

[REDACTED]

From: Simon Davis

Sent: 08 September 2026 13:14

To: 'Paul Carnell' [REDACTED]

Cc: Sam Sykes [REDACTED] Daniel Vick <Daniel.Vick@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: P2193i - Yapton [Filed 20 Aug 2026 15:04]

Dear Paul,

Notwithstanding that we'd need to see the proposed condition wording to properly comment, in principle we have reservations with this approach because if the site is built and then it's clear there is an issue then it is too late. You talk about mitigation but I'm not sure what could be done once there is a runoff flood issue. We need to be sure when we recommend approval that there is certainty that the site will not result in off-site flooding. This approach does give that certainty.

On the subject of levels, I note that we previously marked the submitted levels drawings (as follows) as superseded and there were no substitutes.

PROPOSED LEVELS LAYOUT SHEET 1 OF 8 24-217-214 REVC

PROPOSED LEVELS LAYOUT SHEET 2 OF 8 24-217-215 REVC

PROPOSED LEVELS LAYOUT SHEET 3 OF 8 24-217-216 REVC

PROPOSED LEVELS LAYOUT SHEET 4 OF 8 24-217-217 REVC

PROPOSED LEVELS LAYOUT SHEET 5 OF 8 24-217-218 REVC

PROPOSED LEVELS LAYOUT SHEET 6 OF 8 24-217-219 REVC

PROPOSED LEVELS LAYOUT SHEET 7 OF 8 24-217-220 REVC

PROPOSED LEVELS LAYOUT SHEET 8 OF 8 24-217-221 REVC

Can you advise which plan now shows the proposed levels versus existing.

Kind Regards

Simon

Simon Davis MRTPI

Principal Planning Officer, Directorate of Growth

T: 01903 737874

E: simon.davis@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>



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

From: Paul Carnell [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 August 2026 15:04
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Sam Sykes [REDACTED] Daniel Vick <Daniel.Vick@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: P2193i - Yapton [Filed 20 Aug 2026 15:04]

Hi Simon,

Thanks for the response. Please let me know when you have some available dates.

Re point 3, the drainage engineers response includes the following:

0.3. There is significant ground raising proposed on the site. The FRA is not clear about the extent or detail of the raising. Example wording of 'at least 1.2m' of raising. The impact this raising on flood risk and hydrogeology has not been adequately assessed. The planning officer may consider the visual impact of the elevated levels on the site. For example, plot 26 which is raised from 6.13mAOD to 7.6mAOD. These increases are replicated elsewhere on the site.

This was discussed in more detail at the meeting where Sarah Burrows and Paul Cann gave more detail and context about the comment on flood risk and hydrogeology. As Dan will recall, this followed reports from a nearby residential area (no location was given) which has experienced some low levels of groundwater flooding / water retention, and it was suggested this was a result of development at a recent Redrow site where some land raising occurred. The question is (as I understand it) whether the level raising on the Redrow site has had an impact on the hydrogeology in the area resulting in surface water flood risk on the adjoining site. No specific written or other evidence of this was presented at the meeting outside of anecdotal accounts and Paul Cann noting he had seen something on the site in question which made him think this was a possibility.

We need to engage with a hydrogeological consultant to consider whether we can address the query at this stage. However, my question on monitoring is driven by the absence of specific evidence that either: a) the problem at the site identified is related to the ground level changes in the Redrow scheme; and b) any tangible concern that level rises at our Yapton Road site will have knock on impacts on off-site hydrogeology. In other words, it is not clear whether there is or indeed will be a hydrogeological issue to consider or resolve. Whilst we have not provided any reports (outside of the work already presented) confirming that level raising won't impact hydrogeology, there is no compelling evidence presented to us that it is a possibility.

Therefore, I am suggesting a compromise of sorts by way of a monitoring condition which specifies both a timeframe for monitoring potential off-site impacts on groundwater post completion of development and secures potential remediation if a problem is recorded. If acceptable in principle, the detail of this would need to be discussed with the drainage engineers to make sure that it has the power to address their concerns.

I hope that clarifies, though please call if it would help to discuss.

Kind Regards,

Paul Carnell
Associate Planner, MRTPI

[Redacted signature]

Planning committee decision-making is about to change significantly. [Find out how the National Scheme of Delegation could affect the way planning applications are determined from October 2026.](#)



Shaping places.
Unlocking potential.