

Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1019/25

Recommendation – Refuse

Site: Land West Of 51 To 63 Southview Road, Southwick

Proposal: 2 new dwellings with parking and associated access and amenity areas

Date of site visit: Visited in connection with previous applications

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This 0.115ha site lies at the rear of 51-63 Southview Road and is accessed via an existing vehicular access between 55 and 57 Southview Road. The site comprises undeveloped land which is currently outside of any residential curtilage but which historically formed the curtilage of 51-63 Southview Road. However, the land has been outside of any curtilage for many years and therefore falls to be assessed under its existing character. The site is not in a conservation area and there are no listed buildings in the immediate vicinity. The site and beyond has a history of significant groundwater flooding and is believed to include underground springs.

Southview Road and Underdown Road are largely characterized by Victorian, ornate, semi-detached houses.

The houses were not built with off street parking but many properties have added this over the years. On street parking is heavy. Largely houses, a number have been converted into flats including 53, 55 and 57 Southview Road. Southview Road accesses onto the Old Shoreham Road but allows a left hand turn only. Underdown Road has been blocked off from Old Shoreham Road.

The site and beyond is known to experience significant ground water flooding. Underground springs come to the surface in heavy rain both on the site and in neighbouring gardens.

Following the previous refusals and dismissed appeals (AWDM/1119/19 and AWDM/0373/23) this current application seeks planning permission to construct two detached dwellings on a smaller site immediately to the rear of Nos 51-63, excluding the larger area of open space to the west.

The proposed dwellings are two storeys with a single storey attached garage at the front. They have low eaves with first floor windows at the rear positioned across the eaves, partly at first floor and partly within the roofslope to form small dormers. The only first floor windows at the front serve a stairwell and landing. Each dwelling has three bedrooms.

They measure 7.6m high to the ridge at two storeys and 6.4m high to the ridge of the garage. The house eaves are 4m high. Materials are specified as facing brickwork with a slate/composite slate roof.

The houses will be accessed from the existing vehicular access between Nos 55 and 57 Southview Road. The site plan shows a parking space for each dwelling at the front (plus garage). An access road is also shown running between the houses to the open space to the west. It is shown as being an unsurfaced grass track with a gate which the applicants state would allow access for "the ongoing monthly (during spring / summer) maintenance visits by Acre Landscape to maintain the area including the TPO tree, and to clear any accumulated cuttings & scrub with rubbish that accumulates in the area."

The application is supported by a Design, Access & Planning Statement, Flood Risk and SUDs Assessment (including Hydraulic Report), Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, Biodiversity Metric Calculation and BNG Statement.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/0373/23 - Demolition of 53 and 55 Southview Road and construction of 1 no. 3 bedroom detached dwelling and 8 no. 2 bed flats in 2 no. two storey blocks with new vehicular access from Southview Road and associated parking and amenity areas - application refused and dismissed on appeal

AWDM/1119/19 - Demolition of 53 and 55 Southview Road and construction of 4 No. 3 bedroom terrace and 4 No. semi-detached dwellings and 2 no. 4 bed detached dwellings with new vehicular access from Southview Road and associated parking and amenity areas - application refused and dismissed on appeal

Consultations

West Sussex County Council: The Highway Authority would not raise an objection to the principle of 2 residential dwellings in this location. The access to the site is 3.1m wide which is acceptable for the proposal and of sufficient width for sufficient for Fire and Refuse vehicles to enter the site. The applicant will need to show there is room within the turning areas for larger vehicles to turn.

The vehicle access onto Southview Road is existing and visibility along Southview Road is good due to the alignment of the road however the splays shown are obscured by the tree within the public highway. There is a relatively high level of residential parking along Southview Road which can obscure visibility to a degree however it also serves to reduce the speed of vehicles travelling along the road.

Given the low level of traffic that will be generated by 2 residential dwellings, it is unlikely this proposal will have an impact on Highway Safety.

