

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Karen Liddell [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 07 January 2020 15:23  
**To:** Jennifer Margetts <[JMargetts@elmbridge.gov.uk](mailto:JMargetts@elmbridge.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** 'Ray Townsend' [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** 2018/3810 Amended Application Objection

Dear Jenny

[REDACTED] This response is specific to the Amended Flood Risk Assessment only  
(further issues will be submitted separately)

The cover email of 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2019 from James Owen refers in paras. 1 & 2 to a newly introduced void under the Hampton Court Way building (HCW the hotel) and states that as there is no change to the height or elevations of the building no change is required to the submitted drawings. Please advise if you have agreed with this approach? I have looked at the revised FRA and specifically paras. 3.28 -3.38 where this void is described and illustrated. At 3.34 the void is described as 20m wide (no length is specified) and 1m high, and the illustration at Figure 5 shows a void on the ground floor layout without dimensions or a scale. In the context of the legal planning definition of development, this void would comprise an engineering operation below ground and would require planning permission and thus requires drawings to be submitted. Whilst it is for the EA to determine if this void would sufficiently mitigate the flood compensation resulting from this development, I do not see how they have sufficient information upon which to make a judgement. We do not know how far beneath the building the void sits, a section is required to show the positioning and drainage angles. We do not know how the void is connected to the southern sunken garden where it discharges as there is no commentary or illustration. We do not know how this void would be accessed for maintenance. A 1m deep void with 5 x 450mm pipes into it would be a lovely hotel for the rat population from the adjacent waterways, frequently seen in the area, and there are no measures to prevent rainwater run-off filtering into the void . A 1m high void could not be accessed by humans for checking and cleaning. In short this is a fudged solution that has not been thought out. A void could not be enforced by the planning authority without a full set of drawings. Can ask the EA before they submit their response if they consider they need a full set of drawings before they submit their comments. The issues I raise are matters of principal which in my professional opinion should not be addressed as a submission to satisfy a planning condition.

Paras. 3.25-27 of the FRA describe the flood compensation storage in the upper/undercroft car park and Appendix E on page 131 shows the openings in the east elevations that allow the water to pass into the building upon which we await the EA's response. There is no commentary or illustration of how the water escapes from the car park, or if it is required to be pumped out. The plan at page 130 shows the intended flood barriers to stairs, lifts and key services which will be necessary to evacuate people from the upper floors without access to their flooded vehicles, or indeed commuters vehicles. It is very unlikely that this car park will be designed to be a waterproof tank and thus

human life and possessions will be at risk. I am sure most people in full knowledge would not choose to live here. The principle of flooding the car park also leaves the station without a car park. Whilst the current surface car park may become unusable during a flood I am certain the post flood clearance work would be far less challenging and costly.

I do hope the public have an opportunity to see the EA's response to these flood prevention measures before a recommendation is made on this application. Please alert me and HCRC at the earliest opportunity of the EA response.

Kind regards

Karen Liddell (for HCRC) 16 Summer Road KT8 9LS

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.