

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 July 2019 17:44
To: Laura Gibbons
Cc: Kathryn Griffiths; Caroline Green; Zoe Knott; Ryan Saul; Dorota Kaminska-Majkowska; James Lawson; Lance Else; James Hammond; Darren Mcarthur; Simon Davis
Subject: RE: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Hi Laura,

Thank you for the response.

Please find our comments below (in green) against yours along with relevant accompanying information attached.

Hopefully this finally concludes all items and the condition can be approved for sign off.

Kind Regards



[REDACTED]

Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Luke,

Comments in *red*.

1. The calculations for flotation of the pond are based on the liner being at 0.6m depth below ground water level. We agreed to assume ground water level at the surface in this area, i.e. 6.8mAOD. The invert level of the pond is 6.2mAOD, and there is 0.41m depth of top soil above the liner. The liner is therefore actually 1.01m below ground water level. The calculations need to be adjusted to account for this and more stabilising forces will be required. NAUE have revised their calculations to assume ground water at 6.8mAOD and have advised that the depth of soil now required is 1.38m so we have updated our detail to reflect this.
okay Noted
2. The flotation calculations for tank 3 assume that wet sand is being used as ballast. Yet stone is specified within the drawings. We have requested clarification from SDS and are awaiting a response however see item 3 below. *I will await these details. Tank 3 has been replaced by a concrete tank. See below.*
3. The constructability, design life, and maintenance of the arrangement proposed for tank 3 are a significant concern. Please re-consider providing counterbalance outside of the impermeable membrane (then you're also displacing less groundwater) and above the tank. We are looking at an alternative tank design for this

tank and will forward details as soon as there are available. *I will await these details. We have changed this tank to a concrete tank by Carlow. Please find attached associated details from Carlow and our plan updated to suit.*

4. There are discrepancies between cover levels and invert levels of tanks in flotation calculations and on drawings. Updated drawings/calcs from SDS will be sent over shortly *I will await these details. Updated SDS details provided.*
5. Please update the construction detail drawings to show permeable geotextile wrap fully around the sub-base. Detail has been updated. *Please update so geotextile is under tarmac, not over it. Detail amended and attached.*
6. Please provide a schedule of permeable paving subbase depths and orifice diameters. Schedule has been added to drawing. *okay. Noted*
7. Please provide finish and formation levels of permeable paving on plan. Finish and formation levels have been added to drawing and are also shown in the schedule. *Please ensure 150mm freeboard between cl of permeable paving and FFL, and 20mm between cl of permeable paving and FGL. The permeable paving design has a 300mm freeboard allowance in the design below the surface level to allow for block, bedding and tarmac.*
8. In some locations there are significant drops between orifice invert level and the invert level of the main surface water pipe. Please provide a detail that accurately represents this. Detail has been added to drawing 18-070/111.
9. There appear to be some discrepancies between tank dimensions (area and invert levels) shown on plan and those in calculations. Please check and update. The details need to reflect the actual storage anticipated based on SDS design as not a straight 95% due to pipe/granular running through. We have made amendments to read the same with the drawings now showing 'effective' volume. *Okay. Noted*
10. Please include reference to the covenants that will be imposed within the maintenance manual. (I have not found the example I was looking for, and cannot recall which case it was for, apologies). Reference to covenants will be added to maintenance manual. *I will await the updated manual. Updated drainage note/manual attached.*
11. Please update the maintenance manual to include replacement of geomembrane within the corrective maintenance for attenuation tanks. We are awaiting information from SDS and will update the manual with other items noted above once received. *I will await these details. Updated drainage note/manual attached.*
12. *Can you look at providing some upstream connections to the two southern tanks, to make them more online rather than offline. Offline tanks should be avoided where possible. I acknowledge that the northern most tank may have to stay offline. The main road sewer system is to be offered for adoption to Southern Water and they will not accept online tanks, only offline, privately maintained tanks.*

Kind Regards,

Laura Gibbons, MEng, GMICE
Engineer (Drainage & Coastal)

Subject: RE: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Hi Laura,

Further to your comments below please find attached further/updated details along with responses against yours.

