To the Case Officer,

I wish to object to the proposed house on the land adjacent to No. 41 Overmead. This site has a long planning history, with repeated refusals on the grounds of flood risk and overdevelopment.

Planning History (Summary)

- **July 2023 (AWDM/1027/23):** 2 flats — withdrawn by the developer after strong community objections.
- **Jan 2024 (AWDM/0012/24):** 1 house — objected to on flood risk grounds; no Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) submitted.
- **Mar 2024:** Refused due to high surface water flood risk.
- **Jan 2024 (AWDM/0080/24):** Resubmitted with FRA — still refused for flood risk & appearance.

Flood Risk Concerns

The latest application to the Adur planning committee was refused on the basis of surface water flooding, and the design mitigation being out of character. The current appeal, **APP/Y3805/W/25/3370618**, directly challenges the tests used to assess this flooding.

- Appeal **APP/Y3805/W/25/3370618** relies on a new FRA classifying the site as FZ1 (low risk, fluvial and/or tidal).
- This is misleading, as the earlier FRA correctly treated the site as FZ3a with climate change, acknowledging significant surface water flood risk.
- The new FRA:
    - Admits surface water issues but ignores climate change allowances required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
    - Downplays local experience of surface water flooding at the Mill Lane/Overmead/Oxen Avenue junction

Local Impacts

- The site is at the top of a gradient, meaning floodwater would not only affect the new dwelling but also increase runoff and risk to neighbouring homes downhill.
- Other examples cited by the developer are not comparable, as they are not located on such a slope.

Conclusion

The development is unsuitable for residential use because:

- It presents unacceptable surface water flood risk (worsened by climate change).
- It fails NPPF requirements on climate change allowances and Sequential Test application.
- It would increase flood risk to neighbouring properties.

The Local Planning Authority's refusal was justified and should be upheld.

Yours sincerely,
Jason Rogers & Faye Buckner