LEWIS & CO

APPEAL STATEMENT

LAND TO THE WEST OF 2 BRIGHTON ROAD, LANCING, BN15 8RH

ON BEHALF OF MR PETER CREASEY

PINS Reference: APP/Y3805/W/25/3374094

Client: Mr Peter Creasey

Site Location: LAND TO THE WEST OF 2 BRIGHTON ROAD, LANCING, BN15 8RH

PINS Reference: APP/Y3805/W/25/3374094

CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY	PAGE 3
2.	RESPONSE TO LPA LETTER DATED 25 NOVEMBER 2025	PAGE 3
3.	RESPONSE TO PUTATIVE CONDITIONS SUGGESTED BY LPA	PAGE 8

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

1.1 This Statement has been prepared for Mr Peter Creasey (the appellant) and relates to appeal reference APP/Y3805/W/25/3374094 against refusal of planning permission for "*Erection of two bedroom chalet bungalow*".

1.2 The site address is Land to the West of 2 Brighton Road. The Adur District Council planning application reference is AWDM/0095/25.

1.3 This statement is made in response to the LPA's Letter of the 25th November 2025 which provides their appeal statement and suggested conditions.

2. RESPONSE TO LPA LETTER DATED 25 NOVEMBER 2025

2.1 The LPA's letter of the 25th November confirms that the LPA will not be defending the sole reason for refusal of the application stated on the Decision Notice.

2.2 However, the letter does seek to suggest that a sequential test is correctly required as they consider the site to be at risk of Tidal Flooding. In Response to this the Inspector is invited to consider the contents of the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) by HOP consulting which was submitted with the application.

2.3 The FRA confirms at Paras 4.7-4.9 that the site is within a "very low risk zone" on the Environment agency map (extracted in the FRA). Further, HOP as flooding and drainage consultant for the appeal scheme confirm that the ground levels at and around the site are higher than the predicted 1 in 200 year design flood level and therefore the appeal site is a LOW risk of flooding.

2.4 Furthermore, we do not agree the LPA comment in their letter that there is "uncertainty" over the extent of flood risk to the appeal site. This is set out clearly in the submitted FRA and no objection was received to the application by either the Environment Agency or WSP who are the LPA's consultants on Flooding and Drainage. This is all demonstrated clearly in the

application/appeal documents and the responses to consultation received by the LPA which will be within the bundle of appeal documents sent to PINS by the LPA

2.5 To reiterate the thrust of this appeal, as set out in full in the main appeal statement, it is our opinion that in combination, the FRA and Sequential Test submitted with the appeal scheme demonstrated that the proposed development is acceptable when considered against the Adopted Policy and Guidance in effect at the time of the decision. I the absence of any materials considerations indicating otherwise, planning permission should have been granted without delay.

3.0 RESPONSE TO PUTATIVE CONDITIONS SUGGESTED BY LPA

3.1

LPA Suggested Condition	Agree/ Disagree	Appellant Comments/reasons
1	Agree	Standard Condition
2	Agree	Standard Condition
3	Disagree	Materials are clearly shown on the submitted information and there is no reason to require physical samples.
4	Agree	
5	Agree	
6	Agree	
7	Agree	
8	Disagree	This is a small development of a single dwelling and as such a requirement for a CEMP is disproportionate and unnecessary. Condition 7 will ensure public amenity is protected, and the existing powers held by the Highway Authority and Environmental Health Functions of the District And County Council will protect highway safety, public health etc.

9	Not Agreed	The building regulations regimen will ensure adequate acoustic performance of the fabric of the building to protect occupiers from external noise.
10	Disagree	Foul drainage will be subject to building control application. The site is close to the main sewer and there is no reason to suggest that this cannot easily be connected to in the same manner as all other houses in the vicinity.
11	Agreed	

LEWIS & CO PLANNING

DECEMBER 2025