Kind Regards



Luke Hart | Associate Director

Subject: RE: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Luke,

Thank you for supplying the revised information. I have the following comments:

1. The calculations for flotation of the pond are based on the liner being at 0.6m depth below ground water level. We agreed to assume ground water level at the surface in this area, i.e. 6.8mAOD. The invert level of the pond is 6.2mAOD, and there is 0.41m depth of top soil above the liner. The liner is therefore actually 1.01m below ground water level. The calculations need to be adjusted to account for this and more stabilising forces will be required. NAUE have revised their calculations to assume ground water at 6.8mAOD and have advised that the depth of soil now required is 1.38m so we have updated our detail to reflect this.
2. The flotation calculations for tank 3 assume that wet sand is being used as ballast. Yet stone is specified within the drawings. We have requested clarification from SDS and are awaiting a response however see item 3 below.
3. The constructability, design life, and maintenance of the arrangement proposed for tank 3 are a significant concern. Please re-consider providing counterbalance outside of the impermeable membrane (then you're also displacing less groundwater) and above the tank. We are looking at an alternative tank design for this tank and will forward details as soon as there are available.
4. There are discrepancies between cover levels and invert levels of tanks in flotation calculations and on drawings. Updated drawings/calcs from SDS will be sent over shortly
5. Please update the construction detail drawings to show permeable geotextile wrap fully around the sub-base. Detail has been updated
6. Please provide a schedule of permeable paving subbase depths and orifice diameters. Schedule has been added to drawing
7. Please provide finish and formation levels of permeable paving on plan. Finish and formation levels have been added to drawing and are also shown in the schedule
8. In some locations there are significant drops between orifice invert level and the invert level of the main surface water pipe. Please provide a detail that accurately represents this. Detail has been added to drawing 18-070/111.

9. There appear to be some discrepancies between tank dimensions (area and invert levels) shown on plan and those in calculations. Please check and update. The details need to reflect the actual storage anticipated based on SDS design as not a straight 95% due to pipe/granular running through. We have made amendments to read the same with the drawings now showing 'effective' volume.
10. Please include reference to the covenants that will be imposed within the maintenance manual. (I have not found the example I was looking for, and cannot recall which case it was for, apologies). Reference to covenants will be added to maintenance manual.
11. Please update the maintenance manual to include replacement of geomembrane within the corrective maintenance for attenuation tanks. We are awaiting information from SDS and will update the manual with other items noted above once received.

Kind Regards,

Laura Gibbons, MEng, GMICE
Engineer (Drainage & Coastal)

Subject: RE: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Hi Laura,

Please find attached pond liner calculation (by NAUE). They have advised that 410mm soil is required so we have updated our detail to show this (also attached).

We have also attached the amended permeable paving detail to be unlined.

Any further queries then let me know but this should now conclude all matters as discussed and agreed at the meeting.

Kind Regards



Luke Hart : Associate Director

[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Hi Laura,

Further to the email below please find attached updated SDS tank designs and calcs for GW at 1m begl.

Kind Regards



Luke Hart | Associate Director

[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Hi Laura,

Further to our meeting please find attached the following:

- Updated engineering layout (permeable paving orifice range/reference added)
- Full network calculations
- Updated adoptable construction details (hydrobrake references updated)
- Updated private drainage details (standalone flow control IC added)
- Updated catchment plan
- Updated drainage technical note (amended drawings, calcs and additional flow control maintenance section added)

We will issue the following once available.


- Updated landscaping plans to suit the SDS tank footprint
- Revised SDS design for groundwater at 1m begl
- Supporting SDS flotation calculations
- Calculations/response/details from NAUE on the liner

If you have any queries then let me know.

Kind Regards



Luke Hart | Associate Director




Subject: RE: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Luke,

Thank you for the email. Please see my *comments* below.

