

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 12, 2024 2:29 PM
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: S62A/2023/0028 - Planning representation -Site at West of Chelmsford Road, Hartford End CM3 1JY

FAO Mr M Boulton & Ms L Palmer.

Dear sir/madam,

I write and send this copy email, as an addition to our objection submission documents emailed to you yesterday.

Submitted on our behalf by:

[REDACTED],
Holmes & Hills Solicitors

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I hope this is an acceptable process under your rules, and ask for this further information, photos etc be added to my objections documentations of yesterday.

I am of the older fraternity, and have difficulties with IT, moving photos and alike is outside of my capabilities I'm afraid..... Sorry.

Therefore I can only copy you into the email below and the photos on this email, of river/flood levels recently.

I ask that these be seriously considered as they again prove the extent of the flooding, that is a regular occurrence on this brewery site.

The photos show the high level of water at flooding period, along with the Mill Lane, previous public footpath along the south boundary to the phase one site.

My points on this are as follows:

INCREASED Surface Water volumes, INCREASED Sewage Overflow.

1. The river level is near to the concrete Mill lane Road level, i.e. at its maximum, before it overflows, at the entrance to the lane, onto the B147. I suggest the development will take these level beyond these stretched full to capacity water courses.
2. Mill lane concrete road is now closed as a footpath (1st Phase development). The developer not wanting the public to be able to walk through his grounds of the Old Mill House.
3. The new foot path is now on the south side of the river underwater. Not exactly public friendly and not available to the public in flood conditions, the original path would have been, as is evedent.
4. Had the footpath been left on the north side, Mill lane side of the river, this would still be a functioning footpath in flood conditions, proven by photos attached.
5. You will note that the water is very near to the concrete road, old path, surface. Under which is the existing sewage overflow and surface water outlet from the phase one old brewery development.

6. As will be the proposed same outlets serving this proposed site.
7. The photos prove that these additional outlets can and will only add to these flood plain issues, ever increasing the risks, dangers and damage these water levels cause.
8. At these high levels, obviously any outlets coming into the river through the north bank is under the road, underwater and not functioning or fit for purpose.
9. My section drawing shows this scenario of water backing up, these photos prove my point.
10. At these levels and presumably higher, if approval is granted. I believe the new and existing sewage systems will be under threat, overloaded, and could easily burst, split, or just overflow. Any of this plant/equipment, subjected to these undersigned pressures will certainly fail in my view. Damaging immediate building fabric, raising the status quo levels further, adding to flood risk of the house and garage's on the RG development. Adding seriously risk of sewage contamination, adding environmental damage risk, in and around the river/water course.

INCREASED Water levels threat The Old Mill historic and listed building downstream.

11. As is evident by the photos, and the inspectors will see during any site visit, the listed Mill house is located (I'd guess 200-400 mtrs) downstream from the end of the building shown on the right on the old mill lane.
12. I know (because I have witnessed this happening) and can confirm these levels of water will have either flooded or have put the Mill House under serious threat of further damage.
13. If the waters didn't get to the inside of the Mill house on this occasions, it must have been very near to doing so.
14. I know the developer/owner has a barrier he opens on the arched bridge at the front of his property, which he traps between the walls of the bridge and the house, which temporarily holds back the water from the main house at high flood levels.
15. This is not automatic the last time I witnessed it, and if it were not closed at flood periods the water will almost certainly enter the building.
16. This at current levels, not increased development level.
17. The protection of this building from the water/floods is currently, id suggest, dependant on the manual opening, more so closing of this temporary barrier.
18. If this is overlooked, the building to be unoccupied at the start of a flood risk, the building has a very high chance of flooding, damage, contamination, again.
19. To increase the volumes of water, I'd suggest excessively from this development. You are surly similarly increasing the risk of damage, pollution etc, as described above.
20. How can this be risked on such a beautiful listed site.

Mill Lane in Felsted.

21. My submission talks about the risk and further damaged that is likely in and around this flood plain site, at current water levels.
22. Increased water levels can only worsen this, and the photos, show the excessive levels they reach now.

I hope and trust this can be included as part of my submission, and would ask if you can confirm receipt and that it is acceptable or not.

Kind regards

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 04 January 2024 10:02

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Planning Application

Hi [REDACTED],

Images as promised, still waiting too hear on the Dr's/Schools

[REDACTED]