Please request the following information from the applicant:

- Plans showing there is sufficient room for Fire Appliance to turn within the site
- Consultation with Sussex Fire Service – access is required from 2 side of a development

West Sussex Fire Service: Having viewed the details for the 2 new build properties, providing the access route meets with the requirements of

Approved Document B (AD-B) Volume 1: B5 section 13 and the turning facility is greater than 3.1m wide the Fire Service access will be suitable and meet with our requirements. There is also a fire hydrant within 10m and therefore the supply of water for firefighting also complies with our requirements

Subsequent Fire Service comments following the submission of a plan from the applicant: West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service do not accept direct line or ac measurements from the fire appliance location to the furthest point within a dwelling as this is rarely achievable due to obstructions, this distance needs to be measured along the hose lay route.

Also, showing a fire appliance stopping at the 20-metre point when attending a fire incident is not realistic, and the reason why Approved Document B (AD-B) Volume 1: B5 section 13 requires any access route longer than 20-metres requires a turning facility for the fire appliance. Any attending fire crew will drive straight to a fire incident location and get as close as possible, they would not, and do not stop 20-metres in.

A clear width of 3.7metres is required for the operating area for a fire appliance, your plan shows the back of the fire appliance stopped at 20-metres has a width of 3.32 metres, restricting access to the firefighting hoses and equipment stored at the rear lockers on the fire appliance.

On the plan submitted there is a turning facility hammerhead available for a fire appliance to turn and make their exit, so why have you planned for the fire appliance to stop at the 20metre mark, unless these turning facilities cannot be guaranteed?

Applicant's Response: The Site layout as it stands is a private drive and with the current layout there is insufficient provable turning space for a fire appliance . As our consultants and the FRS officer have advised a sprinkler system to BS9251 is an alternative compliance route for AD B5 (building Regulations) and this will be proposed for each dwelling and will be dealt with at Building Reg compliance stage.

Adur & Worthing Councils: The Environmental Health officer has no objections in principle. Recommends condition to require a Construction Management Plan.

Waste and Refuse: We would be asking for the bins to be left at the kerbside, in Southdown Rd. Any access would not be required for us in this instance.

Trees and Landscape Officer: I consider that the trees should not be affected by the proposed Permeable Paving, excavations within the RPA should be hand dug to avoid damage to roots

Surface Water Drainage Consultant: Comments dated 14th April 2026: We agree that discharge to the surface water sewer is preferred over infiltration due to high groundwater levels at the site. We also note that evidence of the greenfield runoff rate, an updated drainage plan, and calculations using the correct methodology have been provided. The design flow used for the drainage calculations is still 1.5 l/s; however, as this is a lower rate than the

proposed 1.9 l/s we are happy that sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate the drainage strategy is acceptable. We also acknowledge that sufficient information regarding the maintenance and management of the drainage network has been provided. Therefore, we are happy to remove our previously suggested conditions and recommend the approval of the application.

Comments dated 18th May 2026: Following a review of the submitted Hydraulic Modelling Report (dated 22 January 2026), we have noted insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the application is in accordance with the NPPF and its accompanying PPG. Whilst the FRA states that the site is at low risk from surface water flooding and that the proposed development will be safe from flood risk, we are concerned by the potential impacts the proposed development will have on the existing flood risk. We note that Appendix G of the Hydraulic Modelling Report provides modelling outputs showing the existing surface water flood risk at the site and the proposed flood risk following the development. We understand that ground raising will take place to protect the proposed dwellings from flood risk, but the plans shown in Appendix G are unclear about the flood depth changes to the surrounding area. An increase in flood depths is shown on the boundary of the property and on the access road. Clarification is required to show that the risk to the surrounding area will not be increased as a result of the proposed development and safe access and egress can still be achieved via Southview Road.

