

Amy Bray

From: Development Control (DMW)
Subject: FW: LW/799/CM(EIA)

From: Steven Tapp
Sent: 12 December 2017 8:18 PM
To: Development Control (DMW)
Subject: Re: LW/799/CM(EIA)

Hi Amy

Steven Michael Tapp 57 Brownleaf Road Brighton BN2 6LD.

I will already be on your system, these points are evidence of points made in my objection. If you cannot add them to my previous email please log this separately as the points are relevant and worthy of consideration by the committee.

Many thanks
Steve Tapp

Sent from [Outlook](#)

-----Original Message-----

From:
Sent: 11 December 2017 10:44 PM
To: Development Control (DMW)
Subject: LW/799/CM(EIA)

Supporting evidence to my objection of the above From the application....see (d) Development will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that a proposal: (a) adequately provides for the implications of flood risk in that it would not increase the risk of flooding on the site or elsewhere and where possible reduce the risk of flooding overall;
(b) is not detrimental to the integrity of sea, tide or fluvial flood defences or river channels;
(c) would not impede access for future maintenance or improvements of flood defences;
(d) has no significant adverse impact on the nature conservation and amenity value of rivers, wetlands or the marine environment;

The Scope of the EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment)

10.5 BAL undertook a scoping exercise to determine the terms of reference for the EIA and ES. It prepared an outline of the proposed development together with a draft transport statement and requested that ESCC sought views from its various consultees on the issues that needed to be addressed in the ES. Views were given on the following topics:

(i) landscape and visual impact; (ii) biodiversity; (iii) cultural heritage; (iv) drainage and flood risk; (v) noise; (vi) air quality; and (vii) road transport

As there has been no impact assessment of the marine environment how can this be passed ?

From the application.....

The plan shows two surface water sewers to the west of the Site which form part of the surface water sewer network serving the western and northern part of East Quay. The surface water sewer serving the existing building to the south west of the railway line outfalls to the Mill Creek via a 150mm diameter pipe with an invert level of 1.33m AOD.

3.83 The second surface water sewer serves the existing building adjacent to the western boundary of the Site and the hard standing area along the River Ouse. This sewer is assumed to outfall into the River Ouse as shown on the services plan.

3.84 Moreover, with reference to the topographic survey, in Appendix 4 there are a number of gullies and channels across the Site which appear to drain in a northerly direction towards the Mill Creek. The topographic survey identifies a number of outfalls along the Mill Creek, to the north surroundings of the Site and east of the outfall identified on the serves plan, which are anticipated to be associated with the drainage of the Site.

So.....any surface contamination from the site drains into the river (and thus impacts the bay) or onto the beach via the Mill Creek which does discharge tidally into the bay and yet no marine impact assessment !

This surely cannot be passed without one.

This message is intended for the use of the addressee only and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you have received it in error please notify the sender and destroy it. You may not use it or copy it to anyone else.

E-mail is not a secure communications medium. Please be aware of this when replying. All communications sent to or from the County Council may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Although East Sussex County Council has taken steps to ensure that this e-mail and any attachments are virus free, we can take no responsibility if a virus is actually present and you are advised to ensure that the appropriate checks are made.

You can visit our website at <https://www.eastsussex.gov.uk>