Kind Regards,

Laura Gibbons, MEng, GMICE
Engineer (Drainage & Coastal)



Sent: 07 June 2019 09:45

To: Laura Gibbons

Cc: Kathryn Griffiths; Caroline Green; Zoe Knott; Ryan Saul; Dorota Kaminska-Majkowska; James Lawson; Lance Else; James Hammond; Darren Mcarthur; Simon Davis

Subject: RE: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Hi Laura,

Further to your email/response, please see updated plans/information attached along with summary/commentary below:

1. ACD have added root potential areas representing a BS5837 RPA based on maximum expected stem diameter of 500mm. Refer to updated ACD drawings attached. *Okay.*
2. Specialist details are being prepared to cover your request for flotation to be assessed based on groundwater at ground level. These will follow under separate cover once we have received them. *Please could these be provided.*
3. Further soakage test result/details to follow. These are being completed this week. *When will result be provided?*
4. Ditch regrading extent added to drainage drawing. *Exact details will need to be agreed with the land drainage ordinary watercourse consent application.*

5. Calculations for attenuation basin attached. *Can you provide the full catchment calculations for this?*
6. We are proposing to diffuse rain water from roofs into the permeable paving and then connect the permeable paving to the wider sewer network (via a control). We show this typical arrangement, which applies to every drive, on the top right (inset) of drawing 18-070/103. *What size orifice are you proposing?*
7. Refer to our basin sections attached for further details. *Please provide overlap widths/joint methods for liner.*
8. Noted. *I will review once the full catchment calculation is provided for the revised pond.*
9. Noted. Please refer to Section 5 of the surface water report attached. *You will need to specifically detail maintenance for flow control devices. Can it please be confirmed whether single permeable driveways will be the responsibility of the householder or the maintenance company. I will review further once other points have been agreed.*

I trust item 1 and items 4-9 can now be concluded/agreed.

Kind Regards



Luke Hart, Associate Director

Subject: RE: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Luke,

Thank you for sending over the revised information.

As discussed previously on the phone infiltration testing completed at this time will only rule in or out infiltration. If infiltration testing results come back as $\times 10^{-7} \text{ms}^{-1}$ or lower then we can move the design forwards and assume groundwater is at the surface for flotation purposes. If however infiltration test results show infiltration is feasible we require full winter groundwater monitoring (October to March inclusive) to be completed and winter infiltration to be completed above the maximum recorded groundwater elevation.

I have the following comments:

1. ACD have shown tank footprints on their landscaping plans. Updated plans provided. *These plans do not show the root potential areas. This is required.*
2. Pond sections with NAUE liner provided. Details provided. Tank flotation/groundwater assessment to be discussed as soon as possible. *See above comments.*
3. Further site investigation/soakage tests have been requested. Please see associated sketch sent to geotechnical engineers within the link provided. *It is not possible to review if the proposed soakage testing is at the correct depth until winter groundwater monitoring results are obtained.*

4. Headwalls are set 150mm above ditch level. Refer to the updated plan provided. *Outfall invert levels are shown to be 150mm above a localised bed level. Please acknowledge that regrading will be carried out to remove the high areas of ditch bed downstream and ensure that a smooth gradient is provided.*
5. Drainage drawing shows smaller basin (as mentioned recently) and all associated basin levels. Refer to updated plan provided. *I will require revised calculations to be submitted demonstrating that this revised basin size is adequate.*
6. Standard detail updated to show diffuser and control chamber together. Plan updated to show incoming surface water diffusers for typical drive. Permeable paving depths added to drawing (notes). Refer updated plans provided. *To clarify, are you proposing on diffusing rain water from roofs into permeable paving and then connecting the permeable paving to the wider network? You don't actually show control chambers near permeable paving on the layout. Please provide details on layout plans of the connectivity proposed.*
7. Construction drawing previously provided for tanks and outfalls. Basin sections now provided - refer to ACD drawings/sections. *The ACD drawing is not a construction detail drawing. To be clear, I require two perpendicular cross sections showing inlets and outlets, bedding layer, NAUE liner, overlap, topsoil, planting, etc. I also have concerns regarding the basin effectively being bunded along the southern side due to the lower ground level, details of this bund must be provided, i.e. construction, widths, etc.*
8. Catchment plan impermeable areas clarified. Refer to updated plan provided. *I will review when revised calculations are provided.*
9. Maintenance comments as per response before. *I will review when other points have been agreed.*

