

-----Original Message-----

From: Chris Holmes

Sent: 03 December 2018 14:11

To: Simon Davis

Cc: Chris Holmes

Subject: BN/23/18/PL

Apologies Simon, I tried to submit through the portal but it was having none of it.

Regards the application at 37 Hill Lane, all previous points re over -development and loss of light still stand. Specific to drainage submission.

We and to my knowledge no other residents/contributors to Hill Lane maintenance group have been consulted . The wording I find loose in important areas

2.3.1 ditch system to the south of the plot - there isn't. a 10-12 m run of ditch does. No system.(5.2.5 not really) The longest 'run' of ditch is on the southern side of hill Lane adjoining others land. This, by the Maintenance group was satisfactorily re- dug in January of this year. Even with the wet winter (and the deluges this weekend) we've had no concerns of flooding. The road has drained and remained functional. A new additional load is of no responsibility for existing residents and therefore is NOT repairian .

Certainly the majority of properties (and I would imagine 36&37) receive electricity and water from services from the southern boundary which may limit depth of New ditching.

4.2.4 Yes it's at the top of the line but Southern water must be consulted prior to approval as there are existing problems at the low end where the pumped sewer at times can't cope. Therefore 4.2.5 is not a given

5.2.6 & 5.2.10 Not sure where this comes from . To my mind not feasible/possible as the application endeavours to talk up a 'system' that may have existed, which many with longer knowledge than me contest (I've only been here 27 years). Why in Appendix B is the proposed NEW ARRANGEMENT going to cross the road and run on the Southern side to carry a NEW, EXTRA, ADDITIONAL Load. This isn't riparian

Have West Sussex County Council agreed to fund their likely expenditure?

Chris Holmes 39 Hill Lane.

Sent from my iPad