

Lindum House,  
Fellands Gate,  
Old Leake,  
Boston  
Lincs  
29/02/24

Dear Sir/Madam,

We would like to make the following comments regarding the variation of condition 9 of planning consent B/24/0040.

Firstly the 'Flood Risk Assessment Final Report' document appears to apply to a completely different area. The table in Paragraph 4.2, Sources of Flooding, shows no risk of either surface or groundwater flooding, however residents of Fellands Gate will have noticed that the whole area has been inundated with water for the past few months, with roadside drains full, and in places flooding right across the narrow lanes. If this Table is incorrect it negates the value of the whole document in any risk assessment process. The rest of it is likely to be inaccurate and of little use if even the basics are wrong. The company that produced the report has published a disclaimer on page 2 of their 'Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan' stating that:

"All comments and opinions are based upon information available during the necessary investigative process, and the conclusions and recommendations could therefore differ in the event of material subsequently found to be erroneous, incomplete or misleading, and they accept no liability should this prove to be the case".

They have produced a professional-looking document, but have strong reservations about its accuracy, and will take no responsibility at all should it prove to be wrong. This is something that should concern all local residents as, in the case of a flood defence breach, their evacuation route could be seriously compromised by the additional traffic produced if the removal of the seasonal opening condition is allowed.

Historically Lincolnshire Highways have always turned down planning applications for businesses in our locality, saying that the road network cannot support the additional traffic. Now we are told that the same roads can cope with the traffic generated by this major development in the case of a serious flood evacuation during the winter months when, according to the Environment Agency, it should not be open at all due to the risk to life:

"I can confirm that the use of the seasonal closure period applied to this permission is the standard measure for reducing flood risk to caravan sites in the Lincolnshire coastal area. This prevents occupation at the time of year when records show flood risk is higher, minimising risk to life and the likelihood of evacuation being needed."

Sustainable Places - Planning Advisor Environment Agency, Lincolnshire & Northamptonshire Area

If the intention was to have all year opening, then the development should not have been in a Zone 3 flood area. As it states in the applicant's own Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan, there is a Zone 1 area of safety half a mile away at Sibsey, and several other similar sites within a few miles.

The same development in a Zone 1 flood risk area wouldn't cause a public safety problem by opening all year round. In this Zone 3 area, with the increasing rainfall already causing surface and groundwater flooding for months on end during the winter, and climate change predictions of 'tipping points', even heavier rainfall, and rising sea levels, it is possible to foresee a time when whole sections of the evacuation route roads are no longer visible due to the roadside drains overtopping and flooding the adjacent fields. To expect these roads to cope with additional cars attempting to evacuate the area due to a sea-defence breach is completely unrealistic.

To sum up, we have a development deemed by the Environment Agency to be a risk to life if open all year round.

We have a flood risk assessment written by consultants who don't appear confident of its validity.

We have an evacuation route on roads barely 2.5m wide, which are already subject to storm and groundwater flooding.

Lastly, we have three passing places, currently under construction, that are in the opposite direction to the specified flood evacuation route, and also not on the route you get from any sat nav system.

In the event of a sea defence breach there would be a clear risk to public safety.

For these reasons we strongly oppose the variation of condition 9.

Yours sincerely

Mr & Mrs Greaves