

From: <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Date: Fri, 19 Sept 2025 at 08:59
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0706/25
To: <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 19/09/2025 8:59 AM from Mr Courtney Darby.

Application Summary

Address:	Site Of 74 Old Shoreham Road And Land South Of 72 To 88A Old Shoreham Road Lancing West Sussex
Proposal:	Demolition of existing bungalow at 74 Old Shoreham Road to enable access to land to the rear for the construction of nine dwellings along with associated infrastructure.
Case Officer:	Peter Barnett

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Courtney Darby
Email:	
Address:	4 Manor Way Lancing West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Other
Comments:	I would like to confirm that I do not object to this application in principle. I am supportive of appropriate development in our area and I encourage the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to make an efficient and timely decision on this proposal. Provided the scheme complies with relevant planning policies, it should be approved.

However, I strongly urge that any approval is conditioned with a comprehensive and enforceable Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), which should include clear requirements for monitoring and accountability.

I live close to the site, and my experience of another nearby development (which had a CEMP in place) has shown that poorly drafted or weakly enforced management plans can lead to serious and repeated disruption for residents. Key issues have included:

Parking and access: double-parking, vehicles left on verges, and construction-related parking blocking residents and emergency access.

Vehicle movements: large vehicles manoeuvring unsafely in residential streets, creating hazards for pedestrians, cyclists, and other road users.

Highway damage: kerbs, verges, signposts, and protective railings have been damaged and left unrepaired for extended periods.

Dust and air quality: constant dust emissions, with no apparent mitigation in place, significantly impacting local air quality.

Noise and fumes: plant and machinery operating extremely close to residential boundaries, creating intrusive noise and diesel emissions.

Operating hours: regular breaches of agreed working times, with activity starting earlier or continuing later than permitted.

In addition, I would recommend the following points be considered in the CEMP:

Wheel-washing facilities to prevent mud and dust being tracked onto public highways.

Clear site traffic routing plans to avoid unsuitable narrow residential roads.

On-site contractor parking areas to prevent overspill onto surrounding streets.

Regular, independent monitoring of compliance with the CEMP, with results made publicly available.

Enforcement mechanisms, including penalties for contractors who breach agreed measures.

Community liaison measures, such as a named contact for residents

to report issues, and regular updates on construction activities.

Protection of existing green infrastructure, ensuring that verges, trees, and planting are safeguarded from damage.

In summary, I support the principle of development, but only if accompanied by a robust, enforceable, and regularly monitored Construction Environmental Management Plan that addresses the issues above. This will help protect the amenity of local residents and ensure the development proceeds responsibly.

Kind regards