Regards,

Laura Gibbons, MEng, GMICE
Engineer (Drainage & Coastal)

Sent: 17 May 2019 18:29

To: Laura Gibbons

Cc: Kathryn Griffiths; Caroline Green; Zoe Knott; Ryan Saul; Dorota Kaminska-Majkowska; James Lawson; Lance Else; James Hammond; Darren Mcarthur

Subject: RE: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Hi Laura,

In relation to your comments (further below) and our subsequent discussions please find link below to updated drawings/information with summary below.

<https://we.11/L-5W5e7O1DOA>

Please can we discuss the flotation/groundwater item as per my messages as soon as possible?

Comments against original responses/items are:

1. ACD have shown tank footprints on their landscaping plans. Updated plans provided.
2. Pond sections with NAUE liner provided. Details provided. Tank flotation/groundwater assessment to be discussed as soon as possible.
3. Further site investigation/soakage tests have been requested. Please see associated sketch sent to geotechnical engineers within the link provided.

4. Headwalls are set 150mm above ditch level. Refer to the updated plan provided.
5. Drainage drawing shows smaller basin (as mentioned recently) and all associated basin levels. Refer to updated plan provided.
6. Standard detail updated to show diffuser and control chamber together. Plan updated to show incoming surface water diffusers for typical drive. Permeable paving depths added to drawing (notes). Refer updated plans provided.
7. Construction drawing previously provided for tanks and outfalls. Basin sections now provided - refer to ACD drawings/sections.
8. Catchment plan impermeable areas clarified. Refer to updated plan provided.
9. Maintenance comments as per response before.


If we can discuss the remaining item noted above then that would be most appreciated.

I trust otherwise the above/provided drawings/information now addresses your comments.

Kind Regards



Luke Hart : Associate Director



Subject: FW: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Hi Luke,


Laura Gibbons has provided further comments below.


The case officer has requested that you liaise directly with Laura and only submit further information once you have reached an agreement.

Many thanks

Kathryn

Kathryn Griffiths
Graduate Planner





From: Simon Davis
Sent: 03 May 2019
To: Kathryn Griffith
Subject: FW: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

As discussed

Kind Regards



From: Laura Gibbons
Sent: 03 May 2019 16:02
To: Simon Davis
Subject: RE: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Hi Simon,

Still not happy with the details or the proposed landscaping details. My original comments are shown in blue, the applicants responses are provided in red, and my responses to these are shown in *purple*:

1. There are still trees proposed in close proximity to the southern-most attenuation tank. 2 no. trees close to this tank have been removed. Refer to updated ACD landscaping drawings. *On the ACD landscape drawing sheet 4 revision G there are trees in close proximity to the crate nearest the pumping station. Please can a plan be provided which shows both the proposed drainage and the proposed planting and associated potential root areas on the same drawing.*

