

---

**Sent:**

29 March 2026 11:05

**To:**

Sam.Whitehouse

**Subject:**

Re: DC/25/2006 Outline application - unresolved drainage issues

**Follow Up Flag:**

Follow up

**Flag Status:**

Flagged

Dear Sam,

Thank you for sharing the LLFA's response on the planning portal.

It is of great concern that LLFA's response dated 18 March 2026 explicitly states they reviewed the application only based on consultation documents received on 02 January 2026. This suggests that the LLFA has not considered the 6-point technical audit that I submitted to you on 23rd February, which identified fundamental errors in the developer's 100-year hydraulic model. You replied at the time of submission saying that "A comment from the LLFA will be provided to officers prior to any determination of the application." Can you please clarify, because as it stands it appears the LLFA is out of step/date with consultation responses?

That said, I am encouraged to see the LLFA review of the developer's as submitted drainage design has agreed with 3 of my technical concerns regarding urban creep, latest rainfall data, and the submerged outfall, their response confirms that the current application is indeed based on flawed hydraulic modelling.

If we consider just these 3 points, there is a huge significance to the new "Conditions" of the LLFA as they actually prove that the site layout is not viable as currently proposed. By making these "Pre-Commencement Conditions," the Council is effectively deferring a major site redesign to the 'Reserved Matters' stage, which is a huge procedural risk. I must ask whether you realise the consequences of the LLFA mandating three major concerns that the developer omitted from their current plans ie:-

1. Mandatory 10% Urban Creep: The current basin was designed for 0%. A 10% increase in water volume requires a significantly larger basin footprint.
  2. Use of Latest Rainfall Data: Applying the 970mm (Itchingfield) reality rather than the 831mm average will require approximately 17% more storage volume.
  3. Submerged Outfall Simulation: Modelling the flooded ditch will prove the system is "choked." To manage this, the developer must either significantly increase the basin size again or further raise the entire site's ground levels above and beyond the 300mm extra height that the LLFA already now requires.
- The crucial point is that if you cumulatively stack these 3 requirements, then the current 38-house layout becomes very uncertain. There is simply not enough land to accommodate the required basin size and the current number of dwellings. One or the other has to give.

Whilst the LLFA has spotted 3 of the 6 issues that we have previously raised, there remain 3 which the LLFA have yet to see or comment on/address:-

- A 400% Catchment Area Error: In Condition 1(I), the LLFA seems to have without challenge, accepted the QBAR 5.9 l/s discharge rate. They appear to have not noticed that this was calculated for a 3.9ha field, while the building plot being positively drained is only 0.935ha. This violates the West Sussex LLFA Proforma (Section 2.2). Correcting this area error will drop the allowed discharge rate further, requiring an even larger basin. This point needs to be specifically addressed and answered by the LLFA/developer as this will have a major site viability implication.
- The as-designed pipe network is un-adoptable: The developer's own data shows a peak water velocity in some pipes of 0.19 m/s - that's an 80% failure against the 1.0 m/s mandatory minimum for WSCC adoption. As I mentioned in my submission, this was "cloaked" by manually disabling the software's "Best Practice Design Rules" (the 'x' on

p.39). A system designed to silt up is costly to maintain and will be unadoptable by West Sussex Highways, leaving future residents (or Slinfold Parish council) with a permanent and costly private maintenance liability.

- Non-Disclosure of Adjacent High Flood Risk: The LLFA has not addressed the High Risk flood zone immediately to the North of the site. Failure to account for this in a "Cumulative Impact Assessment" violates SuDS Policy 4.

The LLFA's conditions have confirmed that the developer's current drainage design is wrong. This is not a "detail" for later; it is a viability failure. As a minimum I request that the LLFA responds to the "6 Red Flag drainage issues" that was issued 23.2.26.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

BSc Civ Eng Hons