Comments dated 4th June 2026: Following a review of the submitted information since our last response dated 18th May 2026, we agree that the modelling provided within the Hydraulic Modelling Report shows that the proposed development will not be at risk of flooding and the proposed ground raising will not increase the risk of flooding off site. We are also happy that sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate the drainage strategy is acceptable and acknowledge that sufficient information regarding the maintenance and management of the drainage network has been provided. Therefore, we are happy to remove our previously suggested conditions and recommend the approval of the application

Comments dated 16th June 2026: The results of the Hydraulic Model show that the site currently floods in all events which corresponds to the comments made by local residents. The Hydraulic Model also provides post-development flood depths and plans showing the flood depth changes. We have reviewed the data for the 1 in 100 year (1%) plus climate change event which shows that flood depths will increase at the site, but there will be no increase of flood depths outside of the property boundary. The development also provides details of a surface water management system that will manage water that falls on the proposed development.

We have to review the data available to us. We acknowledge that there is evidence of flooding at the site and this is shown within the Hydraulic Model. This site-specific model is the most accurate data available to us when reviewing the flooding information for the proposed development. The Hydraulic Model shows that the proposed development will be safe from flooding and will not increase flood risk to the surrounding area.

For that reason, we cannot object to the proposals on surface water flood risk grounds

Southern Water: No objection. There is currently adequate capacity in both the local surface water and sewerage network to accommodate both surface water and foul flows for the above development. Proposed drainage system must be maintained in the long term to avoid possible inundation of the foul sewerage system

Recommends condition to require details of any landscaping proposals in proximity of public apparatus

Representations

88 objections received, including from the Southwick Society and Southview Area Residents Association:

- Previous appeal and applications dismissed
- Fails to overcome the fundamental backland overdevelopment and character issues previously identified
- Out of character
- Cramped
- Overbearing
- The applicant's drainage strategy is unsound
- Will increase flood risk elsewhere
- Development will remove gardens forcing groundwater into the foul system causing hydraulic failure
- During recent flood events, Southern Water had 3no. industrial pumps operating at a rate of 75 litres per second just to manage the overflow
- Sewers overflowed in 2024
- Inadequate capacity in existing infrastructure
- Restrictive covenants exists to preserve the land's function as a natural soakaway
- Building over underground Ladywell stream
- Other developments in the area have caused the stream to flood gardens and garages
- Development risks disrupting natural water movement
- Area suffers from annual flooding incidents
- Loss of trees
- Impact on wildlife
- Increased air and noise pollution
- Developer must provide 10% BNG
- Will lead to parking pressure in Southview Road
- Lack of turning space for refuse trucks
- Will damage Southview Road surface
- Lack of developer accountability
- Developers are aware of flood risk but are still prepared to build
- Loss of green space
- Pressure on local services
- Unsafe access

- Increased risk of highway accidents
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Vehicle movements behind existing dwellings will cause disturbance and cause headlights to shine into property
- Loss of light
- Garden grabbing
- Will set a precedent for further applications to develop remainder of land
- Numerous photographs submitted showing evidence of flooding
- Gain of 2 houses is outweighed by flooding harm
- Access road clearly designed as backdoor way to future development of remaining land

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 policies 1, 2, 3, 12, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35 and 36

'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.1 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats'

Sustainable Energy SPD (August 2024)

WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020)

National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026)

Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard (DCLG 2015)

Planning Assessment

Sustainable Development

Policy S3 of the NPPF contains a presumption in favour of sustainable development, subject to NDMP S4 Principle of Development Within Settlements. S4 states that proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against other policies. Substantial adverse impacts include but are not limited to (c) a failure to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances.

