Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 10/08/2025 4:28 AM from Alessandro Capoia.

Application Summary

Address:	Land North Of Fulbeck Avenue Northbrook Worthing West Sussex
Proposal:	Application for Approval of Details Reserved by Condition of approved AWDM/0636/16 Condition 8(iii) (Area O - Fencing and Planting)(Amended Plan)|cr|
Case Officer:	Jo Morin

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Alessandro Capoia
Email:	
Address:	2 Lupin Spinney Worthing West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design
Comments:	1. THE BUFFER ZONE HAS BEEN REMOVED. When we purchased our property, there was a beautiful buffer zone made up of mature shrubs and trees. From the outset, Taylor Wimpey informed us that we could not touch it and that we were responsible for maintaining it indefinitely. We were happy to do so, as the hedges provided privacy, and the plans clearly showed them as part of the buffer zone. However, it turns out these plants were never in the buffer zone at all-and they were never ours to maintain. In fact, they belonged to our back garden neighbour, as all their roots were planted on his property. This was a boundary measuring error made by Taylor Wimpey, and yet we are being left to deal with the consequences of a mistake we had no part in. We were perfectly happy with the plants and the arrangement-until first WYG, and then our neighbour, began cutting back and ultimately removing the buffer entirely. Our neighbour had every right to do this, as it was on his land, but the result is that the buffer we all refer to no longer exists for us. And hasn't for almost 5 years and both ourselves and the naighbours have got used to it. Despite this, the expectation for us to maintain it remains. This entire situation rests on flawed assumptions, and any attempt to require us to maintain or provide

access for a non-existent buffer is unreasonable and, in our case, severely detrimental to our privacy, security, and property.

2. THE PROPOSED GATE REPRESENTS A SECURITY BREACH.

The proposed side gate at the corner of the former buffer poses a serious security risk-the very risk that led Taylor Wimpey to block its access in the first place. This gap was originally created by WYG when the shrubs were wrongly cut, and a fixed gate was later installed to prevent members of the public from accessing the back of our property through it. The access produced rubbish and security issues from minute 1.

Installing a new gate in this location would require establishing a clear right of access, which we will never agree to. This makes the proposal fundamentally floored.

As the corner property, we will be the most directly affected. This situation is already creating unnecessary work, stress, and exposure for us. We now have an unwanted side path leading directly to the proposed gate-yet, as has been confirmed elsewhere in these comments, this path does not have a clearly defined or definable right of way.

When we purchased our home, we were explicitly told there would be no side path running alongside our property. This turned out to be untrue within our first year of living here. That incorrect assumption has resulted in our buffer side-and therefore our home-being unnecessarily exposed to public access.

Opening this access with a gate would invite privacy breaches, security concerns, and a host of other issues that we simply cannot accept.

3. WE ARE THE MOST AFFECTED.

From our perspective, we are fully able to access and maintain the buffer (when it existed) from within our own garden, without the need for any external access. We see no justification for opening a gate directly onto a public path, as doing so would only invite problems, create security concerns, and increase the risk of trespass and other property breaches.

4. THIS WAS NEVER AN ISSUE.

When the shrubs were thick and dense, no one proposed installing a gate. The idea has only arisen since their removal. It is unreasonable to base decisions on outdated assumptions that no longer reflect the current reality.

5. COMMON SENSE.

We have lived in this property for almost eight years, and we are now forced to live without the beautiful back garden hedge that once provided us with privacy and security. This loss was not our choice, and it has left our property unnecessarily exposed. We also now have to endure an unwanted side pathway-something we explicitly asked not to have, yet were given regardless.

In the interest of common sense and good neighbor living, we respectfully urge that no further unnecessary changes be made. Instead, decisions should focus on restoring privacy where it has been lost and on preventing the creation of new risks or disruptions to residents' peaceful enjoyment of their homes.