2. A ground investigation report has been provided which details how groundwater monitoring was conducted November to December 2015. Peak ground water levels within this window were 1.64m bgl near the proposed location for the attenuation pond. Winter monitoring is required to be completed October to March inclusive. This is required even when infiltration is not proposed to ensure that the effects of flotation are adequately accounted for in design. Groundwater levels recorded are below the basin levels (the basin is also shallow at approximately 600mm deep/300mm water level.). Flotation assessment will be carried out where necessary as part of the detailed design and in discussion with the relevant attenuation tank manufacturer. *We do not know if groundwater levels are below the basin levels, the monitoring completed is insufficient. This level of detail regarding lining and flotation is required in order to discharge the drainage condition as it is quite a fundamental issue. I also would be very hesitant at agreeing a layout without this level of detail as we would affectively be confining the space available for surface water drainage and ending up with an implementable scheme.*
3. The ground investigation report includes results of infiltration testing completed at two locations. Both tests were completed at over 2m depth. One test gave results which are acceptable to support infiltration. Shallow infiltration testing needs to be completed in the winter to ascertain the potential for permeable paving and shallower infiltrating crate systems. The evidence provided to date is insufficient to justify not utilising infiltration. Our design is based on the recommended advice by the geotechnical engineers (BRD), which advises that the site *"has low permeability and therefore poor infiltration, which would be expected given its cohesive nature.... Consequently the disposal of collected surface water to conventional soakaways are not considered particularly feasible at this site. It is anticipated that any drainage associated with the proposed development will need to feed into the existing local drainage network...."* Planning has been given on this basis and we are progressing site design to accord with planning/FRA/strategies. *Other nearby sites have found shallow infiltration is achievable. Describing a soil as cohesive is insufficient to rule out infiltration. We did not agree the strategy, in all of our responses to the outline application we stated that infiltration should be investigated, especially shallow infiltration. Shallow infiltration tests must be completed in the winter.*
4. Top of bank levels, invert levels and slope need to be labelled on proposed ponds. These have been added to the drainage plan. *Okay, but will review further once the points above are resolved.*
5. Proposed invert levels of outfalls to ditches appear to be low in comparison to surrounding bed levels. A minimum of 150mm must be provided between the invert level of outfall and ditch bed level. The site is quite constrained as we have had to look to achieve outfalls without impacting significantly on pipe depths in the road (for adoption), meeting highway adoption standards and building regulations/level design requirements, existing tree retention at boundaries, minimising roof heights etc. We have amended the outfall pipe diameter and gradient and pulled the headwalls back/provided a new short section of ditch prior to connecting the site to the existing ditch. This improves the level difference by around 50-100mm. *Site specific detail drawings of outfalls need to be provided. 150mm is our absolute minimum requirement.*
6. Details of how the permeable paving links to the main drainage system have not been provided. Typical arrangement/details have been shown on the drainage plan. These still don't seem to have been provided.
 - a. *Construction detail drawings have been provided of diffuser units stating inlet from house, is this what is proposed? It isn't actually clear from the layouts if standard rwp connecting to the main piped network are proposed. There certainly are no diffuser units shown on layouts.*
 - b. *There are still no drawings or indications on the layout of how the permeable paving connects to the main network. Please provide these. Please also ensure formation and finish levels of permeable paving is provided.*
7. Construction detail drawings need to be provided. I recommend that the applicant refers to our checklist for further detail of our requirements. Construction details provided. *Construction details of tanks, ponds and outfalls need to be provided.*
8. Please can the applicant supply a catchment area plan. Catchment area plan provided. *Please provide area figures on this plan.*
9. Again it would be inappropriate to comment in detail on maintenance proposals whilst design has not been agreed. However, I note that the document does not state how maintenance will be funded. This must be detailed. Maintenance will be by the highway authority (WSSC) for road gullies and highway drains, by Southern Water for the main adopted sewers (subject to a s104), and privately maintained for areas that fall outside of these. Bovis have advised that privately maintained areas will go over to a management company with all residents paying a fee towards upkeep. *I will comment further once details have been agreed.*

Kind Regards,

Laura Gibbons, MEng, GMICE
Engineer (Drainage & Coastal)

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 29 April 2019 10:26
To: Laura Gibbons
Subject: FW: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Hi Laura,

Please see below. These will not be added to the website unless you advise they are acceptable.

Kind Regards

From: Zoe Knott <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 29 April 2019 10:26
To: Simon Davis <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Kathryn Griffiths <[REDACTED]>
Subject: FW: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Morning Simon,


Please see the comments below in red in response to the email from Laura Gibbons and the attached supporting evidence.

