
A/44/26/PL Questions in relation to infiltration testing

From Tybie House <[REDACTED]>

Date Sat 08/08/2026 14:13

To Neil Crowther <Neil.Crowther@arun.gov.uk>; Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>

Cc Karl Roberts <Karl.Roberts@arun.gov.uk>; Dawn Hudd <Dawn.Hudd@arun.gov.uk>

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 Mr Crowther,

For the avoidance of doubt, this is neither in support of nor in opposition to the application. This correspondence seeks, again, to urge the Council to respond to key questions which have been asked in relation to the pivotal infiltration testing upon which the current drainage design is based.

As SA1 is now the single point of failure, it's performance under extreme conditions is critical; any inaccurate infiltration rates could have a devastating effect on the residents, both physically and financially.

I feel it necessary, at this stage, to repeat some of the facts previously stated:

- The infiltration testing is stated as being compliant with BRE365. In section C8, Strategy and Method of the Soakage Test Report provided by Southern Testing (Appendix C document) it explicitly states that "Testing was undertaken using the BRE365 method" which is objectively not the case.
- BRE 365 requires sequential testing on the same day or consecutive ones
- Two tests were conducted on 10 April 2025, and a third on 22 April 2025 – a gap of 12 days
- This testing was rejected in application A/115/25/PL and was categorised by Paul Cann as being "flawed" and had "failed"
- Referencing www.arun.gov.uk/infiltration-testing the council states that the trial pits "must be, tested three times in quick succession" with a footnote clearly stating, "Where it not possible to complete consecutive tests on the same day, then testing on consecutive days will be accepted". This page was last updated on 24 October 2025, which is prior to the current application and should therefore be complied with without exception
- The proposed drainage management plan explicitly states that flooding will not be permitted
- Your previous correspondence indicated that you expected fresh testing to be conducted in Spring 2026

The accuracy of this testing cannot be overstated.

Given that the design already states that there is one pipe categorised as "FLOOD" and others as "FLOOD RISK", if the infiltration rate derived from this third test is overly optimistic, it logically follows that SA1 will not drain down as quickly as anticipated. Extrapolating this, it is therefore

equally logical to say that this would result in more pipes being flagged as "FLOOD" and may, of course, result in physical flooding on site.

Also given the previous rejection of this same testing, please can you explain, given there has not been any change in BRE365 relating to the testing methodology, how this testing has now been accepted twice by your drainage engineer, given its flagrant breach of the conditions under which it should be conducted and is stated as complying with. Please also refer to the independent review I sought which states the methodology does not comply with BRE 365. This is therefore not simply my opinion, but one of a professional in this field of expertise.

As we no longer live on the development, the outcome of this has no actual bearing on us, or our situation. People may then ask why we are doing this. Our concern is the future impact that the decisions the Council makes now could have on the residents we counted amongst our friends. We feel that they have a right to be aware of your responses to these issues so that they have all the facts available to them in order to make informed decisions. If subsequent testing indicates the unsuitability of an infiltration solution, they should be aware that the only other apparent solution to dispose of the water would be off site pumping. There is another possible outcome to this predicament, though I shall refrain from detailing it as it could be seen as sensationalist and extremely worrying for the residents, but one which has to be a logical possibility. I'm quite sure everyone understands what that would entail.

This situation has been, and continues to be, extremely distressing for all the residents of this development who merely wish for the homes to be safe and authorised. The predicament has been caused entirely by the failure to discharge pre-commencement conditions. Had those been complied with, the true nature of the geology could have been ascertained accurately, and an appropriate drainage design put forward from the start, instead of trying to retrofit a solution into an already occupied development.

In conclusion, I have a simple request: please will you provide the answers to the issues above, and upload those to the portal along with this correspondence for the benefit of all the residents of Mayflower Meadow?

--

Kind regards

Dr Tym Huckin BSc(Hons) FIAP MBCS