In considering these policies, the following are areas of concern:

DP3 (1) Principles of Well Designed Places. The new guidance accentuates the need for new development to respond to its context, which integrate with and enhance their surroundings. Whilst this does not preclude two tier and higher density forms of development, the location and arrangement of plots in the current proposal is considered to be harmful to this character, which has been acknowledged previously in an inspector's appeal decision. This is referred to in the section below: Design, character and appearance

L2 Making Effective Use of Land. Substantial weight is attached to the benefits of achieving new development, but there is great concern that the development will be inconsistent with the streetscene, from which it is visible, this is also described in the Design, character and appearance section below:

L3 Achieving Appropriate Densities. The site is approximately 850m walking distance to Southwick Station, to which the NDMP L3 refers, and is considered to be outside the area within which densities above 35/45dpa should be sought, (subject to appropriateness under L3 c (i). However, the proposed density of approximately 17 dwellings/ha is a contributory factor to the effects on the prevailing character of the area, which set out in the Design, character and appearance section, below.

Housing

The NPPF Policy HO7 attaches substantial weight to the provision of new homes. It is acknowledged that current supply in Adur District is below five years, as set out in the following paragraphs, however, this is considered alongside the effects of the development, further below.

An updated version of the NPPF was published on 17th August 2026. Paragraph 8 of Annex D states that Local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites. This should be sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing, assessed against their housing requirement in the development plan, or against their local housing need (calculated using the standard method) where the development plan housing requirement is more than five years old. Paragraph 9 states that the supply of specific deliverable sites should include a buffer (moved forward from later in the plan period) of:

- a. 5% to ensure choice and competition in the market for land; or
- b. 20% where there has been significant under delivery of housing over the previous three years, to improve the prospect of achieving the planned supply;
- or c. For the purposes of decision-making only, 20% where a local planning authority has a housing requirement adopted in the last five years examined against a version of the Framework published prior to December 2024, and whose annual average housing requirement is 80% or less of the most up to date up-to-date local housing need figure calculated using the standard method set out above.

Annex D also refers to the Housing Delivery Test, and makes clear that where the Housing Delivery Test indicates that delivery has fallen below the local planning authority's housing requirement over the previous three years, the following policy consequences apply:

- a. Where delivery falls below 95% of the requirement over the previous three years, the authority should prepare an action plan to assess the causes of under-delivery and identify actions to increase delivery in the future;
- b. Where delivery falls below 85% of the requirement over the previous three years, a buffer of 20% should be added to the identified supply of specific deliverable sites. This is in addition to the requirement for an action plan;
- c. Where delivery falls below 75% of the requirement over the previous three years, an evidenced unmet need for housing is deemed to exist for the purpose of applying policy S5(1)(j) in this Framework. This is in addition to the requirements for an action plan and 20% buffer.

The Adur Local Plan was adopted on 14th December 2017. Policy 3: Housing

Provision makes provision for a minimum of 3,718 net additional homes in the period 2011 to 2032, equivalent to 177 dwellings per annum. As Adur District Council adopted its Local Plan more than 5 years ago the Five Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement uses a housing requirement based on the local housing need that is calculated by the standard methodology set out in the PPG.

Five year Land Supply:

The published land supply figures published in March 2026 using a base date of 1st April 2025 used a Standard Methodology figure of 549 which reflected the situation at that point in time.

This included a 20% buffer. It indicated a land supply figure of 3.2 years.

Housing Delivery Test:

On 17th August 2026 the Government published both the 2024 Housing Delivery Test measurement and 2025 Housing Delivery Test measurement

The 2024 measurement indicated that Adur scored 37% which resulted in a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The 2025 measurement indicated that Adur achieved 48% between 2022/23-2024/25 and therefore the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. A Housing Action Plan will also be prepared.

Design, character and appearance

The character of Southview Road and Underdown Road is mixed but is essentially Victorian and inter-war detached, semi-detached and terraced houses with generous rear gardens. The character of the site and the land to the west, which has been excluded from this application, is open green space. It is very different to the site of the development at Somerly Gardens, at the northern end of Southview Road, much of which previously had a substantial industrial building on it and a large expanse of car parking with no natural landscaping on it at all.

