



planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk  
to me ▾

Sun 30 Aug, 17:24 (4 days ago) ▾

## Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 30/08/2026 5:24 PM from Mr Brett Channon.

### Application Summary

### Application Summary

|               |                                                                      |
|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Address:      | Land West Of 51 To 63 Southview Road Southwick West Sussex           |
| Proposal:     | 2 new dwellings with parking and associated access and amenity areas |
| Case Officer: | Peter Barnett                                                        |

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

|          |                                                |
|----------|------------------------------------------------|
| Name:    | Mr Brett Channon                               |
| Email:   |                                                |
| Address: | Flat 22 Rochester Close Rochester Gardens Hove |

### Comments Details

|                 |                                              |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Commenter Type: | Member of the Public                         |
| Stance:         | Customer objects to the Planning Application |

Reasons for  
comment:

- Other

Comments:

Re: Planning Application AWDM/1019/25 - Land West of 51 to 63 Southview Road,  
Southwick

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to raise a specific technical concern about this application that I do not believe has been addressed by any of the documents currently on file.

I am not a resident of Southview Road. I am a prospective purchaser of a property on Underdown/southview Road, close to the application site, and my interest is in the effect this development could have on groundwater conditions in the surrounding area, including at that property.

I have reviewed the Flood Risk and SuDS Assessment submitted with this application, along with the drainage consultee responses and hydraulic modelling on file. I note that the applicant's own groundwater monitoring (winter 2019-20) recorded the water table rising from 5.5m below ground level to the surface on 24 January 2020, remaining there until the end of March. This is consistent with concerns raised by a number of local residents in previous representations, and with the site's known history of groundwater and infiltration problems (documented separately by Southern Water for the wider Southwick area).

On the strength of that data, the Flood Risk and SuDS Assessment concludes that soakage/infiltration drainage is not viable, and the applicant has instead proposed attenuation and controlled discharge to the surface water sewer. I have no issue with that conclusion as far as it goes.

However, none of the submitted documents - the Flood Risk and SuDS Assessment, the hydraulic modelling report, or the drainage consultee's responses appear to assess a separate and distinct issue: the effect of the proposed foundations on the site's existing lateral groundwater flow. Given that the water table is documented as reaching ground level for extended periods each winter, the introduction of deep foundations and an impermeable slab across the site footprint has the potential to act as a barrier to that flow, diverting or backing up groundwater toward neighbouring gardens and properties rather than allowing it to move through the ground as it currently does. This is a recognised effect in geotechnical and hydrogeological practice and is a different question from the surface water flood risk that has been modelled to date.

---

I would also note that I can find no Ground Investigation Report, Structural Engineer's report, or foundation design of any kind among the documents submitted with this application. Without that information, it is not possible for anyone, the council, its consultees, or local residents to assess what foundation type is actually proposed, still less what effect it might have on the groundwater. Given the site's documented water table history, I would suggest this information should have accompanied the application rather than being left to a condition, but at minimum it should be secured and assessed before any permission is granted.

I would ask that, before this application is determined:

1. The Lead Local Flood Authority and/or the Environment Agency be specifically asked to comment on groundwater flow (as distinct from surface water flood risk), given the site's documented shallow water table.
2. The applicant be required to submit a Ground Investigation Report and foundation design, together with a hydrogeological or geotechnical assessment addressing the likely effect of that foundation design and construction method on lateral groundwater movement, both during and after construction.
3. Any permission granted include a condition requiring that information and its findings to be secured and approved before foundation works begin.

I recognise this application proposes a much smaller scheme than the two previous refused applications on this site, and I am not seeking to reargue points already decided at appeal. My concern is narrowly about groundwater diversion, which I do not believe has been considered in either this or the earlier applications, and which has a direct bearing on the amenity and structural safety of neighbouring properties.

Thank you for your time.

---