

Site 8 objection to planning application ref. 170885

I write on behalf of the Sovereign Harbour Residents Association to oppose this application. Our objections are as follows:

1 The diameter of the proposed outfall/overflow pipe (375mm) shows the likely volume of surface water discharge that may be expected. Note – this scheme intends that *all* surface water run-off from the entire development is to be directed into the harbour (not simply the public areas).

2 The effectiveness of the revised drainage scheme depends on all of its component parts working to overcome the shallow ground depth above the high groundwater table – a mere 0,8 metres, where 1.4 metres is required for a traditional soakaway. These components are:

Planter filtration beds, perforated pipes, channels, gullies and pumps – all of which are liable to become blocked with silt and debris and will require a high level of maintenance. [See planning document no. 9801224]

3 The drainage system is almost entirely situated within the public access areas, which are likely to flood when the system fails. This flood water will include the surface water run-off from the new houses and their parking areas.

4 The normal rise and fall of groundwater levels, and tides, will introduce silt, dirt and other detritus into the system - recycled from previous percolation - which will then overflow directly into the harbour, to the detriment of us all. This is likely to occur even if the system works as intended.

5 The developer's proposed maintenance schedule [see document no. 9801224] shows a very frequent need for maintenance, intended to be carried out by a management company following handover from the developer. Several questions arise from this and need answers:

Which management company? How and when will it be operational? Will the eventual home-owners be told of their liability to pay for this? (Will they accept the principle of paying to maintain assets situate in public areas and/or for public benefit?) Is it intended that the whole of these costs will be visited upon all harbour residents (through even higher harbour charges) or upon council-tax payers at large?

6 The best way to ensure that a management company is in place and operational in good time is to make it a condition of allowing any revised drainage scheme. To protect the public interest its structure should be approved by EBC/ESCC.

7 This drainage scheme is fraught with risk; it is a departure from the NPF and has yet to be agreed by the lead flood authority – ESCC. The risk seems to be borne entirely by the local authorities and local residents in particular. [Yet another reason

why previously agreed plans should not be subject to repeated changes that are not coherent with the overall approved development.]

8 The public walkways are now proposed to be laid to a significant fall (due to using non-permeable paving instead of permeable). This fall will make public access more difficult, especially for those with mobility issues. [See planning document no. 9801191]

C Mepham
Chairman SHRA