The east and west sides of Southview Road have a different character. The east side has a more built up character, with new development at Old Dairy Close, plus housing and garaging in Roman Way coming closer to the rear of dwellings in Southview Road (generally around 22-33m) than those on the west side of the road where the rear of houses in Underdown Road are more distant (around 75m). Other than the Somerly Gardens development at the north end, some garaging at the rear of 45 Southview Road and some sporadic development at the southern end, the majority of the area between Southview Road and Underdown Road is undeveloped. This forms part of the *“leafiness and openness in the back gardens and beyond, which can be seen in the gaps between the dwellings, (which) are important to the local suburban character, and to the sense of place”* as identified by the previous Appeal Inspector. He considered that the existing developments elsewhere in the road *“provide little support for this damaging proposal.”*

The previous scheme, refused and dismissed at appeal, was for 9 dwellings in the form of a house and two blocks of flats. In his decision letter, the Inspector stated that:

“Due to their tall height, substantial scale, and bulky monolithic hipped roofed forms, the utilitarian appearance of their lengthy sides and backs, and their poorly proportioned front outshoots and fenestration, the large and dominant purpose-built flats buildings, with their central entrance halls, would contrast starkly with the character and appearance of the nearby dwellings. As the east building would be largely surrounded by the new road and its turning head, and other hard surfaced areas, including paths, parking spaces and bike and bin stores, its built up character would be at odds with its suburban surroundings. Moreover, as the east building would be particularly prominent from Southview Road in views along and by the new road, and as both tall and bulky flats buildings would be harmfully discordant in the mostly good-sized gaps between the nearby dwellings in Southview Road, the proposal would be incongruous.”

The current application is much reduced and is for 2no. two storey dwellings with pitched roofs, with a corresponding reduction in hard surfaced area. However, it still results in the introduction of intrusive built form into the green space at the rear of the existing houses which is likely to harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development will be visible from Southview Road along the access drive and in glimpsed views between the buildings.

Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan seeks high quality design and respect for context, while the NPPF states:

DP3: Key principles for well-designed places

- 1. Development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets. This should not preclude innovation or change where appropriate, especially where an increased scale or density of development is justified in accordance with policies L2 and L3*

The development is not considered to comply with policies L2 or L3.

The proposal would not integrate with or enhance its surroundings, being located at the rear of the established line of housing development in the street and intruding into an undeveloped area of open space at the rear of those properties in Southview Road. It represents an unsympathetic form of backland development which fails to respect and enhance the prevailing character and form of residential development in the surrounding area. Consequently, as it would be visible from the street frontage in Southview Road, it would be inconsistent with the overall street scene. The higher density of development is not considered to be justified in this case as it would harm the character of the area through the introduction of built form in a backland location, resulting in increased hard surfacing, and a poor relationship with existing established development in the street.

Residential amenity – proposed dwellings

Both units comfortably exceed the minimum floorspace figure of the Nationally Described Space Standard. The 3 bed dwellings have a floor area of 154sqm.

Development Management Standard No. 1 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats' requires dwellings to have a minimum garden length of 11 metres and an area of 85m². The dwellings comfortably meet these requirements with rear gardens in excess of 170m².

Residential amenity – neighbouring occupiers

Nos 55-61 Southview Road have truncated gardens compared with other houses in that road. This has resulted in the area forming the application site at the rear of those dwellings. Development Management Standard No. 1 'Space Around Dwellings' states that:

"The space required between buildings is affected by the location of principal windows and the need to maintain privacy between facing windows and allow light to enter such windows. A distance of 22m is the minimum required between facing principal windows in order to retain sufficient privacy."

It goes on to state:

"Where a principal window faces a solid obstruction a distance of 11m is required between the window and a single-storey structure or 14m between a principal window and a two-storey structure, in order to allow adequate light to enter the windows" but then adds "The acceptable distance between the rears of buildings is governed mainly by the distance required to give adequate privacy between facing principal windows, which is 22m in the case of 2 storey developments."

In this case the rear of the existing houses/flats in Southview Road will face the front of the proposed new houses at a distance of around 14.5m to the front of the garage and just under 20m to the main elevation. There is no standard for a front to rear relationship but in this case there are no upper floor windows at the front of the new houses which serve a habitable room and privacy will therefore be maintained through the use of obscure glazing. While Nos 53-57 Southview Road are divided into ground and first floor flats, the separation distance is considered to be sufficient to prevent a loss of light or an overbearing impact.

With regard to vehicle access into the site, the Inspector in his appeal decision for AWD/1119/19 advised:

"A new drive would run along the side boundary with the bungalow at 51 Southview Road. The boundary is a rendered brick wall at the front, with a timber fence at the rear. The bungalow has an enclosed porch on the flank elevation and a window, and I noted on my site visit that the window was obscured glazed. The drive would introduce vehicle movements along the side boundary, but as the proposed estate would be relatively small the amount of vehicle movements would be limited and consequently disturbance

from those movements would also be limited. I note there are similar access drives already off Southview Road, for example that between 43 and 45 Southview Road and the access to Somerly Gardens, which have closer relationships with the neighbouring properties than that proposed in the appeal scheme. Having regard to all those factors I consider the presence of the drive along the side boundary with 51 Southview Road would not be so noisy as to be unacceptably harmful."

While the affected properties on either side of the access road are flats in this case, the relationship is similar to that described above and there is not considered to be a reason to reach a different view now.

BNG

A preliminary ecological assessment dated June 2025 has been submitted. An ecological assessment of the site was carried out in March 2025. The assessment found that the site consists mainly of grassland with bramble on the site boundaries. The report states that the vegetation is cut annually. There are small sycamores on the southern boundary and hawthorn scrub on the northern boundary. These are confirmed to be removed as part of the development.

A previous survey was carried out in 2019 and slow worms were found on the site. A precautionary approach is therefore recommended. The report states that the retained area to the west will continue to be suitable for slow worms and any that are found on the site can be relocated on to that land. This would need to be the subject of a planning condition in the event that permission is granted.

Ecological enhancement on site would be possible through the installation of bird boxes and hedgehog houses and highways.

With regard to BNG, the submitted BNG assessment confirms that there will be a net loss following the development and that 0.29 habitat units will need to be created off site. This would need to be secured by condition in the event of the application being approved.

The Council's Tree Officer is satisfied that any existing trees to be retained should not be adversely affected by the proposed development.

There is less hard surfacing associated with this development when compared with the previous appeal scheme with space available for some limited landscaping to soften the appearance of the development and to help with biodiversity.

Sustainability

The D&A Statement states that the use of Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHP) and PV panels will be provided to reduce energy use.

Details can be secured by condition in the event that the application is approved.

Flood Risk/Drainage

The site has a history of groundwater flooding and this also extends beyond the site. Neighbours refer to the site as having underground springs and talk of some surrounding gardens also having them.

The 2026 NPPF states:

F7: Ensuring development is safe from flooding

- 1. Development proposals should not present a risk from flooding to potential occupiers, users, or visitors, and should not increase flood risk elsewhere.*
- 2. Where development is proposed in a location known to be at risk from any form of flooding, now or in the future, it should be refused unless:*
 - a. Within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons which justify a different arrangement;*
 - b. The development will be safe throughout its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users;*
 - c. Any residual risk can be safely managed, and safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan;*
 - d. The development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment; and*
 - e. It can be demonstrated that flood risk will not be increased elsewhere.*

This approach is supported by Adur Local Plan Policy 36: Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage.

