

Full council meeting 17.12.15

**Bill Freeman – I talk on behalf of the Adur Floodwatch Group  
An association of residents groups and resident areas in  
Adur.**

**Item 9 on the agenda this evening  
Additional Council Meetings for the Local Plan.**

The leader states that following the publication of the Proposed Submission of the Adur Local Plan 2014 amendments are proposed in relation to a strategic allocation within the document in response to some representations received!

The majority of the residents around the Lancing Brooks flood plain, North South and West are totally opposed to any more development there - so who is Adur DC responding to?!!

Of the 1151 representations to the 2013 consultation, 90% of those, over 1000, expressed their fears for the increased flood risk by the proposed developments.

The cabinet member responsible for the Plan, Cllr Beresford recently made great play publically of supporting the majority to the detriment of the minority who are greatly concerned about this. Surely, if the minority are the only ones who are affected by a proposal, they become the majority! Anybody not affected should not even be in the frame.

My question – why is ADC continuing to persist in proposing to build 600 houses on the Lancing Brooks flood plain?

The recently published WSCC CH2MHill Surface Water Management Plan clearly states the cause of flooding in Lancing area is due to capacity restraints in the Lancing Brooks.

It goes on to say that even with all the measures in place to reduce flood risk, the Lancing Brooks drainage system will still be at risk during more extreme weather conditions.

It also states that in such conditions, whatever you do to mitigate, in extreme weather, Lancing is highly vulnerable to ground water flooding. Drainage is affected by groundwater levels.

I assume the CH2MHill study been referenced in the later work done on the Plan? Unless ADC has chosen to disregard this informative report?

The whole Lancing area is subject to a >75% risk of groundwater flooding – the major issue. Even the £26m Tidal Walls Scheme will make absolutely no improvement on that.

cont./

I would also say, for the technical version of this report published to the public, all the vital appendices of the report were edited out – which gives cause for concern.

We understand the flood plain will be raised to enable construction of the 600 homes and business development as will a repositioned travellers site on the Withy Patch to make room on the A27 for a new roundabout.

This level of build and road infrastructure will cause a massive increase in surface water flows into an already over capacity Lancing Brooks which will disrupt ground waters irreparably. That does not take into account the phenomenal additional volumes of foul waste which our water company will have to handle.

Already residents are being refused insurance cover and experiencing failed house sales because of flood risk.

Why is ADC not listening to the majority of the electorate who oppose the NMF build? Why are you insisting on increasing the flood risk to residents around the Lancing Brooks area, putting them in harms way, blighting their properties to become uninsurable and unsaleable, That apart, consigning residents to indescribable misery. Believe me after those two recent winters events, I know personally what that is like for the community!

Extreme weather events are becoming the norm. Cumbria 6 years ago was flooded. Look at the community there now. They were supposed to have been protected for 100 years by a £45million investment in flood defences which simply were not a match for the levels of weather experienced.

I have to ask, Cllr Beresford, is this the legacy ADC wants to create for Lancing?

I repeat the 2 questions I am permitted.

1)

Why is Adur DC continuing to persist in building these 600 homes on the Lancing Brooks flood plain?

2)

Why are you not listening to the majority of the electorate who oppose the NMF build and insisting on increasing flood risk to residents around the Lancing Brooks area which will put them in harm's way, blight their properties and making them uninsurable and unsaleable – consigning residents to indescribable misery?

Under the rules of the National Planning Policy Framework and with the evidence of the CH2MHill report, Adur does have the information to assist in taking this ill conceived allocation out of the Plan and to tell Government we have no more room for building the level of development it cannot sustain. Emerging planning rules give Adur until 2017 to do this before Government steps in – so it still has time.

Once again, we ask you to take this totally inappropriate allocation out of the Local Plan.

Ends/

Third question :

As per the WSCC advice in the 2013 consultation, will mitigation for flood risk be proved by Adur as required under the NPPF requirements before the NMF allocation goes into the plan for our comments on the soundness consultation?

(The answer was No – we're not doing a developer's job and we could not afford to. It will be done at planning application stage)

#### **Personal Notes on Cllr Beresford response**

Waffled, said he himself had been accused of diatribe – described what he'd just heard as complete diatribe. **Said he did not get the questions despite the fact I deliberately spelled them out as 1 & 2.**

Went onto to waffle about the way the plan's prepared according to the NPPF to ensure that flood risk, ground and surface water is taken into account using the sequential and exception tests. Totally compliant with NPPF in all aspects. **Failed to directly answer the two questions, as expected.** Waffled about need for houses and everything had been taken into account to prevent 3<sup>rd</sup> party flood risk to create the homes the govt and Adur needs.

Totally arrogant and dismissive – totally refusing to listen as always.

When asked a third question, as asked by WSCC in the first consultation, to validate the sustainability of drainage, said that WSCC had approved what Adur is doing and is compliant and they are happy, as is the EA. Once again, said that I was not listening. **Said that Adur will not do the job of the developer who has to provide the drainage solution which is examined at planning stage to get approval to develop.** He never explained that in his original answer and if he did it was not obvious amongst all his absolute waffle.

So the drainage sustainability will not be addressed till planning stage! Totally unacceptable. Rude, arrogant and dismissive of the public and its concerns.

Ridiculed the use of the term Lancing Brooks.

Unfortunately the meeting did not allow counsellors to get involved. Very restricted and undemocratic,

Public questioners not able to debate, just talk for 5 minutes and ask 2 questions and then a further question having received answers to the first two.

Cllr Beresford tried to stop me asking the third question – I reacted and said I would ask the question as I am allowed to and Carson A, the chair, nodded me to do so.

My local councillor and I spoke on phone later. Like me, he felt that other councillors were clearly not impressed with Beresford's attitude and treatment of me.