

I note the circular from Southern Water dated 19 April 24 ref# PRN752214.

This and the village hall debate on the 9th April 24 have gone a significant way to explain some of the objections that I had at first sight of the application. It is extremely disappointing this information was not circulated in any form prior to submission.

Having examined the online plans, listened to the village hall talk and read the subsequent circular, I do not now outright object to the scheme.

I no longer take issue with the ICW itself, subject to the assertions from Southern Water in this circular that:

1) The car park and hard landscaping designs "...will be reconsidered in light of this feedback". I have sought clarification from Southern Water on what form this will take.

2) The proposed plan is "...to be revised to include gapping-up of the existing hedgerow along the eastern site boundary to Cuckfield Road." I note the addition of twenty-four trees (in addition to 720 hedgerow saplings) in the Landscape Management Plan added 18th April 24, although their placement does not appear to be specifically detailed here or in the Arboricultural Report added 18th April 24. I have sought clarification from Southern Water on this.

I still find myself, however, unsure about one of key facts of the application: namely, what the alternatives to an ICW would look like. It is clear Southern Water *has* to do something to reduce the amount of phosphorus emissions, so *there will* be some change to the site whatever happens. If not the ICW option, then would this be a physical addition of infrastructure to the existing site? Would this be even more visible from the road than the proposed ICW? What would the infrastructure upgrade plans of these options actually look like on a long term basis?

It is hard to object or support a proposal if you are only seeing one of the options. The circular does not sufficiently explain these other options under the heading "Why not upgrade the WTW?"

I also await a response on one further point raised in the circular surrounding Odours. Southern Water mentions that 'unexpected pollution' to Cell 1 and the knock on nutritional load, "...will not incur long-term detrimental impacts to the ICW or its capacity. Should the situation arise, it must be recognised that there may be odours for a brief period of time due to the nutrient load." This confuses me as on the one hand they say it 'will not' happen, which is confirmed in Section 7 (page 23) of the Air Quality Assessment RevB document, and then in the next sentence they outline what will happen if it does. I have contacted Southern Water to clarify this and what they mean by a 'brief period of time', and to confirm if this would require the replacement of Cell 1 to remedy. It sounds like this would have to be a catastrophic failure further up the chain for this to occur but it is not clear.

In conclusion, I see that there are positive aspects to this scheme (especially if the alternatives involve new and visible infrastructure on the original WTW site). Although I may be inclined to do so in the future, I cannot fully support the

application at this stage, due to the timescales that have been given to research, query and assimilate all the information.

Tom AbouNader