Gmail

Support Planning <support.planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

planning objection

1 message

natalie lawrence [redacted] 29 September 2026 at 11:24
To: "support.planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <support.planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

This message was sent from outside Adur & Worthing Councils Allow sender | Block sender

FORMAL OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION AWDM/1209/23

Site: Gochers Laundry, Alma Street, Lancing, West Sussex

Proposal: Demolition of existing light industrial building and redevelopment to provide 8 residential dwellings

Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to formally object to planning application AWDM/1209/23 for the redevelopment of Gochers Laundry, Alma Street, Lancing, to provide eight new residential dwellings.

My objection is primarily concerned with the inadequate parking provision, the accuracy and practicality of the submitted parking assessment, highway and pedestrian safety, the impact on existing residents and parking, the potential displacement of vehicles onto neighbouring private land, and the excessive intensity of development for this constrained site.

I respectfully request that these matters are given significant weight when determining the application.

1. Inadequate parking provision

The proposal would introduce eight additional households into an area where parking demand is already significant.

There is insufficient evidence that the development provides adequate parking to meet the realistic needs of all eight households, including residents, visitors, deliveries, tradespeople and other legitimate users.

This is particularly concerning because the surrounding road network already experiences substantial parking pressure.

The development should not be designed on the assumption that existing public highway parking can simply absorb the additional demand created by eight new homes.

West Sussex County Council's Guidance on Parking at New Developments (September 2020) states that its overall ambition is to ensure sufficient parking is provided to meet the needs of new development while maintaining highway operation and protecting surrounding communities. The guidance is intended to inform the Highway Authority's advice to Local Planning Authorities. (West Sussex County Council)

I therefore ask the Council to establish whether the proposed parking provision genuinely meets the parking demand generated by the eight dwellings, using the applicable West Sussex methodology.

2. The submitted parking assessment does not reflect the actual parking constraints

Although the applicant has submitted a parking assessment, I have significant concerns about whether it accurately represents the real-world parking situation immediately surrounding the application site.

The assessment appears to rely upon parking availability at locations which are not realistically accessible or appropriate for residents and visitors of the proposed development.

Of particular concern is the suggestion that visitors and other vehicles could park in Marlborough Road at Lancing Business Park.

This is not a realistic residential parking solution for eight houses on Alma Street.

Lancing Business Park is some distance from the application site and is not a residential visitor-parking facility intended to serve these properties.

It is unrealistic to assume that visitors to eight residential properties will routinely park at a distant business park and walk to the development.

A theoretical parking space located some distance away is not equivalent to a parking space that is realistically available and likely to be used by residents and visitors.

The assessment should therefore distinguish between theoretical parking capacity within a wider survey area and parking which is genuinely practical for the development.

3. Parking displacement onto surrounding residential streets

The most likely consequence of inadequate on-site parking is that vehicles will seek the nearest available alternative.

In practical terms, residents and visitors are far more likely to seek parking in Alma Street and the immediately surrounding residential roads than to park at a distant business park.

This creates the potential for significant additional pressure on existing residents.

The Council should assess the development on the basis of realistic parking behaviour, rather than assuming that drivers will consistently use distant or inconvenient parking locations simply because they have been identified within a survey.

West Sussex County Council's parking guidance recognises the relationship between parking provision, highway capacity and the protection of surrounding communities. (West Sussex County Council)

4. Parking pressure at Headborough Court

There is an additional concern regarding Headborough Court, which is directly opposite the proposed development.

Headborough Court is private land and should not be regarded as an available parking resource for residents or visitors of the proposed development.

However, because it is immediately opposite the site, there is a foreseeable risk that residents, visitors, tradespeople or delivery drivers associated with the eight new properties may seek to enter, stop or park within Headborough Court if sufficient parking is not available at the development itself.

The applicant cannot rely upon neighbouring private land to compensate for a shortfall in parking provision.

Existing residents and owners of Headborough Court should not be expected to accommodate parking generated by a separate residential development.

I therefore ask the Council to specifically consider the potential for parking displacement and vehicle activity onto Headborough Court when assessing the application.

The applicant should be required to demonstrate that the development can function independently of Headborough Court and that residents and visitors will have adequate parking without relying upon neighbouring private land.

5. The parking assessment should be independently scrutinised

Given the apparent discrepancy between the parking situation described by the applicant and the actual constraints experienced around the site, I ask the Council and West Sussex County Council as Highway Authority to scrutinise the parking assessment carefully.

In particular, consideration should be given to:

- the precise area included within the parking survey;
- the distance of each identified parking location from the application site;
- whether identified spaces are genuinely available to the public;
- whether private parking areas have been treated as available capacity;
- whether evening and weekend parking demand was properly assessed;
- the existing level of parking demand on Alma Street;
- parking demand within Headborough Court;
- whether vehicles currently park partially on pedestrian areas;
- the likely parking requirements of all eight new households;

- visitor parking requirements;
- deliveries and servicing;
- and the realistic behaviour of residents and visitors.

The Council should not accept the identification of distant or private parking locations as evidence that the development has adequate parking capacity.

6. The existing road is already constrained

Alma Street is already subject to significant parking pressure and the existing road does not comfortably accommodate the current level of vehicles.

Adding eight new households will inevitably increase:

- vehicle movements;
- parking demand;
- visitor parking;
- delivery activity;
- servicing requirements;
- vehicle manoeuvring; and
- pedestrian/vehicle interaction.

This additional demand must be considered against the existing physical limitations of the road, rather than assuming that spare capacity exists simply because vehicles can theoretically be parked somewhere within the wider area.

7. Lack of pavement and pedestrian safety

A particularly serious concern is that the relevant section of the existing road does not have a conventional pavement.

Pedestrians therefore already have to negotiate a constrained environment shared with vehicles.

The introduction of additional vehicles, together with the apparent lack of sufficient on-site parking, creates a foreseeable risk that vehicles will park in or obstruct areas used by pedestrians.

The submitted plans appear to show vehicles being positioned in a manner which could obstruct or compromise pedestrian movement.

This should not be accepted as an appropriate solution to the site’s parking constraints.

Pedestrians should not be expected to walk around parked vehicles or into the carriageway because adequate parking has not been provided within the development.

This is particularly concerning for children, older people, wheelchair users, people with mobility difficulties and parents with pushchairs.

8. Conflict with Adur Local Plan Policy 28 – Transport and Connectivity

Adur Local Plan Policy 28 – Transport and Connectivity is directly relevant.

The policy requires development to address transport and connectivity impacts and, in relation to parking, requires appropriate provision having regard to West Sussex County Council guidance and consideration of the impact of development upon on-street parking. (Adur & Worthing Councils)

That requirement is particularly important in this case because existing on-street parking is already constrained.

The Council should therefore consider not simply whether parking spaces have been shown on a plan, but whether the overall parking consequences of the development are acceptable in the actual location.

If the consequence of providing eight homes is increased parking on Alma Street and surrounding residential streets, that impact needs to be properly assessed.

9. Conflict with West Sussex County Council parking guidance

The West Sussex County Council Guidance on Parking at New Developments is intended to help determine the level of parking required and to advise Local Planning Authorities on the highway implications of new development. (West Sussex County Council)

The guidance identifies the principle that parking demand generated by development should be appropriately accommodated while protecting highway operation and surrounding communities.

I therefore request that the applicant's proposed parking provision is checked against the current applicable WSCC methodology and that the Council does not accept an artificially reduced parking requirement based on theoretical availability at distant locations.

West Sussex County Council's current developer guidance also identifies the need for a parking strategy and, where appropriate, tracking analysis demonstrating the suitability of parking, turning and road-space arrangements. (West Sussex County Council)

10. Highway and pedestrian safety

The combination of:

- eight additional dwellings;
- inadequate on-site parking;
- existing parking pressure;
- the absence of a conventional pavement;
- potential parking displacement onto Alma Street;
- the potential for vehicles to use neighbouring private land;
- the apparent reliance on distant parking at Lancing Business Park;
- and the potential obstruction of pedestrian space

creates a significant concern regarding highway and pedestrian safety.

The Council should establish whether vehicles associated with the development can safely enter, leave, park and manoeuvre without causing unacceptable conflict with pedestrians or existing road users.

11. Overdevelopment and excessive intensity

I also object to the intensity and density of the proposed development.

I recognise the importance of providing new housing and making efficient use of previously developed land.

However, the issue is not simply whether eight houses can physically fit within the application boundary.

The proposed development must be capable of functioning properly once occupied and must respond appropriately to the physical constraints of its surroundings.

The fact that the proposed number of dwellings creates significant unresolved parking and highway problems is evidence that the site may be being developed at an excessive intensity.

