

Ground Floor
Northleigh
County Hall
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1RH



Lead Local Flood Authority

Date 7th August 2025

Stephen Ashdown
Development Control
Mid Sussex District Council
Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath
West Sussex
RH16 1SS

Dear Stephen,

RE: DM/23/2866 – Land East of Ansty Way, Cuckfield Bypass, Cuckfield, West Sussex

Thank you for your reconsultation on the above site. We have reviewed the application as submitted and wish to make the following comments.

This is an outline planning application (All matters reserved except for access) for the redevelopment of land to the east of Ansty to create a new Garden Community, comprising of the erection of up to 1,450 homes (including 30% affordable housing), up to 90 residential care units (C2 class), a primary school, a SEND school, health hub, sports facilities including all weather hockey pitches and tennis centre, allotments, retail, community and employment uses together with ancillary and associated development including new and enhanced pedestrian/cycle routes, open spaces, and landscaping.

We **maintain our objection** to this planning application in the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) / Drainage Strategy and require further information relating to:

1. In the greenfield runoff rate calculations, region 1 is being used, which does not reflect the hydrological region for the site. Please send FEH point data file to FRM@westsussex.gov.uk to confirm the location of the calculation inputs. Do not send this to the planning officer, to ensure the data remains confidential and in accordance with FEH Web Service terms of use. Please title the email: *DM/23/2866 FEH point file*. It is essential that the correct parameters are used when calculating greenfield runoff rate, otherwise surface water flood risk could increase elsewhere.
2. In the calculations, runoff volume calculations for existing and proposed scenarios is required.

3. As requested previously, evidence of consideration into the use of infiltration drainage in areas away from watercourse corridors will need to be provided at this outline planning stage. No further testing has been completed and the application is currently relying on testing carried out in summer, not winter.
4. At outline planning stage, we require an outline drainage layout showing proposed location of drainage components, storage volumes, outfall locations and a rough idea of flow rates from each outfall. 3m easements will be required around basins and swales. All outfalls to watercourses must be within the red line boundary, or third party agreements will need to be provided at outline stage.
5. The watercourses must have a 3m easement to allow riparian maintenance to take place.
6. The ponds are labelled with 'freeboard depth'. We believe this does not reflect freeboard as this should be 300mm following the SuDS Manual. All SuDS should be designed to follow SUDS Manual.
7. As requested previously, further details regarding the use of the pump and emergency procedures following 24 hour failure are required.
8. The FRA and Drainage Strategy does not cover how the site will remain safe in times of flooding. As mentioned previously, due to the impact crossing heights can have on surrounding development layouts and proposed site levels it is important this is considered for all watercourse crossings at this early masterplan stage. This is to ensure that alterations to facilitate safe access/egress do not impact the proposed development description or likely masterplan layout.
9. We have concerns that there will be a loss of floodplain storage as a result of this development. As mentioned previously, evidence that the impact development could have on floodplain storage, for all sources of flooding has been considered and mitigated against will be required at this stage of planning. This is required at outline application stage due to the potential this could have on developable area on the site and the impact that could have on the development's masterplan.
10. The current masterplan and drainage strategy shows several access roads and footpaths/cycle links located within areas of increased flood risk and surface water flow paths. We require further evidence that existing flow paths will not be impeded by any type of development at this stage of planning.
11. As mentioned previously the calculations need to use FEH2022 rainfall and Cv value 1.
12. In the calculations, there is extensive flooding in the 1 in 100 year plus climate change event, which is likely to increase flood risk elsewhere.

Without addressing the above, surface water flood risk is likely to increase elsewhere, as it has not been adequately demonstrated that the site can drain.

The following may assist in addressing comments: [Surface Water Drainage Proforma](#)

We would strongly suggest reading MSDC Drainage (in association with the LLFA) previous response too before submitting any further documents.

Please note that the National Standards for SuDS have recently updated.

We will review our comments and provide updated response when we have received further information.

Yours sincerely,

Eleanor Read
Flood Risk Management Team
FRM@westsussex.gov.uk

Document reviewed:

Ansty Garden Community: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy by Aqua Terra Consulting, May 2025