear about this application?

Not specified

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**



Horsham District Council, Alberty House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB

Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton