For official use only (date received): 28/08/2025 20:43:48

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/Y3805/W/25/3368838

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference	APP/Y3805/W/25/3368838
Appeal By	MR P MEREDITH
Site Address	LAND WEST OF 98 UPPER BRIGHTON ROAD DOWNS MEAD SOMPTING LANCING WEST SUSSEX BN15 0LA

SENDER DETAILS

Name	MR MATTHEW ISAAC
Address	1 Downsmead Sompting LANCING BN15 0NA

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- ☐ Appellant
- ☐ Agent
- ☐ Interested Party / Person
- ☑ Land Owner
- ☐ Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- ☐ Final Comments
- ☐ Proof of Evidence
- ☑ Statement
- ☐ Statement of Common Ground
- ☐ Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- ☐ Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

In addition to my previous comments, I wish to object to the proposed development at 98 Upper Brighton Road on the grounds of parking, overdevelopment, and safety concerns.

Parking on Downsmead is prohibited for anyone other than properties 1, 2 & 3 Downsmead and its upkeep is paid for solely by the three houses here. Number 98 Upper Brighton Road was historically given limited rights of access to its original garage. However, a second garage has since been added, the kerb dropped, and HMO residents at Number 98 have begun using Downsmead as a parking area. This is not permitted and was never intended.
The proposed chalet bungalow would add further demand for parking where none can lawfully be provided. This is contrary to Adur's Local Plan Policy 33 (Transport and Parking), which requires development to provide safe, adequate and appropriate parking without causing problems for neighbouring properties or the wider network. It also conflicts with NPPF Paragraph 111, which states that planning permission should be refused if development results in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

The site is already intensively used as an HMO. Adding a chalet bungalow represents overdevelopment, cramming additional housing into a plot that cannot reasonably accommodate it. This goes against Adur Local Plan Policy 15 (Quality of the Built Environment), which seeks to ensure that new development respects its surroundings and provides a high standard of amenity. It also undermines Policy 9 (Shaping Places), which requires development to maintain the character of the area.

Downsmead is a narrow private road never designed for high levels of traffic. Extra vehicles from the HMO already make access difficult. Another dwelling would only increase the risk of obstruction. This raises serious concerns for emergency access - fire engines and ambulances may be delayed or blocked from reaching our properties. This is contrary to NPPF Paragraph 110, which requires development to ensure safe and suitable access for all users.

Downsmead is maintained by the three houses here at our own expense. Extra use by Number 98 places an unfair burden on us and breaches existing covenants. While covenants are dealt with separately, the practical outcome is increased traffic, unauthorised parking, and neighbour disputes. These are material planning considerations because they directly affect safety, access, and residential amenity.

For these reasons, the proposed chalet bungalow should be refused because:
Parking is prohibited on Downsmead, and no on site provision has been made (Policy 33).
It represents overdevelopment of the site, harming local character and amenity (Policies 9 and 15).
It creates unacceptable safety issues for access, particularly for emergency services (NPPF Paragraphs 110 & 111).
It increases use of a private road far beyond what it was designed or permitted to accommodate.

I therefore respectfully request that the Council refuse this application.