Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 21/10/2025 10:29 PM from Mr David Mackinnon.

Application Summary

Address:	41 Rogate Road Worthing West Sussex BN13 2DY
Proposal:	Proposed First Floor Extension to create a two storey dwelling house
Case Officer:	Jo Morin

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr David Mackinnon
Email:	
Address:	1 Cuckfield Crescent Worthing West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	Objection - Unacceptable harm to residential amenity and health impacts on a disabled resident I wish to object to planning application AWDM/1176/25 (First Floor Extension to create a two-storey dwelling at 41 Rogate Road) on the grounds of severe and unacceptable harm to the residential amenity, health and wellbeing of my family, in particular my [redacted] daughter, who is disabled with highly complex needs and has extreme sensory sensitivities. Our home is immediately adjacent to the application site, within approximately two metres. My daughter spends most of her time at home in the room closest to the boundary with the proposed development, and she also makes regular use of a therapy pool located in our garden. She experiences acute sensory distress in response to noise, vibration and unexpected activity. [redacted] Through years of professional support, environmental control and structured routine, we have achieved a fragile but effective equilibrium that enables her to live safely and for our family to cope.

Sustained construction noise and disruption on our boundary - particularly from demolition, structural work, power tools, and construction traffic, would almost certainly destroy that equilibrium. The effect on my daughter's health and safety would be profound and immediate. My partner also suffers from [redacted], a condition that is directly exacerbated by stress, and further disruption risks rendering her unable to provide necessary care. This is therefore not a routine concern about inconvenience; it is a matter of safeguarding a disabled child and preserving the physical and mental health of her and her carers.

Under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF paragraph 135) and Adur & Worthing Local Plan Policy DM18 (Residential Amenity), development should ensure that it does not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of existing occupiers through noise, disturbance or loss of amenity. In this case, the harm would be severe, prolonged and incapable of adequate mitigation. No construction management plan or noise assessment has been published demonstrating how these impacts would be controlled or assessed in relation to a highly vulnerable resident next door.

I therefore urge the Council to refuse planning permission on the basis that the proposed development would cause demonstrable harm to neighbouring residential amenity, contrary to Policy DM18 and the aims of the NPPF to create safe and healthy places.

If the Council is nevertheless minded to approve the application, I request that:

The Council's Environmental Health Officer is formally consulted and a Noise Impact Assessment carried out specifically addressing the situation of a hypersensitive disabled child next door.

A Construction Management Plan (CMP) be required before commencement, strictly limiting working hours, prohibiting noisy works during early mornings, evenings, weekends and school holidays, and specifying measures for noise and vibration.

The developer be required to provide advance notice of any particularly disruptive activity and contact details for immediate complaint resolution.

We can provide supporting statements from medical and social care professionals confirming the severity of our daughter's condition and sensory sensitivities if required. In our family's view, permitting this proposal would have devastating and life changing consequences.

I ask that this objection be given substantial weight in the assessment of the application and that the Council recognises its duty under the Equality Act 2010 to give due regard to the need to avoid discrimination and to protect the wellbeing of disabled residents when exercising its public functions.

Yours faithfully,
David Mackinnon