[redacted]

From: Planning
Sent: 20 October 2025 13:21
To: Sophie.Spencer
Subject: FW: TIME SENSITIVE: OBJECTION – DC/23/2279, Land North of The Rosary, Partridge Green – Flood risk, SuDS siting and Sequential Test

Telephone:
Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk

Horsham District Council

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: 16 09 2025 15:13
To: 2 All Committee Services [redacted]
Cc: Jason.Hawkes [redacted]
Subject: TIME SENSITIVE: OBJECTION – DC/23/2279, Land North of The Rosary, Partridge Green – Flood risk, SuDS siting and Sequential Test

Meeting date: 17:30 Tuesday 16 September 2025

Dear Chair and Members

We are instructed by [redacted], who objects to this outline application for up to 81 dwellings at Land North of The Rosary, Partridge Green (ref. DC/23/2279). We should be grateful if these late representations could be passed on to members.

1) Sequential Test – not lawfully or adequately applied

The National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2024) requires the Sequential Test to be used for applications in areas at risk of flooding except where a site-specific FRA demonstrates that no built development within the site boundary – including access or escape routes, land raising, or other potentially vulnerable elements – would be located in an area at risk now or in the future (¶¶ 173–175).

The SuDS basin and parts of the LEAP lie within mapped flood-risk extents (fluvial Flood Zone 2 and areas of medium/high surface-water risk). The Officer Report nevertheless concludes that the Sequential Test is not required on the basis that homes and roads avoid those areas. That conclusion does not engage with the Framework's explicit reference to "other potentially vulnerable elements" and to access/escape routes and is therefore unsound.

2) FRA evidence confirms flood-exposed elements remain

The FRA Addendum (24 April 2025) acknowledges Flood Zones 2–3 along the site's north and north-west and identifies the SuDS and LEAP within the medium/high-risk area. The Officer Report adopts that analysis. This is not a scheme where all development components are safely outside risk – only dwellings/roads are said to be in Flood Zone 1.

3) NPPF decision tests not satisfied at application stage

Under NPPF ¶ 181, permission in flood-risk areas should only be granted where the FRA shows that:

- the most vulnerable uses are in the lowest-risk parts of the site;
- the development is flood-resistant and resilient;
- residual risk is safely managed; and
- safe access and escape are secured where appropriate.

For major development, ¶ 182 also requires SuDS to take account of LLFA advice, to have appropriate operational standards, and lifetime maintenance. None of this has been demonstrated for the SuDS basin and LEAP located within mapped risk, nor is safe access/egress during design and exceedance events evidenced.

Increased flood risk elsewhere not ruled out
In addition, it is unclear how the proposal demonstrates compliance with the requirement that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. By design, runoff from new hard surfaces would be collected and directed to a SuDS basin that lies within Flood Zone 2. In a fluvial flood that basin is likely to be inundated at the very time attenuation is most needed, reducing storage capacity and forcing water to bypass the system. Without clear evidence of backwater tolerance, safe overflow routes and safeguarded off-site discharge rates, there is a real risk that exceedance flows would be displaced off-site, worsening flood risk elsewhere.

4) Inadequate conditions cannot remedy a policy failure

The conditions relied on (SuDS submission tied to the FRA, a construction-phase method statement, an "as-built" verification and a maintenance plan) do not secure basic and proportionate risk controls, such as:

- mapped exceedance flow routes that bypass homes and the LEAP;
- minimum finished-floor levels for dwellings above predicted flood levels;
- SuDS basin freeboard with a safe emergency spillway; and
- explicit runoff limits and storage performance for design events including climate change.

Deferring such primary flood-safety matters to later design undermines the NPPF requirement that the decision-maker be satisfied now that residual risks are safely managed for the lifetime of the development (¶¶ 181–182).

5) Conflict with the development plan and national policy

Given the above, the proposal conflicts with HDPF Policy 38 (Flooding) and with NPPF Chapter 14 (¶¶ 173–175 and 181–182). The officer's assurance of compliance is not borne out once the siting of the SuDS/LEAP within risk areas and the absence of a lawful Sequential Test analysis are properly considered.

Conclusion – refusal warranted

This application fails the Sequential Test as properly understood in the NPPF and fails to demonstrate compliance with ¶¶ 181–182 on safe management of residual risk, safe access/egress and robust SuDS for a

major development. The Committee should refuse permission for conflict with national policy and HDPF Policy 38.

All the best
Lewis

Lewis Hadler
Senior Paralegal
Richard Buxton Solicitors
Dale's Brewery, Gwydir Street, Cambridge CB1 2LJ
T. 01223 328 933 D. [redacted]
E. [redacted]
W. www.richardbuxton.co.uk

Authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority