Communities, Economy & Transport

Rupert Clubb
BEng (Hons) CEng FICE
Director

County Hall
St Anne's Crescent
Lewes
East Sussex
BN7 1UE

Tel: 0345 60 80 190
www.eastsussex.gov.uk

East Sussex County Council

Sam Batchelor
Planning and Environmental Services
Wealden District Council
Vicarage Lane, Hailsham
BN27 2AX

14 November 2025

our ref: SUD/WD/25/012/R2
your ref: WD/2025/0922/MEA

Dear Sam Batchelor

DEMOLITION OF POULTRY FARM AND ASSOCIATED DWELLING; ERECTION OF UP TO 1700 NEW DWELLINGS (INCLUDING 35% AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND 50 RESIDENTIAL CARE/LATE LIVING UNITS (C2)); MIXED-USE CENTRE WITH RETAIL, COMMERCIAL AND COMMUNITY USES; 2FE PRIMARY SCHOOL INCLUDING EARLY YEARS PROVISION; MULTI-PURPOSE SPORTS HUB; COMMUNITY ALLOTMENTS; NEW AND ENHANCED PEDESTRIAN/CYCLE LINKS; OPEN SPACE INCLUDING NEW SANG; SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE FEATURES; CHILDREN'S PLAY AREAS; LANDSCAPING; AND CREATION OF TWO POINTS OF ACCESS ONTO A22.LAND WEST OF UCKFIELD - OWLSBURY FARM, HORSTED GREEN, LITTLE HORSTED TN22 5TJ
Received Date: 6 November 2025

Position of the Lead Local Flood Authority: -

No objection	The information provided is satisfactory and enables the LLFA to determine that the proposed development is capable of managing flood risk effectively.	
No objection standard conditions	The information provided is satisfactory and enables the LLFA to determine that the proposed development is capable of managing flood risk effectively. Although there will be a need for standard conditions which are outlined in this response.	
No objection specific conditions	Whilst the application documentation has not met all the County Council's requirements, it is possible that the risk is capable of being mitigated to acceptable levels by the application of planning conditions which are outlined in this response.	
Objection due to Insufficient Information	The applicant has failed to meet the requirements to assess its acceptability in flood risk terms. The LLFA will respond in 21 days of receipt of the requested information	**X**
Objection	The application presents an unacceptable on site/off site flood risk.	

Detailed Comments:

We have reviewed the revised Drainage Strategy report (rev3) dated October 2025 together with the letter dated 28 October 2025 which summarises the applicant's response to our previous consultee reply dated 13 October 2025.

The drainage strategy should demonstrate the scheme is feasible at outline stage for the quantum of development and any illustrative masterplan. The current submission does not achieve this.

The proposed basin locations and sizes cross several metres of contour, up to four in the case of Pond SE which would result in banking or up to 15 metres in plan to achieve a level body of water with maintenance access. This aspect is ignored on the drainage strategy plans and therefore does not demonstrate the scheme is feasible. Due to the tightly arranged concept layout we would urge the developer to move away from a pictorial representation and provide some engineering feasibility plans.

A topographic survey has not been provided at the outlet positions and constraints such as root protection zones are not show. It has therefore not been demonstrated that these points of outlet (and therefore positions of storage) are feasible. Some of the points of discharge appear to be outside the red line boundary and therefore potentially not within the applicant's legal ability to install and maintain.

It is not sufficient to state that fluvial events may not occur at the same time of concentration as the sustainable drainage design storm. An assessment of downstream surcharge should be added to the drainage model to demonstrate the feasibility of the storage volumes.

The proposals to adjust the basins to avoid existing overland flow paths is acceptable once the layout accounts for the true plan area of the basins, see comment above. There is a residual flow path once the developed area is removed which needs to be facilitated past Pond E.

Currently the greenfield runoff calculations use the total area of 79 hectares whereas the drained area in the calculations is 30.5 hectares (which includes urban creep allowance). The proportion is too low as it includes some large areas of runoff not constrained by the urban area and therefore overestimates the allowable peak flow. The greenfield runoff calculations should be adjusted to be the Urban Areas rather than Total Areas. Other than the areas used, the method of calculation of greenfield runoff is acceptable and the use of the average storm return (QBar) for a peak flow restriction for all storms is acceptable.

The submission should confirm whether the proposed sports pitches will be drained as it is common for drainage of modern sports pitches and if so, should be included in the modelling.

These aspects should be addressed prior to outline planning consent being granted for this development.

If you wish to discuss any of the points raised in this letter, please contact the case officer on SUDS@eastsussex.gov.uk

Yours sincerely

Nick Claxton
Team Manager - Flood Risk Management

Case Officer: Andy French
E: SUDS@eastsussex.gov.uk