

Supplementary Report to the Planning Applications Committee
on 31st January 2018

LW/16/0037/MAJ
Seaford

page 10

Please note the Amended Drawing: Revised June 2016: 13 parking spaces.

The District Valuer has confirmed that;

“The Commuted sum would be the difference in value between the residual land value of a fully private scheme (£311,011) which is what they will be providing less the benchmark land value (£225,000). This value is £86,011.”

RECOMMENDATION:

- Conditions 1 and 2:

Reason: insert ‘CP11 of the Joint Core Strategy and policy ST3’

- Delete conditions 12 and 13 (they duplicate conditions 6 and 7)
- Add a new condition (16) to be worded as below;

Prior to commencement, details of the position, height and external materials of the rear retaining wall, shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of amenity for the occupants of the adjoining property and general locality in accordance with policy CP11 of the Joint Core Strategy, ST3 of the Lewes District Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

LW/17/0459
Barcombe

page 21

Environment agency comments:

“We can confirm that the Environment Agency has no objection in principle to the proposed development as submitted; however, we request that the following planning condition(s) be attached to any planning permission granted in order to make the development acceptable [see below]. Without these conditions, the proposed development on this site poses an unacceptable risk to the environment and we would object to the application.

Due to the length and complex nature of this application the Environment Agency recognises the need for careful explanation for our decision.

While any works in the functional floodplain are normally difficult to justify, the small scale and extent of evidence/mitigation provided to the Environment Agency has addressed our concerns as set out below:

- The impact of the works has been analysed with hydraulic modelling (Appendix 10 and although not fully relevant also modelling from the FRA Sep 2017). The works are an improved version on the mentioned option 3, which showed a maximum of 4 cm flood level increase for the 1% plus Climate Change event only in the very near vicinity and not affecting properties in a no risk area.*
- The improved conveyance and smaller footprint of the final design will improve upon these figures*

Given that 4cm is within the inherent uncertainties of hydraulic modelling results, realistic consideration and our field experience, the impact of the works were considered negligible, while we also recognise the additional protection to two properties that the proposal will achieve.”

Additional condition:

The development permitted by this planning permission shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (29/11/2017) and Addendum (09/01/2018) and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:

1. The proposed retaining wall is built adjacent to the dwelling and its design follows that of the one shown in the FRA (figure 18, pg. 17)
2. The wall footprint does not extend southwards beyond the red boundary line for the modelled option 3 (appendix 10. Flood Risk Report July 2016)
3. The southern section of the garden infill is carried out using a local “cut and fill” using soil on-site from higher spots to fill the lower areas (Addendum pg.2) and only to the current height of the Hayes Lane track (FRA and Addendum)
4. No changes are made to the earth bank south from Hayes Lane.

The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the impact of the works is minimal. To prevent flooding elsewhere by ensuring that compensatory floodplain storage is provided. To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants. To comply with Section 9 of the Planning Practice Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for Flood Risk and Coastal Change.

Additional letter of objection:

- Technical, convoluted and repetitive language of the submission makes it difficult to comment on the proposals
- Strongly object to ANY increase in flood levels
- Cannot be right to allow the actions of one household to endanger others
- The submissions make questionable or incorrect statements
- Will result in a substantial loss in flood storage capacity at the site
- Urge you to weigh the experiences of local residents who have first hand experience of flood events, with the hypothetical modelling and assertions set out in the application submissions.