

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 04 January 2022 07:53
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Fwd:
Attachments: Government_ Mundy Dec2021.pdf

AMANDA SCHOLES
PLANNING RECEPTIONIST



To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Nicola Moore [REDACTED] On Behalf Of Planning
Sent: 24 December 2021 15:34
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Fwd:

Obj letter

Nicky Moore
Technical Support Assistant, Planning



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk
Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>



From: Nigel Mundy [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 December 2021 13:03
To: Planning [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd:

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.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Network Options** [REDACTED]

Date: Thu, 16 Dec 2021, 15:14

Subject:

To: Nigel Mundy [REDACTED]

I wish to lodge this objection to the developments formally known as P/140.

Now being displayed as.

P/153/21/Res this section is date expired.

This objection is therefore addressed to

P/167/21/res

P/155/21/res

P/158/21/Res

All of which were known as P/140 so part of this objection is that these are new applications and should be going through the whole process again.

Another part of this objection is the bird mitigation from P/140 which has been proven an abject failure by the three year survey carried out by Sussex ornathological society on the proposed mitigation fields and P/140 and despite all the tactics used to stop the geese visiting P140 (such leaving the fields fallow) the geese still used them as they have done for year after year.

They came and ate the weeds when there was no wheat. Proving that these fields are important to them.

Part three of this objection is.

Having looked at the proposed drainage plans.

And having been in the groundwork.civil engineering and drainage industry for more than fifty years of my life. I gained my knowledge from experience.

And in my opinion the proposed drainage on all of these developments is not fit for purpose. There are proposed ponds in several locations.but nowhere are there an indication of how they are to be kept safe from young children accessing them.

You must be aware that children are attracted to such areas and many children have met Their end in such things.

And the idea of releasing the water from these ponds into the existing ditches is in itself non sustainable as the ditches are many many years old and have never been maintained nor cleaned.

And when first formed would have exited above sea level but sea level has risen considerably since the ditch construction so chances are that they no longer have an exit that is suitable.

Attached is an email reply from Michael Goves department.and in it is an outline of the new planning proposals by the government. And after reading that and comparing it to the proposed plans for this area. It seems that the governments proposals are being ignored for the most part. And the developers are being allowed to more or less do as they please.

In the attached email there are links to various organizations for their input. One being the department of the environment and their flood risk assessment.

I believe that it seriously needs updating.

Their claim is that the proposed development area is flood risk One yet the area less than 100 metres away (church lane)is at much higher risk.

And if you follow their assessment on their graph up the course of the rife.

When it gets to lagness the pagham road is shown to be under water.

effectively cutting pagham off completely.

Also why do the government solely rely on DOE when there are many other experts who have other assessments on flood risk that contradict DOE.

If you follow the science. The glacier in the Himalayas has been found to be melting faster that first predicted.and that will raise sea levels even faster.

And also the Twaites glacier in Antarctica has also been found (in Dec 2021) to be melting at an accelerated pace and will effectively raise sea levels by at least 60cms. All this should be taken into account. And realized that it increases flood risk for homes on the coastal plain all over the world.

I know we need houses built. But a recent survey has shown there are hundreds if not thousands of empty properties in West Sussex alone so why can't they be renovated and used instead of continuously building on green fields and prime agricultural land.

These are my objections. So please take them into account.thank you

N. Mundy
40 Hook lane rose green
Pagham
PO213PB



Department for Levelling Up,
Housing & Communities

**Department for Levelling up, Housing and
Communities**

Department for Communities and Local
Government
3rd Floor, Fry Building
2, Marsham Street
London SW1P 4DF

Mr Nigel Mundy
40 Hook Lane
Rose Green
Bognor Regis
West Sussex
PO213PB

www.gov.uk/dluhc

Our Ref:12827832
Your Ref:

Date:15 December 2021

Dear Mr Mundy,

Thank you for your email of 22 October to the Rt Hon Michael Gove MP about the Government's policies for planning for housing and flood risk mitigation. I hope that you will appreciate that the Secretary of State receives a large volume of correspondence and it is not always possible for him to send a personal response to each letter that he receives. Your letter has been passed to the relevant policy team for reply.

We have updated our National Planning Policy Framework to ensure planning policies support climate change mitigation and adaptation, including tackling flood risk, as well as creating places which are better-designed and more beautiful. As part of this update the NPPF was amended to make sure that all sources of flood risk need to be considered (including areas that are at risk of surface water flooding due to drainage problems), taking into account future flood risk, to ensure that any new development is safe for its lifetime without increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere. The NPPF is clear that areas at little to no risk of flooding from any source should always be developed in preference to areas at a higher risk of flooding.

The revised Framework was published on 20 July and may be found here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

The changes to the Framework are in part, an initial response to the emergent findings of our joint review with Defra of policy for building in areas at flood risk. The review sets out a number of actions to maintain and enhance the existing safeguards concerning flood risk in the planning system. Informed by this, and the government's Policy Statement on flood and coastal erosion risk management, we will consider what further measures may be required in the longer term in relation to planning policy and guidance for proposed development in areas at risk of flooding from all sources as part of our wider reform work. The review may be found here:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1006735/Review_of_Policy_for_Development_in_areas_at_flood_risk.pdf

Our Planning Practice Guidance sets out further information on assessing and avoiding flood risk, and where necessary how to manage and mitigate flood risk as part of a development.

Current guidance for managing flood risk may be found here:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-in-flood-zones-2-and-3#extra-flood-resistance-and-resilience-measures>

All local planning authorities and risk management authorities should ensure they can deliver their statutory functions. LPAs need to undertake onsite compliance checks for new residential developments in at risk areas to ensure developers to comply with planning conditions related to building in flood mitigation measures. We want to support LPAs and strengthen the existing planning enforcement regime. This could include raising fee thresholds for a breach of planning condition, increasing the time local authorities have to prepare a case against a breach of planning, and strengthening the policy around intentional unauthorised development.

The Framework is also clear that when determining planning applications in areas at risk of flooding, a local planning authority should ensure that priority is given to the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDs). These systems mimic, as far as possible, the way the site would have drained naturally, prior to any development. In addition, since April 2015, there are new expectations relating to the provision of sustainable drainage systems in all new major developments, unless demonstrated to be inappropriate.

Through the accompanying Technical Standards the use of sustainable drainage in developments will place a hierarchy of discharge with connection to combined sewers as the last option, thus removing many of the pressures associated with new developments such as sewer flooding and use of storm overflows. The Technical Standards document can be found here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sustainable-drainage-systems-non-statutory-technical-standards>

In August 2021 Government announced a review of the implementation of Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act (2010). This review will look at the benefits and impacts of implementation as well as alternative methods for ensuring that sustainable drainage, or SuDS, are incorporated in future developments, approval of which will be conditional on approval of drainage plans.

I hope that you find this information helpful.

Yours sincerely,

The Planning Policy and Reform Correspondence Team

