8 Manor Way

Lancing

BN15 0QU

Adur Planning
Portland House
44 Richmond Road
Worthing
West Sussex
BN11 1HS

8.11.24

Ref: AWDM/1233/24 Further Comments

Please kindly confirm receipt of this letter

Dear Adur Planning,

We are responding to the further comments by the applicant for the above planning application.

We note that the applicant is resisting the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment as requested by Adur's drainage consultant, this to comply with national planning rules because the application site is in an area which the Environment Agency rate as 2 & 3 for high risk of flooding.

If this application was to be approved without a proper drainage assessment by the council's drainage consultant, this would give us great concerns. As indicated in our first submission, we experience garden flooding almost every winter with the wetter and prolonged weather we now experience.

Particularly of concern is the raised rear garden which we are certain will worsen our garden flooding. That ground has been raised significantly with compacted hard core type materials. Supposedly, this was done on the advice of a civil engineer but there appears to be no written evidence or report from that consultant to demonstrate that this levelling up will not cause drainage problems elsewhere.

This new level has already created substantial loss of privacy for the immediately neighbouring properties. Without the required Flood Risk Assessment which should include the above consultant's written report, this alone should attract a refusal for the application.

Whatever the outcome, we request that the rear garden should be restored to its original level to eliminate both our worries over worsening drainage and the neighbour's loss of privacy.

Regarding the front facing dormer, as already submitted, we are strongly opposed to that because there are none elsewhere in the road and it fails to fit the character of Manor Way.

Even greater concern, the applicant's latest notes indicate that he wishes that both the front and rear dormers and the hip to gable weatherboarding be in black. We are opposed to black which certainly does not respect the character of Manor Way. For the same reason, a black weatherboarded hip to gable on the side elevation is also unsuitable when all roof elevations seen from the road are clad in natural colour tiling.

The applicant suggests that the colour can be agreed after any given approval. This colour together with the road facing dormer are major reasons of objection and concern. Whatever the decision, these two elements should be considered as material to the decision to approve or refuse. We firmly request that the matter of colour cannot be decided by a post decision condition.

Until we received the letter from planning inviting our comments,
we should mention that at no time have we had dialogue with the applicant on all these development proposals. That simply has never taken place. If it had, we would have expressed all our strong objections before the application was submitted.

Regarding the rather sarcastic comments concerning the large driveway stones being dislodged into the road as being a 'comic' issue, we in no way withdraw those concerns for public safety. We use that pavement daily and these stones are a hazard. Just today, one of the residents at 4 Manor Way was seen clearing stones off the pathway back onto the drive. We still maintain that this is a hazard for users of the pavement and the road and needs the authority's attention.

Once again, we oppose this application as it has been submitted and would be pleased to learn that the authority will arrange that the rear garden will be restored to its original level to lessen concerns for drainage and loss of privacy.

[redacted]

MR C & Mrs J Coole