

[REDACTED]

From: Elaine Walby on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 21 July 2026 10:45
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Land East of Wandleys Lane - WA/51/26/RES

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

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

Our priorities...

 Improving the wellbeing of Arun	 Delivering the right homes in the right places	 Supporting our environment to support us	 Fulfilling Arun's economic potential	 Our core foundations	 
---	--	--	--	---	--

Connect with us: [Facebook](#) | [X](#) | [Instagram](#)

From: Cllr. Stephen McAuliffe [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 July 2026 08:56
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>; Neil Crowther <Neil.Crowther@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>; Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Land East of Wandleys Lane - WA/51/26/RES

Dear Simon,

Having reviewed the submissions relating to this development and having revisited the Planning Inspector's decision notice, it is apparent that the developer has not provided satisfactory information in relation to compliance with Condition 10(13) – '***10. Details of how the drainage scheme shall effect [sic] the hydrological conditions of the adjoining ancient woodland such that no loss or deterioration shall occur.***' (n.b. bold and underlined text is my emphasis).

The rationale for this Condition is given in the main body text of the Inspector's decision (para. 38):
*'...In addition, and after discussions at the hearing, it was confirmed that a drainage scheme **could be devised to ensure the hydrological conditions of the woodland are not harmed.**'*

Having reviewed the documents provided on the ADC Planning Portal, there is no mention in the drainage plans, ecology statements or arboricultural reports, referencing the Planning Inspector's requirement to protect the ancient woodland as a whole. The only reference to ancient woodland protection measures cited, relate to the root protection of individual trees at the edge of the woodland and the need for a 15m root protection buffer. These are not protection methods that are suitable for compliance with the Planning Inspector's Condition 10(13) on the need for ongoing protection of Wanleys Copse, Ancient Woodland in its entirety via retention of the existing *hydrological connectivity between field and woodland*.

To date, there has been no attempt to adhere to Condition 10(13) imposed by the Planning Inspector on maintaining hydrological flow and thus the future integrity of Wanleys Copse. The contrary is indeed the case as the plans and drawings (e.g. drawing 5988-005-0531-A02) clearly identify all surface water will be diverted to piped drainage, rain garden and attenuation ponds which ultimately discharge at the southeast of the site – thereby skirting the ancient woodland. With regard to percolated rainwater that currently permeates the soil when the field is not at water holding capacity i.e. non-exceedance flows, there has not been any attempt to model or infer how these flows interact with the woodland nor how this interaction will be maintained in the future; as is required by Condition 10(13).

Required hydrological connectivity between the field and the ancient woodland has not therefore been assessed and thus, the plans do not demonstrate that the Planning Inspector's decision and condition have been met. The Inspector stated at the hearing, and repeated this in the decision, that the proposed development was only acceptable if existing hydrological conditions could be maintained, and if not, this would be a reason to refuse. When addressing this point, the developer was very confident that this requirement could be achieved using engineering solutions which had been tested and introduced elsewhere. It is thus incumbent upon the developer to show how this will be achieved prior to the discharge of the condition, and likewise, it is incumbent upon Arun District Council to ensure that developer submissions have been adequately assessed and that they fully address the compliance need with Condition 10(13). Failure to do so may constitute a non-compliance with planning process and thus leave ADC open to legal challenge.

In summary, the Inspector placed a very clear requirement on the developer to maintain pre-development hydrological regimes and especially, the hydrological connectivity and flow pathways between the field and the ancient woodland. The developer is required to demonstrate how this has been assessed and can be achieved, and, ADC must assess the submissions to ensure they are suitable, practicable and achievable. Currently, plans show that the opposite of maintaining hydrological connectivity are planned, i.e. all water currently percolating into, and through the soil, or, exceedance flows across the field, will in the future be collected, channelled and diverted to off-site discharge away from the ancient woodland. Therefore, based on the documents currently logged on the ADC planning portal, the required Planning Inspector Condition 10(13) relating to and requiring maintenance of the existing hydrological regime that exists between field and ancient woodland has not been met.

Prior to any discharge Condition 10(13), I would therefore expect ADC to request, receive and fully assess via suitably qualified and competent hydrological subject matter expertise, documents from the developer that provision sufficient levels of information to demonstrate that the requirements of Condition 10(13), as set out in the Inspector's appeal decision, have been fully met.

Regards,
Cllr Steve McAuliffe
Arundel & Walberton Ward Member;
Arun District Council Representative to the South Downs National Park Authority