

10 Mant Close
Climping
Littlehampton
BN17 5TD

29 May 2018

Group Head of Planning
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF



Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Amended Planning Application No. CM/10/18/OUT - Second Objection Letter

We write in relation to our previous correspondence dated 12 May 2018, and wish to make further representations as a result of your notification dated 23 May 2018 informing of an Amendment to the above application with a New set of Plans/Description.

We request that our Objections to this Application as set out in previous correspondence remain in place, and, in addition, include other key activities of concern, detailed below, these to be considered in due course when the Planning Committee assess all the evidence before reaching their decision.

Sewage Disposal/Services/Waste/ Removal of Trees & Excess Surface Water

Within the boundary of our property, 10 Mant Close, there are 2 public sewer access chambers sited for inspection and maintenance. On purchasing our property and requesting the appropriate search documents, one of which was Southern Water Land & Drainage Water, dated 22 Nov 2013. The SW search document clearly sets out and gives notice, that it is possible, that our property could be at risk of internal flooding from the public foul, combined or surface water sewers due to overloading the sewerage system, which undoubtedly, could have a serious effect on other neighbouring properties.

You will of course have all the relevant evidence and documents before you when making your planning decision, however, for your information and this submission, the Sewer Map outlines the pipe route down the open green recreation area to the sewer chambers within our boundary in Mant Close, this passes under Wooldridge Walk into Mistletoe Farm land, and continues alongside the neighbouring boundaries of 1, 2 and 3 Wooldridge Walk into Horsemere Green Lane.

Having examined in some detail the documents associated with this planning application (those available for public view), our concerns are particularly focused on the risk of flooding, the increase in capacity of the existing sewage system located in Mistletoe farm, damage resulting from disturbance of roots of ageing trees and the possible consequences to neighbouring properties. We need to be confident, not only in our own interests, but that of immediate and all other neighbouring properties adjacent to the proposed redevelopment site, if Planning Permission is approved, all Building Regulations, Construction, Specifications, Standard Procedures both below and above ground level must be strictly enforced to ensure a safe and clean environment free of any risk as described above in the Southern Water Land Search document.

Our attention is drawn, with concern, to Consultation Document dated 30 April 2018, Engineer (Drainage and Coastal), Engineering Services, Arun District Council. Action and recommendations are set out with regard to surface water drainage and sewers on the proposed site. As part of the Planning Committee's responsibilities we trust that prior to any Planning decision, Members will have had sight of the appropriate authorisation confirming system tests have been successfully completed and the system fulfils its service life.

Engineers Recommendations:

- 1) Soakaways must be investigated for surface water disposal. Ensure that there is capacity in the system to contain below ground level of appropriate stored volumes.
- 2) Reference to a culverted ordinary watercourse running along the boundary of the property, any proposals to alter this will need to be discussed at the earliest opportunity.
- 3) Southern Water sewer and rising main running through the site. Early consultation with Southern Water is recommended.

Site & Damage Possibilities:

Trees/Surface Water/ Flooding/Sewer & Pipes

- 1) Old mature trees risk heave and ground swell, naturally making way for excess water, risk of site and surface water in neighbouring gardens
- 2) Older trees can embed pipes and sewers by growing roots around the pipes, this site could be liable to such damage. If these larger trees have a structural root failure and topple, these field lines can be destroyed.
- 3) Tree root penetration in sewer systems cause significant pipe damage, it is estimated that more than 50% of all sewer blockages are due to tree root invasion.
- 4) Could the proposed development impact upon the root stock of remaining trees, either during or after construction?
- 5) What effect could roots have on the foundation of any building in the future? If root growth begins to undermine the structure of a building after a number of years, could this lead to requests for their removal?
- 6) What proposed drainage and soakaway plans are proposed to protect neighbouring properties from risk of excess surface water and flooding?

Proposed Site:

Whilst the site plan itself is to scale, neighbouring properties beyond the site boundary are not scaled on plan, these dwellings can look further away thus making the redevelopment look more spacious. The site (0.74acre), scale and proportions fail to relate positively and appropriately to the neighbouring 'single storey' properties. To comply with planning guidelines new buildings are required to have a proportionate amount of outdoor space, this redevelopment, despite the latest amendment, still proposes to site 4 dwellings into plots that are much smaller than those that surround it. In addition, we wish to reiterate our earlier concerns with regard to highway safety of pedestrians, cyclists, other road users which does include heavy vehicles, access in out of construction vehicles and personnel vehicles, the latter which will possibly require 'crossover authority' to the proposed site. We strongly object to this proposed redevelopment.

In conclusion, we would like to request that, should this application be approved, the Council Planning Committee consider using its powers to enforce controlled hours of operation and other restrictions that might make the duration of the works more bearable. The proposed site of redevelopment is very small and contained, with no road frontage, so we would ask that consideration is given to how and where construction vehicles and staff would gain access to the site for unloading and parking without causing a highway hazard or inconveniencing neighbours; and if approved, these legally binding Conditions to be included in the Approval Notice for Planning Permission.

We formally request that the Council take our objections into consideration when deciding the application.



M A Siddons

G. A. Bird