ADM/ 12/4/18

# (no subject)

[redacted] 20 August 2018 at 17:39

To: "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Gary I see that you are away until Weds. I tried to send the email below to you, as your web site would not let me log on – even though I asked for a new password. I hope it is not too late to be considered. Mike

I represent the owners of 37 Riverbank, Shoreham by Sea.

I received a notice re this application on 9 Aug 2018 from Mott MacDonald advising us of so-called non-material changes to the planning application, and asking us to contact Keely Mowatt (KM) at the Environment Agency (EA) if we have any queries.

I sent her an email the following Tuesday with copies to Gary Peck (ADC) and other Adur Houseboat Association (AHA) officers. I got an initial unsatisfactory reply from KM, and have since emailed her again. Again another answer lacking in detail, so I emailed her again and am waiting her response. Meanwhile I have now read page 2 more closely, which invites us to lodge comments on the ADC planning site within 14 days of 06-08-2018. This is today, hence please take note:

The Council will recall that the original planning permission was granted for a handrail made from marine grade stainless steel. I cannot remember the detail of the shape of the handrail, or number of wires etc, but it seems that the design comprised a tubular steel structure with a number of taught horizontal cables (10?) filling in the gaps where people and children could fall through. The Council may also recall that AHA took great pains to ensure that the construction was made from marine grade stainless steel (316 or better) as we want the handrail to remain in good condition for the duration of the sea wall (100 years life).

We now find that EA want to offer plastic coated mild steel rails with no intermediate cables. No reason is given for this.

The owners of number 37 **object** on 2 grounds:

1. The lack of horizontal cables (or bars) would seem to make the fence unsafe, especially for children who might fall down the north bank. The situation is not so clear cut for the south bank as they would probably have to be walking on the wall itself, and could probably easily fall over the top handrail.
2. It is not clear what marine grade powder coating is. But in our experience any powder coating is likely to fail after a few years. This is because any abrasion to the coating (whether caused by accident or vandalism) will allow water/salt/or salt water to enter and IMMEDIATELY start rusting the mild steel. This in turn leads to an unsightly appearance and then failure. We therefore wish to keep the 316 grade stainless steel design as originally agreed.

Additional notes.

a. We are aware that WSCC will be responsible for maintaining the handrails. But it would seem unlikely that they will have the resources to constantly monitor the rails and instantly repair them as soon as they spot any abrasion or other failure in the plastic coating. And why should they, when the rails can be constructed properly in the first place?
b. Two days ago my wife and I did an 'audit' of street furniture in the Burgess Hill/ Hurstpierpoint area. We spotted over 30 powder coated posts supporting various highway signs. Of these about 75% exhibited damage to the coating with consequent signs of rust appearing. At least one of the posts was on the point of collapse. All the posts are less than 50 years old. None of them are in marine atmospheres nor adjacent to public footpaths (subject to vandalism).

c. [redacted]

d. As a matter of course EA seem to use 316 grade (aka A4 grade) fittings on other sea walls – eg in Brighton to Peacehaven. Why are they now proposing to downgrade the material for Reach W5?

Mike Wooldridge