From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 November 2026 16:56:15 UTC+00:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0530
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 21/11/2026 4:56 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land at Hornbrook Farm Brighton Road West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application for up to 160 dwellings, open space and associated works and infrastructure with all matters reserved apart from access (revised 10.11.2026)
Case Officer:	Nicola Pettifer

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	4 Ghyll Crescent Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design
Comments:	I object to this application because the Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment (Project No. 62726, Rev P05) and its Appendix H hydraulic model (62726-RJL-01-XX-CA-C-0100) do not represent a buildable, ground-truthed drainage design. Anyone taking this site on would be buying an unpriced civil engineering headache: No Holding Ponds and No Real Levels: Despite talk of detention basins and swales in the text, there are

no holding ponds in the hydraulic model. Instead, Appendix H models five abstract 1.50 m deep storage boxes (Parcel 1 to Parcel 5) with zero infiltration (0.00000 m/hr), set at dummy 100.000 m cover levels and 99.000 m outfalls on a made-up 0-40 m grid.
None of this has been plotted against the actual 17.31 m fall across the site (65.92 mAOD down to 48.61 mAOD), nor have the footprints of the storage structures or the retaining/plateau earthworks mentioned in Section 7 been proved inside the 4.27 ha developable area.

Every Parcel Hits "FLOOD RISK" in the Design Storm: In Appendix H's 100 year +45% CC +10% A run (page 10), all five parcel storage structures fill to between 1.435 m and 1.487 m of their 1.50 m depth and flag FLOOD RISK, while every lesser storm event (2-year through 100-year) already shows surcharged nodes. We are looking at roughly 2,940 m³ of combined storage across five separate parcels-with zero infiltration-that hasn't even been physically fitted onto the hillside yet.

Digging 1.5 m Deep Into Perched Groundwater: The geotechnical findings in Section 6 confirm perched water as shallow as 0.53 m below ground level sitting over interbedded mudstones, siltstones, and sandstone bedrock.
Excavating 1.50 m deep attenuation chambers and cutting level house platforms into a steep slope with groundwater half a metre down is asking for flooded trenches, tank flotation/uplift, slope stability trouble, and lost attenuation capacity-none of which has been designed or costed.

Unknown Outfalls and Unmapped Land Drains:
Section 2 admits there is an existing 45 m ditch along Doomsday Lane whose outfall to the south is "yet unknown," a "possible highway ditch" along Brighton Road, and probable old land drains across the fields that will have to be found and ripped out during site strip.

Meanwhile, overland exceedance routes are left for later, and long-term maintenance of the parcel drainage is dumped onto individual parcel owners.

Sloppy Baseline Numbers: Even the basic figures don't agree across the submission-site area is quoted as 9.24 ha in the report, 9.230 ha in Appendix H, and 9.1988 ha in Appendix I, while discharge totals shift between 27.4 l/s, 27.5 l/s, and 27.3 l/s.

Until the applicant puts proper surveyed levels, real pond or tank footprints, verified outfalls, and groundwater mitigation on the table, this drainage strategy is pure guesswork and should not be approved.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk

Horsham District Council