

Subject: Objection to Planning Application AWDM/0706/35

Please confirm receipt of this objection.

Dear Adur Planning,

I write to register my strong and unequivocal objection to the above proposal for the back land development of 9 houses directly behind my property. This scheme is wholly inappropriate for the location and will cause severe and lasting harm to neighbouring residents, the local environment, and highway safety.

1. Severe Drainage Concerns – Increased Flooding Risk

This site is a critical part of the drainage network for this part of North Lancing. It experiences significant flooding from rising groundwater during extreme wet winters—on average in 7 out of every 10 years. A key drainage ditch, which carries road drainage from across the area (including the A27), runs directly through this site to the New Monks Farm pumping station.

In the winters of 2023 and 2024, residents experienced repeated flooding and foul waste system failures. Every property backing onto this site—including ours—suffered garden flooding. The issue is particularly acute in the small crescent that No. 74 proposes to use for site access, where groundwater rises through the tarmac and drains directly into the ditch at the back of the site.

Any infill development here, particularly with 9 dwellings plus a new access road, will inevitably displace floodwater, worsening problems for neighbouring residents. Without an independent and climate change-compliant Flood Risk Assessment, this application is contrary to NPPF Sections 159–165 on flood risk and should be refused.

2. Unsafe and Inappropriate Access

The proposal to route all traffic via No. 74 and the narrow crescent/slip road onto the A27 is deeply flawed. We understand there are recommendations to introduce double yellow lines along this road, which would remove essential parking for residents who have no alternative.

This road already suffers from restricted turning space for large vehicles, forcing them to mount verges and kerbs. Increased traffic movements—construction vehicles, delivery vans, refuse lorries, and residents’ cars—will present serious risks to pedestrians and cyclists, contrary to NPPF Sections 110–111 on highway safety.

3. Overdevelopment and Loss of Local Character

Nine houses on this confined back land plot represents overdevelopment and will erode the character of the area, which is defined by generous gardens and open space. Such “cramming” is contrary to the council’s Local Plan design policies, which seek to protect the character and appearance of established neighbourhoods.

The scale and density of the proposal will also lead to loss of privacy, with direct overlooking into neighbouring gardens and properties.

4. Direct Noise Disturbance on My Work and Livelihood

Our property is immediately next door to No. 74, and my home office is located in the back garden, directly against the proposed new access road. I work from home full time as a Human Resources Manager, a role that requires frequent sensitive and confidential conversations.

The noise from construction traffic, heavy vehicles, and later the ongoing use of the access road will make it extremely difficult—if not impossible—to maintain the level of privacy and focus my job demands. This will cause serious and continuous disruption to my professional responsibilities, my livelihood, and my right to enjoy my property in peace.

5. Ongoing Noise, Pollution, and Amenity Loss

This scheme will bring months, if not years, of disruption from construction noise, dust, vibration, and traffic. Once built, the permanent increase in vehicle movements along the access road will cause continuous disturbance to neighbouring properties, particularly ours.

The impact on our residential amenity is wholly unacceptable and contrary to the NPPF's core principle of ensuring a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants.

6. Damage to Wildlife and Biodiversity

When the site was purchased, it was reportedly cleared without due regard for the wildlife it supported. The land, together with the adjacent western plot, forms an important wildlife corridor of drainage ditches, woodland, and open fields.

The Local Plan identifies this as an area for biodiversity enhancement—not destruction. Approving this scheme will cause irreversible habitat loss, affecting birds, foxes, hedgehogs, badgers, slow worms, and even deer.

7. Lack of Meaningful Community Benefit

This proposal offers no tangible improvement to local infrastructure or community facilities. It also fails to address the apparent lack of much-needed affordable housing in the area. Current planning rules mean that any development of up to 10 houses is not required to make provision for affordable housing, and this scheme is no exception—delivering no benefit to those most in need of housing support.

Under the NPPF's planning balance test, harm to the community should not be accepted where there is no overriding public benefit—which is clearly the case here.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons—worsening drainage and flood risk, unsafe and unsuitable access, overdevelopment, severe amenity and privacy loss, ongoing noise and pollution, and irreversible harm to local wildlife—I urge the planning authority to refuse this application in full.

This is an ill-conceived proposal that fails to comply with both local and national planning policy, is detrimental to the character of the area, and offers no benefit that could outweigh the significant harm it will cause.

Yours faithfully,

Miss Kayleigh Barnes & Mr William O'Neill

72 Old Shoreham Road, Lancing