This concern is consistent with comments previously recorded by Lancing Parish Council in relation to this application, which included the view that the proposal represented “overdevelopment” and was “not in keeping with the current street scene”, as well as concerns regarding road condition. (Lancing Parish Council)

12. Adur Local Plan Policy 15 – Quality of the Built Environment and Public Realm

The Council should also consider the proposal against Adur Local Plan Policy 15 – Quality of the Built Environment and Public Realm.

The policy requires development to respond appropriately to its context, including matters such as proportion, form, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size and scale.

It also seeks to ensure that development creates a safe and secure environment.

In this case, the proposed density cannot reasonably be considered separately from the consequences it creates.

The parking shortfall, highway constraints and pedestrian issues are all symptoms of the same fundamental concern: the proposed layout is attempting to accommodate a level of development that does not sufficiently respond to the physical constraints of the site and surrounding area.

13. Density should not be assessed purely by the number of dwellings that can fit on the site

I recognise that Adur Local Plan policy seeks to make effective use of land.

However, achieving an appropriate density does not mean maximising the number of units regardless of the consequences.

The Council must consider whether the proposed density creates a development that is functional, safe and appropriate to its surroundings.

A development which requires residents and visitors to rely upon already-constrained public parking, potentially neighbouring private land or distant business premises in order to function properly raises a serious question about whether the proposed number of homes is appropriate.

14. Emergency, servicing and delivery access

The Council should also require clear evidence that emergency vehicles, refuse collection vehicles, delivery vehicles and other service vehicles can access and manoeuvre safely.

The additional pressure created by parked vehicles could reduce the usable width of the road and make access more difficult.

This is particularly important where the existing road is already constrained and there is no conventional pavement.

The applicant should provide appropriate vehicle tracking and demonstrate that the development can function safely without relying on vehicles parking or waiting in inappropriate locations.

15. The application should be assessed on actual conditions, not theoretical capacity

The central issue with this application is the difference between theoretical parking capacity and the actual parking situation.

A parking assessment which identifies spaces at a distant business park does not demonstrate that eight residential properties have adequate parking.

Similarly, the existence of private land immediately opposite the site does not make that land available to the development.

The relevant question is:

Where will residents, visitors and service vehicles actually park when these eight homes are occupied?

The answer cannot reasonably be that they will routinely use distant business premises or neighbouring private land.

The Council should therefore assess the application based on realistic parking behaviour and the actual physical constraints of Alma Street.

16. Requested action

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that planning application AWDM/1209/23 is refused.

In particular, I ask the Council and Highway Authority to give significant consideration to:

1. The adequacy of parking provision for all eight dwellings;
2. The accuracy and methodology of the applicant's parking assessment;
3. The unrealistic reliance upon parking at Marlborough Road/Lancing Business Park;
4. The potential displacement of vehicles onto Alma Street and surrounding residential streets;
5. The potential displacement of vehicles onto private land at Headborough Court;
6. The existing parking constraints in the area;
7. The absence of a conventional pavement;
8. The risk of vehicles obstructing pedestrian movement;
9. The impact of additional vehicles on highway safety;
10. Emergency, refuse, delivery and servicing access;
11. The cumulative impact of eight additional households; and
12. Whether eight dwellings represents an excessive intensity of development given the physical constraints of the site.

I also request that the Highway Authority specifically considers the real-world parking conditions on Alma Street and around Headborough Court, rather than relying solely upon the applicant's existing parking assessment.

Conclusion

This objection is not based simply on opposition to new housing.

The concern is that the proposed eight dwellings appear to create a level of parking, highway and pedestrian demand that the site and its immediate surroundings cannot safely and appropriately accommodate.

The existing road is already constrained, parking demand is already significant, there is no conventional pavement, and the submitted assessment appears to rely upon parking locations that are either private, distant or unrealistic for ordinary residential use.

The development should not solve its parking requirements by transferring the consequences to existing residents.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that application AWDM/1209/23 is refused on the grounds of inadequate parking provision, unacceptable parking displacement, highway and pedestrian safety concerns, inappropriate site layout and excessive development intensity.

Photo evidence has been sent via email, including an image of the Gocher's laundry van parked on Alma Street. The resident lives on East Street and parks the van on Alma Street due to the lack of available parking on the adjacent road.

Yours faithfully,

Natalie Lawrence