

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0525/26

Reps and Consults



planning@adur-worth Fri 15 May, 16:48 (5 days ago)

to me

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 15/05/2026 4:48 PM from Ms Natalie McNeill.

Application Summary

Address:	77 Marlborough Road Lancing Business Park Lancing West Sussex BN15 8UF
Proposal:	Demolition of the existing single-storey industrial unit and redevelopment to provide two-storey industrial building (Use Class E(g)(iii)) comprising production, assembly, operational, ancillary storage and logistics space at ground floor with ancillary office, welfare and administrative accommodation at first floor, together with associated access, car parking and cycle parking.
Case Officer:	Peter Barnett

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	Ms Natalie McNeill
Email:	
Address:	24 Lancing Park Lancing West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	Formal Objection to Planning Application AWDM/0525/26 (Amenity, Privacy, and Policy Grounds) Dear Planning Department, I write to formally object to planning application AWDM/0525/26 relating to the

proposed redevelopment at 77 Marlborough Road, Lancing Business Park, Lancing.

I am the owner and occupier of 24 Lancing Park, Lancing, West Sussex, BN15 8RF, which lies in very close proximity to the application site. I have serious concerns that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to my family's residential amenity and fails to comply with both local and national planning policy.

1. Loss of Privacy (Contrary to Policy)

The proposed two-storey industrial building would directly overlook two bedrooms, a bathroom, and our rear garden at an extremely limited separation distance of 15 metres. This would enable clear and uninterrupted views into private living areas. This is contrary to the core planning principle of safeguarding residential amenity and privacy, as set out in:

- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which requires developments to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupants (Paragraph 135(f));
- Local Plan policies (including Arun Local Plan policies such as D DM1 / equivalent), which require development to avoid unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy.

Of particular concern is my daughter's ground-floor bedroom, which would be directly exposed to overlooking from the proposed building, representing a serious and unreasonable intrusion.

2. Overbearing Impact, Scale, and Loss of Light

The height, bulk, and proximity of the proposed development would create a dominant and overbearing presence when viewed from my property. It would result in a significant sense of enclosure and an oppressive "hemmed-in" effect within both the garden and rear-facing rooms.

The proposal would also lead to a material loss of natural daylight and sunlight to habitable rooms and outdoor amenity space, contrary to good design principles and BRE guidance on daylight and sunlight.

This conflicts with:

- NPPF Paragraph 135, which requires developments to be sympathetic to local character and maintain a high standard of amenity;
- Local design and amenity policies that resist overbearing and visually intrusive development.

3. Noise, Disturbance, and Intensification of Use

The introduction or intensification of industrial/commercial activity in such close proximity to residential properties will inevitably result in increased noise, vehicle movements, deliveries, and general disturbance.

This would significantly harm the quiet enjoyment of our home, particularly outside normal working hours, and is inconsistent with:

- NPPF Paragraph 135(f), which seeks to ensure developments create places with a high standard of amenity;
- The agent of change principle, which requires new development to mitigate impacts on existing residential uses.

4. Impact on Health and Wellbeing (Material Consideration)

My 10-year-old daughter has been diagnosed Autism and ADHD. A stable, predictable, and low-stimulation home environment is essential for her wellbeing. The increased overlooking, activity, and noise would have a direct and harmful impact on her mental health and daily life.

This is a material planning consideration under:

- NPPF Paragraph 135(f), and
- Public health and wellbeing objectives embedded within planning decision-making.

In addition, our family dog suffers from anxiety and is medicated; increased disturbance will further exacerbate this.

5. Loss of Outlook, Security, and Enjoyment of Property

The proposal would fundamentally alter the character of our home. When purchasing the property, a key factor was that it was not overlooked and offered a private, secure environment. The development would introduce a constant sense of being overlooked, reducing both comfort and security.

6. Incompatibility with Surrounding Residential Context

The scale, height, and function of the proposed building appear out of keeping with the immediate residential setting. The proposal does not demonstrate sufficient regard for neighbouring dwellings and fails to integrate appropriately with its surroundings.

7. Insufficient Mitigation and Design Consideration

The application does not appear to adequately explore alternative design solutions to reduce harm, such as:

- Reduced building height or massing;
- Increased separation distances;
- Reorientation of windows or use of obscure glazing;
- Landscaping or screening buffers.

Even a reduction to a single-storey form would not fully address the impacts of noise, disturbance, and loss of amenity.

8. Precedent and Cumulative Impact

Approval of this application may set an undesirable precedent for further intensification of industrial development in close proximity to residential properties, leading to cumulative harm to the area.

For the reasons outlined above, the proposal results in significant and unacceptable harm to residential amenity, including loss of privacy, overbearing impact, noise, and adverse effects on health and wellbeing. It is therefore contrary to both national and local planning policy.

I respectfully request that planning application AWDM/0525/26 be refused. Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to approve the application, I strongly urge that substantial amendments and robust mitigation measures be secured to protect neighbouring residents.
