Date: Mon, 10 Nov 2025 at 10:33
Subject: Objections to AWDM/1322/25
To: <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Dear Sir/Madam

We did try and submit this via the website but it kept showing an error message.

Re: Objections to AWDM/1322/25 - Development of a detached bungalow in the rear garden with access drive from Franklin Road

We are writing to make our objections to the above planning application on several grounds.

1. **Parking**

The plans show that there is provision for two vehicles to park at the front of what is currently part of no.17's driveway. It would be extremely tight for any vehicle to swing into a parking space in the position shown on the plans. Also, any vehicle longer than 4.2m would stick out further than the end of the wall which is parallel with the pavement. Considering the average length of a car is 4.4m, this would be problematic, not only for the other vehicle in the parking space but for the residents to-be, of the HMO at no.17, to get in into their driving spaces. This would force larger vehicles to have to park on the already congested road on Franklin Road.

The fact it is proposed to have 2 double bedrooms, could mean 4 possible vehicles could be linked to the property. Again, more vehicles would be forced to park on the already congested Franklin Road.

Having 2 parking spaces at the front of the driveway of no.17, has taken away parking spaces from the 6-bedroom HMO. Again, forcing more vehicles to have to park on the already congested Franklin Road.

2. **Lack of drainage in driveway**

The parking area/driveway at the front of No.17 is already underway, with an electric charging point and type 1 MOT in situ now. However, there is no provision for drainage, there are no soakaways etc. present. There is no indication that there will be. This will cause major issues when any rain occurs to the property itself and neighbouring properties.

3. **Access to property**

The reason that the parking for the proposed bungalow is situated at the very front of no.17, some 50m away from the bungalow, is because there is insufficient room for a car to drive

down the side of no.17 (largely due to the large heat pump attached to no.17). Consequently, there is no provision for any building/construction traffic to access the plot. It is assumed that the construction traffic would then want to use the private access right of way drive for the properties of 15A, 15B and 15C. This assumption is based on the fact that they have already used this private access drive in order to get heavy construction machinery into the garden of no.17. This is supported by the fact that part of the wall, between no.17's garden and private driveway, was purposely knocked down for this to happen. The amount of heavy construction traffic that would need to gain access down this private driveway would be considerable. It would have an impact in the integrity of the road surface. This could cause considerable issues for the wheel chair residents at 15A, 15B and 15C. As it's a private driveway the construction vehicles shouldn't be using it. So how will the construction site be accessed? Answer, it can't.

4. **Development so close to boundary line**

The plans show the installation of a 1.8m fence around 3 sides of the property. The north side, adjoins our property at no.19. The plans show that the space between the wall and the fence is minimal, less than the width of a wheelie bin. The window of the bungalow on the north side would have very little room to open. Maintenance and cleaning would also be extremely difficult. The space on the south side is even more limited. It is also difficult to see how such construction can take place so close to the boundary line without access and disruption to both our property at no.19 and 15C. Furthermore, we have 2 greenhouses adjacent to this boundary, which would be extremely vulnerable.

5. **1.8m fence**

As stated above the installation of the 1.8m fence on the north side of the bungalow, is on our property boundary line. In fact, the maintenance and upkeep of that boundary line, falls to us at no.19, as per our deeds. When this 1.8m fence degrades over time, the cost to us of the upkeep/replacement of it will be considerably higher, than the current 1.2m fence in situ. Why should we have the burden of this extra cost without requesting it in the first place.

Also, this 1.8m fence will stop part way along our garden, where the garden of no.17 is proposed to end. The design and appearance of this will look extremely odd and very unaesthetically pleasing. The standard fence size for the adjacent properties in this area is 1.2m. This will be very out of character and placing.

6. **Loss of light**

The bungalow will severely restrict the amount of light that will enter the west end of our garden where we have a very large established vegetable growing area. The bungalow will hugely impact the amount of light reaching this vegetable area, as it is directly to the south of here and will therefore block out light all throughout the day. This will have a large negative effect on the viability of maintaining this. This will also mean that the birds, butterflies, bees and other insects will become less.

7. **Overlooking and the loss of privacy**

As stated above, the bungalow will very close to our vegetable area. Consequently, by its very nature, we are constantly in that part of the garden tending to it. The bungalow will be directly over looking it meaning there will be a huge loss of privacy to us. Not to mention the hot tub we have situated in the garden next to this area, which is presently not overlooked at all.

8. **Noise**

Currently our garden is a place of quiet serenity and sanctuary for us. This is already going to be severely disrupted by the recent approval of no.17 becoming an HMO (AWDM/1594/24 on 25/09/25). To then add another property so close is again going to raise the noise and disturbance levels even more. It will no longer be a pleasure to sit out in the garden.

9. **Overdevelopment**

The allowance of the bungalow to be built in the rear garden of no.17 is a massive over development of the area and there are not enough provisions in place to be able to manage this effectively. To have a bungalow on this 'backland' space would be excessive.

10. **HMO residents**

As mentioned in point 8, no.17 has recently been granted approval of a 6 bed HMO. The work to no.17 is still underway and the property is empty. Consequently, there aren't any residents in the property to be able to log their views on the development of the proposed bungalow at the end of what will be their garden. The building work will affect these new 6 residents who may unaware of the plans afoot. Also, having the occupants of the bungalow walking right pass the side of the house may very well be unwelcome.

11. **Flood risks**

One of the greatest concerns of a bungalow being present at the rear of no.17 is the enormous risk it will pose of flooding in the immediate area. This area is a high-risk flood area and has indeed suffered as a result of this on numerous occasions over the past years. The site itself is located within a major surface water flow path. To put a building in this path would be ludicrous and will hugely impact those directly next to the building. Primarily, 15A, 15B and 15C which are specifically built properties for vulnerable adults with varying degrees of disability. Also, our property at no.19. In addition the added pressure of another property to the already overworked drains – which having a 6-bed HMO is also going to be adding to, will not be positive. All of this in not acceptable.

In addition, it appears that the bungalow is to be built extremely close to a public foul sewer, which is crossing the proposed site. The potential risk of this would be horrendous to those in the neighbouring area.

12. **Previous planning applications**

AWDM/0317/23 – Demolition of the garage of the rear (west) of 11 Franklin Road and proposed creation of one, 1 bedroom single storey dwelling house. Refused on 17/04/24. This site is the other side of the private access driveway to the south of no.17. The primary reason for refusal was due to flood risk. The same conclusion can be formed for this current application.

AWDM/1472/20 – Demolition of existing dwellings and construction of 3no. dwellings including access driveway, parking and landscaping, 80 Greenland Road. Refused on 24/11/20. Appeal raised - Appeal ref APP/M3835/W/20/3265685. Appeal dismissed on 04/05/21. The reasons for refusal being, the character and appearance of the area, living conditions of the existing occupiers with particular regard to privacy, light, noise and disturbance, and ecology. Once more, the same conclusion can be formed for this current application.

In conclusion, based on all of the above, we cannot see anyway in which the application can be approved. **We therefore urge you refuse the application**.

Yours faithfully

Mr James & Mrs Kellie Aylward
19 Franklin Road
Worthing
BN13 2PG