Many thanks,

Zoe

Zoe Knott
Principal Planner

Nexus Planning is pleased to have been commended by the RTPI for Planning Consultancy of the Year 2019



Subject: FW: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Hi Kathryn,


Please see comments/response below in red against original email along with updated/additional drawings attached.

Any queries then let me know.

Kind Regards



Luke Hart | Associate Director



From: Laura Gibbons
Sent: 12 April 2019 12:16

Subject: RE: Y/9818/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Simon,

Comments on the revised drainage and landscape proposals:

1. There are still trees proposed in close proximity to the southern-most attenuation tank. 2 no. trees close to this tank have been removed. Refer to updated ACD landscaping drawings.
2. A ground investigation report has been provided which details how groundwater monitoring was conducted November to December 2015. Peak ground water levels within this window were 1.64m bgl near the proposed location for the attenuation pond. Winter monitoring is required to be completed October to March inclusive. This is required even when infiltration is not proposed to ensure that the effects of flotation are adequately accounted for in design. Groundwater levels recorded are below the basin levels (the basin is also shallow at approximately 600mm deep/300mm water level.). Flotation assessment will be carried out where necessary as part of the detailed design and in discussion with the relevant attenuation tank manufacturer.
3. The ground investigation report includes results of infiltration testing completed at two locations. Both tests were completed at over 2m depth. One test gave results which are acceptable to support infiltration. Shallow infiltration testing needs to be completed in the winter to ascertain the potential for permeable paving and shallower infiltrating crate systems. The evidence provided to date is insufficient to justify not utilising infiltration. Our design is based on the recommended advice by the geotechnical engineers (BRD), which advises that the site *"has low permeability and therefore poor infiltration, which would be expected given its cohesive nature.... Consequently the disposal of collected surface water to conventional soakaways are not considered particularly feasible at this site. It is anticipated that any drainage associated with the proposed development will need to feed into the existing local drainage network...."*. Planning has been given on this basis and we are progressing site design to accord with planning/FRA/strategies.
4. Top of bank levels, invert levels and slope need to be labelled on proposed ponds. These have been added to the drainage plan.
5. Proposed invert levels of outfalls to ditches appear to be low in comparison to surrounding bed levels. A minimum of 150mm must be provided between the invert level of outfall and ditch bed level. The site is quite constrained as we have had to look to achieve outfalls without impacting significantly on pipe depths in the road (for adoption), meeting highway adoption standards and building regulations/level design requirements, existing tree retention at boundaries, minimising roof heights etc. We have amended the outfall pipe diameter and gradient and pulled the headwalls back/provided a new short section of ditch prior to connecting the site to the existing ditch. This improves the level difference by around 50-100mm.
6. Details of how the permeable paving links to the main drainage system have not been provided. Typical arrangement/details have been shown on the drainage plan.
7. Construction detail drawings need to be provided. I recommend that the applicant refers to our checklist for further detail of our requirements. Construction details provided.
8. Please can the applicant supply a catchment area plan. Catchment area plan provided.
9. Again it would be inappropriate to comment in detail on maintenance proposals whilst design has not been agreed. However, I note that the document does not state how maintenance will be funded. This must be detailed. Maintenance will be by the highway authority (WSCC) for road gullies and highway drains, by Southern Water for the main adopted sewers (subject to a s104), and privately maintained for areas that fall outside of these. Bovis have advised that privately maintained areas will go over to a management company with all residents paying a fee towards upkeep.

I will review further once points 1-3 are resolved.

Kind Regards,

Laura Gibbons, MEng, GMICE
Engineer (Drainage & Coastal)

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>

DX 57406 Littlehampton

You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>

DX 57406 Littlehampton

You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>

DX 57406 Littlehampton

You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>

DX 57406 Littlehampton

You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>

DX 57406 Littlehampton

You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails

are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.
