

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 17 May 2026 13:13:09 UTC+01:00
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 17/05/2026 1:13 PM.

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

Address:	4 Ghyll Crescent Horsham
----------	--------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	. Executive Summary This formal objection is submitted to demonstrate that the applicant's proposed Sustainable

Drainage System (SuDS) strategy, as visually defined on the Illustrative Masterplan layout, is fundamentally non-viable due to unalterable physical site constraints. The layout relies heavily on surface features-specifically shallow attenuation basins and swales-that cannot physically function on this site due to an immutable hydrological conflict: a critically high, shallow water table measured consistently at just 20 inches ($d \approx 0.5\text{m}$) below the natural ground surface.

2. Fundamental Technical Conflict

The masterplan's design framework designates distinct areas across the development footprint for "Proposed SuDS Basins/Swales" to mitigate the massive surface water run-off generated by the 180-home layout. Standard civil engineering and planning guidance stipulates that shallow, open-surface SuDS features require a clear vertical separation zone-typically at least 1.0 metre-between the base of the feature and the peak seasonal groundwater level. This separation is required to preserve structural storage volume and allow for soil filtration and natural attenuation.

Critical Site Constraint: Because the local groundwater table stands at only 20 inches below the surface, the essential vertical separation zone is entirely non-existent. The local water table intersects directly with, or rests immediately below, the natural ground level chosen for these features.

3. Cascading Failures Triggered by High Groundwater

The physical reality of a 20-inch water table triggers three separate, unmitigable engineering failures that render the proposed layout completely non-implementable:

A. Direct Surface Flooding and Immediate Saturation

Because the subterranean water pressure sits only 20 inches down, these open swales and basins will immediately fill from below during normal seasonal shifts. Rather than functioning as empty flood attenuation vessels engineered to catch and slow storm runoff from the hard standings, they will remain permanently waterlogged, saturated wetlands.

This creates a severe public health hazard via stagnant, standing surface water directly adjacent to dense residential dwellings.

B. Total Loss of Engineered Attenuation Volume

To comply with statutory local requirements, a swale must provide an empty, designated storage volume calculated to hold a 1-in-100-year storm event (plus

allowances for climate change).

If a basin is cut to a depth of 0.5 metres, but the regional water table sits at 0.5m, the engineered storage capacity is reduced to effectively zero.

The 180 units will generate hundreds of thousands of litres of unmanaged surface runoff that the masterplan lacks the physical, structural volume to contain on-site.

C. Spatial Failure and Layout Incapacity

The masterplan treats these swales as narrow, aesthetic ribbon features. To make an engineered drainage solution function safely under these groundwater conditions, the applicant would have to construct watertight linings, install heavy pumping equipment, or build massively wide, built-up earthen bunds above the natural grade line.

An engineered system of that scale would command an immensely larger surface footprint.

Expanding these features to achieve viable storage would directly displace proposed housing plots, vehicle access lanes, and infrastructure. This proves that a 180-unit high-density layout is a spatial impossibility when constrained by the site's true hydrology.

4. Conclusion and Demand for Refusal

The developer is utilising an arbitrary high-density target (180 homes) to force a generic, unviable "cut-and-paste" drainage plan onto a site that cannot support it. Forcing surface water into shallow features atop a 20-inch water table will result in systemic, catastrophic flooding.

Because the site suffers from absolute physical incapacity to support the combined spatial requirements of 180 homes and a functionally safe, compliant drainage system, Horsham District Council should exercise its discretionary authority to REFUSE

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



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