The submitted Drainage Statement advises that, following winter groundwater monitoring, it has been confirmed that the site has a high water table and that infiltration is not a viable option. The development's surface water is therefore proposed to be routed to Southern Water's public sewer in Southview Road. Southern Water has agreed to this at a maximum proposed discharge rate of 2.0l/s. The Hydraulic Report submitted in support of the application confirms that the site floods in all scenarios and that there is no significant impact on neighbouring properties. The Statement concludes that the flood risk profile of the site is low. While surface water flooding affects the site currently, the post-development scenario is that both dwellings will not be affected by flooding as it is proposed to raise floor levels above the critical flood level. The dwellings are shown as having a finished floor level of 11.46m AOD for the northern plot and 11.15m AOD for the southern plot. This represents an increase of approximately 0.3m for the northern plot and 0.6m for the southern plot.

A combination of sub-base storage under the access road and a controlled flow rate of no more than 2l/s to the Southern Water sewer will decrease the volume of water that currently flows overland southwards.

The Council's Surface Water Drainage Consultants have considered the submitted information and, following clarification on a number of points, they "agree that the modelling provided within the Hydraulic Modelling Report shows that the proposed development will not be at risk of flooding and the proposed ground raising will not increase the risk of flooding off site." They go on to state that they are satisfied that "sufficient evidence has been provided

to demonstrate the drainage strategy is acceptable and acknowledge that sufficient information regarding the maintenance and management of the drainage network has been provided.” On that basis, they have not objected to the application.

Southern Water have also not objected to the drainage strategy. They have confirmed that there is currently adequate capacity in both the local surface water and sewerage network to accommodate both surface water and foul flows for the above development.

Consequently, while the concerns of local residents are understandable, on the basis of the submitted drainage report and the lack of objection from the relevant drainage bodies, an objection on flood risk grounds cannot be sustained.

Highways

Policy 15 of the Local Plan requires development to:

Have safe access to the highway network, and not result in harm to highway safety;

Have acceptable parking arrangements (in terms of amount and layout)

The D&A Statement confirms that vehicular access will be via the existing access from Southview Road. Two parking spaces are proposed for each dwelling with cycle storage available in the garages. The site is in a sustainable location with good access to rail and bus services and local amenities and shops.

There are concerns locally that the proposal will increase traffic and parking congestion and lead to increased risk to the safety of residents and users of Southview Road. While these concerns are understood, the Highway Authority has confirmed that it has no objection to the current proposal. They have stated that the access road to the site is of an acceptable width (3.1m) and the access onto Southview Road has good visibility but is partly obscured by a tree within the public highway to the north. There is also a relatively high level of residential parking along Southview Road which can obscure visibility to a degree, however it also serves to reduce the speed of vehicles travelling along the road and, given the low level of traffic that will be generated by 2 residential dwellings, they do not consider that the proposal will have an impact on Highway Safety.

It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the site can be accessed by a Fire Appliance. The applicants have confirmed that a sprinkler system is proposed for each dwelling and will be dealt with at the Building Regulations stage. This would need to be secured by condition in the event of the application being approved.

The Council's Waste Manager has confirmed that refuse vehicles would not enter the site and bins would be left at the kerbside this instance.

In the light of there being no objection from the local highway authority, it is not considered that an objection on highway grounds is sustainable.

Conclusion

It is recognised that this development will make a very modest contribution towards meeting local housing delivery targets (2 units). It is acknowledged that substantial weight is attached to the provision of new homes. However the development of the site and relationship of the proposed development upon its surroundings as set out in the report, are such that these modest benefits will be substantially outweighed by the adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the NPPF, specifically policies S4 and DP3, also L2 & L3.

Recommendation

REFUSE permission for the following reason:-

1. The proposed development would intrude into an undeveloped area of open space at the rear of properties in Southview Road and represents an unsympathetic form of backland development which fails to respect and enhance the prevailing character and form of residential development in the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan and policies S4, L2, L3 and DP3 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett

Date: 9 September 2026

Authorised by: Stephen Cantwell

Date: 9th September 2026