6 (4) Old Shoreham Road AWDM/0337/18

[redacted] 29 April 2019 at 17:30

[redacted]

Blind copies to residents

AWDM/0337/18 | Demolition of fire damaged dwelling and erection of a replacement 5-bedroom dwelling at 4 Old Shoreham Road, retention of existing dwelling at 6 Old Shoreham Road and erection of 2 no. 4-bedroom dwellings. Closure of existing site access from A27 roundabout and creation of a new access road from Old Shoreham access road and associated vehicle parking and landscaping | 6 Old Shoreham Road Lancing West Sussex BN15 0QT

Attn: Gary Peck, Planning Services Manager

Dear Gary,

The latest comments from both Adur Technical and the WSCC Lead Drainage Authority have now lifted objections to the drainage scheme for the above application.

This is of great concern to the community in the areas around the above site.

(Link to site plan:- http://194.165.12.116/NorthgatePublicDocs/02119337.pdf)

The major concern is the issue of increased flood risk from rising groundwater, as per those severe events experienced in the 4 winters 2012/12 to 2015/16. For this development, those concerns are now being recommended by the WSCC lead drainage authority to be dealt with ***post approval*** by way of a condition.

The scheme with a few subsequent tweaks and drainage recalculations for management of pluvial and surface water flows **is absolutely no different from that which prompted the planning officer's recommendation to refuse** when a deferment was agreed at the 11th February planning meeting.

It was perceived that there could be a solution to the sustainable drainage for all aspects of the site which until that time was objected to by both WSCC & Adur authorities. The postponement allowed further work to be done by the applicant to come forward with that solution.

Nearly 3 months later and some further 8 communications between the respective engineering authorities and the applicant have simply failed to achieve that.

If tabled at planning committee as it is, the scheme is absolutely the same as when recommended for refusal when the deferment decision was made. It questions why a deferment was even requested.

The only difference is there is a recommendation that a post approval condition be made to deal with off site flows with further works to be approved by Adur DC to ensure no 3rd party increased risk of flooding..

This is simply not acceptable. This key issue still has not been dealt with within the drainage scheme. It still does not bring back to committee a complete scheme which shows full sustainability for the drainage of the site itself and the surrounding area without increased flood risk to both parties.

The community knows this additional work should be carried out pre planning committee consideration. It is so vital to the site and the areas around that this work must come to committee as a fully finished up scheme. The 2.11.18 submission by Adur Technical clearly shows all these concerns – see link.

http://194.165.12.116/NorthgatePublicDocs/02144822.pdf

With a post approval decision, there is also absolutely no trust by the community that a suitable outcome will be agreed which achieves a nil increased risk to their wellbeing in extreme weather conditions as mentioned above.

With no facility to further comment once condition approval is given, the local community asks for reassurances that the applicant will be asked to carry out this further work as mentioned in the proposed condition, so that a complete solution comes to planning committee with no conditions on this matter of drainage. The WSCC final submission is attached.

An immediate written response is requested to reassure that the applicant will be asked to carry out this further work before the application is tabled for committee consideration.

The history of events during those four winters above, fully reported to both authorities, surely should be prompting the local authority to exercise its duty of care to the community to ensure that this application is fully sustainable before it is considered by the planning members. Every resident in the area who suffered, during the above winters, flooded gardens, garages, under floor flooding, surcharged sewers with road closures and sewage in the road and properties, deserves the right level of care that this situation will become no worse in future events of extreme weather.

A post approval condition is absolutely no guarantee that this will be the outcome.

-

Background information for members

Since the submission of the application in March 2018, there have been no less than 18 published communications between all parties on the matter of drainage.

Lancing Manor SE Network has **consistently objected** to the last three applications because of increased flood risk and a dangerous road scheme into the site. The earlier submitted Residents' Network submission to object - see link below:-

http://194.165.12.116/NorthgatePublicDocs/02123402.pdf

This is the 7th application to develop this site. All have been previously refused, 4 because of drainage management concerns, 6 because of overdevelopment and this application's level of development infill is no different.

(Site layout link, http://194.165.12.116/NorthgatePublicDocs/02119337.pdf)

2 planning appeals to the Planning Inspectorate against refusals have also been rejected by that Govt authority.

No Adur Waste Management comments have been published on the ingress/egress acceptability for the proposed 4.5m wide road into the site.

Highways England comments should be sought on the impact of the proposed turn of the road extension into the site which is configured where there is a new electricity substation and cabling for the recently installed new lighting for the A27.

The back area of the site, where two large properties are proposed, always floods in extreme weather from rising groundwater. A separate link to a Dropbox account will be sent to all members as video evidence of this for the 1/30 year event in Jan 2016. Further substantial infill

can only exacerbate this and displace increased water levels into the site itself and the community areas around.

Following a request to tidy up the site, the applicant responded by levelling the whole area and turned it into a car park with hard core and tarmac planings infill – completely without planning approval. No enforcement actions have been taken on this unapproved work.

Conclusion

It is clear there is a corporate wish to resolve this application by the authority. Understandably, there must be concerns that, if refused yet again, challenges could well result. But this is simply not a reason not to ensure its total sustainability before planning members' consideration. Residents do not have the facility of highly paid professional experts to represent them and their only hope is that their local authority officers and members will exercise fullest duty of care to ensure that their risk during those increasing periods of extreme weather is not made worse.

Therefore, the undersigned welcomes a positive, speedy response to the above request..

Yours sincerely,

Bill Freeman

Lancing Manor (S.E.)

Residents' Network

Adur Floodwatch Group

Run by the community for the community

5 Manor Way

Lancing

BN15 0QU

[redacted]

Cc

Adur Planning Portal

Adur CEO

Director of Economy

Adur Councillors

Head of Planning

Lancing Parish Council

WSCC Lead Drainage Authority

Adur Technical

CEO, National Flood Forum

Adur Floodwatch Members

WSCC final submission.pdf
63K