From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 October 2024 12:09:37 UTC+01:00
To: "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1002/24

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 23/10/2024 12:09 PM from Mr Andrew Scoon.

Application Summary

Address:	Forest Barn Forest Lane Worthing West Sussex BN13 3FD
Proposal:	Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single storey extension to rear of property measuring 8m from rear wall of the original dwelling, maximum height 3.9m and height of eaves of the extension 2.4m
Case Officer:	Jo Morin

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Andrew Scoon
Address:	11 Daffodil Road, Worthing, West Sussex BN13 3GP

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Loss of General Amenity
Comments:	Dear Jo Morin, Objection to Planning Application First, may I say that I have never sought objections or more information from planning applications in detail before, nor have I raised concerns I wish the planning authority to have attention of, so I apologise if this is not the correct pathway, or if I am communicating incorrectly. I believe I must contend the allocation

of this development as 'permitted' before being able to get to the crux of my concern over habitat degradation prior to planning consent. The landowner may have other satisfactory information to support the degradation of habitat, but I think it is important to flag this valuable information in case the landowner may be held responsible to replace or offset habitat lost. As I say, my contest of 'permitted development' is expressly so that any loss in habitat can be correctly mitigated for.

I would like to understand the grounds on which the development has been agreed as permitted development. Upon seeing the previous application poster 'AWDM/0596/24', I checked the website but found it was closed. Since then, a new application has been lodged in August which I have not been privy to notification of becasue it was marked as permitted development. I received no notification and had no chance to raise my initial concerns about habitat degradation.

I wish to draw the planning authorities' attention to the removal of a High Priority Habitat hedgerow in 2022, which occurred before both planning applications in 2024. I am unsure if this clearance was associated with or pre-emptive of the development, but it appears within the boundary of the withdrawn application 'AWDM/0596/24'. This is the issue I would have raised if given the opportunity and no other understanding for why a stretch of hedgerow would be removed. At a similar time, notification came to me from a community group where people were generally supportive of the derelict buildings being developed leading me to associate the two occurrences.

As a Nature Recovery Consultant, I am aware that this clearance would be considered unauthorized degradation if the project were undergoing the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) process and the clearance was unauthorized anywhere after January 2020. It is the duty of neighbours to be informed and provide evidence of such actions. The ecological report also notes that building works were obvious at the time of survey and requests for confirmation that bat emergence surveys were conducted prior to starting works. If not, starting works without authorization could contravene laws of protected species as well as unauthorised degradation that are seemingly being lost to the fact that the development is now considered permissive.

Regarding permitted development, the buildings have been derelict and neglected for at least the seven years I have lived here. They were never evidently used or could be described as 'incidental to the enjoyment of the house'. I would also like to argue that the ecological technical note describes the loss of other habitats, including the hedgerow, as 'of limited value in their own right and their loss to the proposed development is not likely to be significant in a local context'. However, given the temporal scale and the adjacent New West Durrington development, any remaining locally historical habitat is indeed valuable. This is equally true for potential bat roosting habitat unscathed from development. I have evidence of bats within the New West

Durrington locality from perhaps 5 years ago and the habitat nearby where I have evidence has continuous cover to the development site in this application.
Approximately two years ago, I observed diggers and machinery removing the hedgerow along the southern boundary, which shares a slope with the adjacent estate. About 15 meters of Habitat of Principal Importance (HPI) hedgerow were removed. I am concerned that the acceptance of this development as 'permitted', along with changes in boundary scope, may conceal previous indiscretions by the developer. Pre-emptive commencement of works may have damaged Priority Habitat and violated laws of Protected Species. The Worthing Society has also commented on the historical significance of the buildings, which I understand would be compromised by labelling the development as 'permitted'.
I would love to hear from you and be assured that these concerns are understood and the applicant fairly held accountable if any of these issues were in fact at odds with national laws and statutory aims.

Image 1: Google earth image from 04 2022 showing intact hedgerow

Image 2: Google Earth image from 11 2022 showing removed hedgerow

---

Kind regards