

From: [John and Sally Searancke](#)
To: [Andrew Sierakowski](#); James.cross@arun.gov.uk
Subject: Fw: A29 New Road Realignment - WSCC/052/20 Please find time to read.
Date: 22 December 2020 15:21:15

Dear Sirs

We thoroughly endorse all of the comments raised in the email which you will have received from Heather Godsmark, and can do no better than bring it to your attention once again, in the hope that some sanity may now prevail, and that you and your teams will act responsibly and transparently when dealing with concerned residents of Chantry Mead, Murrell Gardens et al, in Barnham and Eastergate.

To date, your proposals have been mired in obfuscation.

Yours sincerely,

J & S Searancke

6 Chantry Mead

Barnham

PO22 0DE

On Fri, 18 Dec 2020 at 11:56, Heather Godsmark [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Mr Cross,

I am writing to you to highlight my, and many other local people's concern, about the potential enhancement of flood risks and other adverse impacts unreasonably associated with the WSCC A29 Realigned road application. The application is very lengthy and, as best I can, I have tried to understand the implications of some of the more technical information, particularly as it may seriously impact many existing east boundary dwellings.

I believe that WSP/WSCC Highways have followed an extremely flawed process, choosing against applying recognised Good Practice, DMRB and Planning Policy Guidance specifically in respect of addressing cumulative effects. Additionally, WSP/WSCC Highways appear to have ignored the very sound EIA scoping advice provided by both WSCC and Arun planners. In my attached application objection response, I have tried to highlight the most concerning contradictory, missing and misleading information, but there will be much more that I have missed.

*The real extent of adverse impacts applying to the east boundary dwellings is well hidden in technical details and I feel really sorry for those householders who will suffer, not only from an increased potential for higher flood risk but substantially will lose enjoyment of their currently open westward, countryside view, from both house and garden. This westward view will be completely blocked by an overpowering, blank, flat faced, noise barrier, comprising a 3m height Rusty Wall set above an up to 2.4 metres high, east side embankment slope. It cannot be other than deceitful to describe this raised road as **'built on a small embankment'**; a description reinforced by unrealistic road cross sections,*

misleadingly drawn over flat existing ground levels and positioned away from the sensitive housing impact points. All levels of planning control regulations require applications to be clearly presented, to allow the public to understand the scheme proposals and its attendant impacts, both good and bad. Hiding such important adverse impact information, within difficult to read technical drawings without supplementary explanatory notes, is irresponsible.

I apologise for the length of my attached planning response but there is a lot to criticise. The resulting scheme is ill-designed for its setting and unreasonably adversely impacts on many people's lives without bringing any balancing, recognisable local benefits. Again for your review, I attach a very unsettling email passing between WSP/WSCC/Arun, included in the application but for reason of redactions and reply insertions, it is not clear which party is saying what to which other party. WSP/WSCC appear to be confirming that for the new road scheme, Arun is 'happy' to allow it to fail to meet the prescribed SuDs standards which apply to the Barnham area. Beside Chantry Mead, the seasonally high water table is recorded to be just 150-300mms below ground surface and a Level 3 High Flood Risk zone applies to that east boundary area, characterised by Barnham Lane Ditch.

This WSP/WSCC/Arun email goes on to confirm that, at this application stage, there is not enough close-by borehole data to be sure that the designed system will be adequate: ***It was also agreed that an additional borehole could be installed within the proposed Phase 1 infiltration area and any amendment to the design made prior to construction.***

1) How can it be fair, advisable or acceptable, for one local authority entity to grant a waiver against meeting applicable Barnham SuDs standards, to another local authority entity, for a local authority project, when those same Barnham SuDs standards will be enforced on other non local authority developers? Without an actual change to those Barnham standards being made for all developers, it is not right to grant concessions to a particular local authority project just to get it over the line it's not ethical?

2) It is clear from the WSP/WSCC/Arun email that there is no certainty that the designed road drainage scheme will be efficient, or ever will be satisfactory in the longer term, given a lack of monitoring data information at the design stage, together with it discharging into an already challenged Barnham Lane Ditch within a level 3 high flood risk zone. This uncertainty is both unfair, undesirable and unacceptable to local community interests since it will be the east boundary dwellings, together with pony grazing meadows to the north, which will pay the price for drainage design shortfalls most likely a price enhanced by climate change increasing rainfall events.

3) Knock on adverse effects, from the reducing of other mitigation measures of importance to facilitate maximising of the scheme's SW drainage opportunities, are apparent throughout the application and particularly they are detrimental to landscape and biodiversity interests. How can drainage concessions be awarded to facilitate delivery of this local authority road design against SuDs regulations and to such a poorly prepared and detailed application, so misleadingly explained to those the local people to become most profoundly impact?

Hopefully, the WSCC and Arun planners will be minded to be rigorous in scrutinising this application but from what I have understood so far, they may be pressured otherwise I hope not? It must not be the expectation of WSP/WSCC Highways that this local authority project can be fast tracked to a decision on the basis of an extensively flawed and misleading application. WSP/WSCC Highways need to be called to account, to start again and apply good practice, suitably realigning and redesigning this road so that it does not ruin the lives of so many existing local people. Their rights to enjoyment of their homes, maintenance of their house values and selling opportunities must be acknowledged and respected within the balance of any decision.

I look forward to receiving your reply, explaining you opinion of Arun's position in respect of the worrying matters I have raised.

Yours sincerely,
Heather Godsmark

