

[REDACTED]

From: Geoff Gibbs <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 14 November 2021 18:44
To: Michael Eastham <Michael.Eastham@arun.gov.uk>; Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: A/188/21/DOC Land at Dappers Lane Angmering Littlehampton

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Dear Sir

Approval of details reserved by condition imposed under ref A/76/20/PL relating to Condition Nos 17 - existing & proposed ground levels, 18 - surface water drainage, 19 - maintenance & management of surface water drainage, 21 - discharge flows to watercourses and 22 - foul drainage system

I know this is a Discharge of Conditions (DOC) application and that you do not invite representations from members of the public.

However, because of my continuing concerns, I feel compelled to write. I made two carefully considered representations upon A/76/20/PL and you granted Conditional approval.

I am pleased that your Engineer, in her e mail of 21st September 2021, did not recommend discharge of Conditions 18, 19 or 20. I concur with her further comments in her e mail of 27th October 2021.

Conditions 18 and 19 both stated that 'Development shall not commence etc.' and I was therefore shocked that construction work on site commenced prior to these Conditions being discharged.

I support Angmering Parish Council in its e mail representation of 6th October 2021 expressing a similar view on the dangers of leaving such very important matters to Condition.

My main **objection** to the original Planning Application (A/76/20/PL) was that the Applicant had not demonstrated this development will not increase flood risk to others. I have always considered the flood risk impact of development proposals upon the existing community to be paramount. Of the various recent planning proposals in Angmering this is the one that could have the gravest impact upon the area around where I live.

National Planning Policy Framework at section 163 clearly states - '*When determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.*' I believe the Applicant's original proposal did not demonstrate this.

Further, the technical guidance associated with the National Planning Policy Framework on flood risk and coastal change states at section 50 that '*Local authorities and developers should seek opportunities to reduce the overall level of flood risk in the area and beyond.*' Again, I believe the Applicant's proposal did not demonstrate this.

After submitting my initial representation to A/76/20/PL I had a useful Zoom conference with the Arun Planning Officer and Engineering staff. It now seems that the primary way to convey surface water off site will be by constructing a further 'new pipeline' from the site in a westerly direction (north of the existing culverted watercourse). I am unclear what the status of this new pipeline will be.

Following that conference I submitted my second representation on A/76/20/PL reiterating that my main concern remained the potential this development has to increase flood risk to others and added that local residents, along with me, could confirm that runoff from this site has been a problem in the past. There was particularly serious flooding in 2002 when runoff from the site ran between bungalows on the north side of Garden Close onto Garden Close and into Chantryfield Road where I live and this is already an unacceptable exceedance flow route from the site. At that time the development site was 'green field' with virtually no artificial impermeable surfaces.

The current proposal seems to be two surface water drainage routes off site to Arundel Road.

Firstly the 'new pipeline' referred to above.

Secondly the existing ordinary watercourse mostly in open channel north of Woodlands Close and Garden Close and then piped north of Pine Trees Close and Furzefield Close. Documents associated with A/76/20/PL (the FRA and Appendices Drainage Details) express serious concern over the condition and efficacy of this conveyance system and particularly the piped length.

Bearing in mind concern about the adequacy of this 'second drainage route' (for the avoidance of doubt I am referring to the existing ditch and pipeline) and that there are already drainage problems from this site the flood route exceedance plan published on 25th October 2021 is particularly important.

I adopt a simple approach. This site generally falls from the north east to the south west. This is the direction that water on the surface will travel. The positive drainage systems appear to drain to the 'basin' which I assume to be a

balancing pond. From this I assume the flow will discharge via the 'new pipeline' at a controlled rate. Should there be a conveyance problem associated with the 'new pipeline' and the basin fills to overflowing the water will then flow towards the southern boundary of the site and the 'second drainage route'. It is already clear from the documents referred to above and confirmed by residents' observations that this 'second drainage route' has significant conveyance issues compounded because it seems much of its piped length is within the curtilage of private residences. Water could then, potential leave the site in a southerly direction.

Please consider those, off site, who may be adversely affected by these proposals and follow the advice of your Council's drainage engineer.

Regards

Geoffrey M Gibbs

Chartered Civil Engineer and Scientist

45 Chantryfield Road

ANGMERING

West Sussex

BN16 4LU

14th November 2021