

From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 March 2025 10:42:48 UTC+00:00
To: "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0146/25

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 01/03/2025 10:42 AM from Mr Brett Widdows.

Application Summary

Address:	7 Mill Hill Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex BN43 5TG
Proposal:	Proposed erection of a replacement dwelling, following demolition of the existing property and 2 no. associated garage buildings.
Case Officer:	Peter Barnett

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Brett Widdows
Address:	26 Mill Hill, Shoreham-by-sea, West Sussex BN43 5TH

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design- Highway Access and Parking- Other- Overdevelopment- Privacy Light and Noise- Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Objection to application AWDM/0146/25 - 7 Mill Hill, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 5TG
	There are several issues that are causing us great concern

regarding the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a totally new build on this site. These are: the effects of this development on wildlife, increased flood risk, and substantial change to the road frontage.

1. Mill Hill is a semi-rural location which links at the top to the South Downs National Park and Mill Hill Nature Reserve. It has no pavements and in that way resembles a country lane. Traffic is single lane, with vehicles pulling in to let others pass. High hedges and other greenery running the length of the western side form a wildlife corridor. This planning application proposes the removal of many existing mature trees and large mixed hedges at No 7, which would not only be detrimental to wildlife but would also change the rural character of the area.

The Arboricultural Statement rates the trees and hedges to be removed as 'low quality' and their loss acceptable impact in context of the development. However, the front hedge which provides privacy for No 7 and its neighbours opposite, is 4 metres in height, mixed native shrubs, with holly trees within it, and connects with the hedges up and down Mill Hill. It is always full of small birds. The holly tree (to be removed) in the SE corner is twice that height. The application plans replacing this planting with what looks like 2 small trees/shrubs within a narrow boundary planter, and the rest of the frontage hard-surfaced with 2 wide driveway entrances for vehicular access. The Arboricultural Statement suggests that this will 'return amenity to the street scene' which is very doubtful as there is little to screen neighbours and passers-by from the house, adjoining garage, and parking spaces for 4 cars. The application's Design and Access Statement describes this as 'some small trees and hedges would be altered to suit the new entrance'. Local Plan Policy 15 requires it to respect and enhance the character of the site and of the area, which this part of the proposal does not meet.

A Tree Protection Plan is recommended to be part of this application's acceptance, to protect the remaining few trees 'with scope for replacement planting' elsewhere on the site, but this optimistic approach does not replace mature dense native vegetation in ecological terms or guarantee any future wildlife value. Mature trees were cut down prior to the arboricultural assessment, soon after acquisition of the property.

There is likely additional light pollution from the proposed plan's large front windows and very extensive glazing at the rear in what is typically quite a dark night area. The owners of 7 Mill Hill have another property further down the road and have created a large driveway with an excessive number of external lights, despite having 2 streetlights just metres away. Though it is not indicated on the plans, the owners may wish to repeat the lighting element of the design at No 7, which would be detrimental to wildlife.

2. The proposed removal of trees, hedges and side lawn and replacing with hard surfaces does not address the potential for flooding on this road, which is unusually steep for Shoreham. There is already considerable surface water run-off down Mill Hill during and after moderate or heavy rain. The existing driveway at No 7 is above the road level, as is the entire east side of the plot. Rainwater runoff streams down in quantities and across to the east side of Mill Hill, causing visible erosion to this side of the highway and the foot of driveways leading on to it. With no pavements or gutters, this is a problem for pedestrians in particular to navigate the road safely, but affects all residents and users of this narrow road. The application gives no detail of materials to be used to mitigate flooding on to the road, given that most of the current water-absorbing environments on the plot are to be removed, particularly along the road frontage. Replacement with buildings and hardstanding looks to vastly increase the amount of water run-off. Southern Water hasn't been able to comment on the suitability of the plan as limited or no relevant information on flood prevention has been supplied. This seems unacceptable for approval at this stage.

3. The current house does not present as an over-imposing structure; it is in keeping with the other properties on the west side of Mill Hill, set in large plots with main windows facing away from the road, or set far back and sheltered by vegetation. Currently No 7 has only two small 1st-floor windows in the side overlooking the road, with the lower window and door hidden behind hedging and trees. Parking is discreetly out of sight to the rear. The proposed plan would create a very large building, which looks to be 3 times the footprint, taking up the entire width of the eastern side fronting on to and now facing the road. This aspect of the development does not seem proportionate with the site. Planning Statement 6.5 says that 'many surrounding properties span the width of the site' but this refers to the much narrower plots of the east side of Mill Hill, not those on the west side adjoining No 7. Care has been taken not to impinge on the privacy of the two immediate neighbours to the south and north but there is no mention at all of the privacy impact on neighbours in the smaller, facing properties to the east - Nos 26, 28, 30 and 32. Planning Statement Fig 1, the aerial view of the plot outlined in red, is inaccurate, as is Fig 4, as the front windows of No 26 opposite also look straight on to the SE section of the plot's existing hedge.

In style the design is quite out of character with the area, with exceptionally large and high windows that would directly overlook neighbours opposite. It is notable that there is no artist's impression of the front of the house, driveway and boundary, as it would look from the road (as there is of the back), only a line drawing front elevation of the house. The Planning Statement 6.9 Figure 5 fails to show the existing tree and hedge line or height on the road boundary, entirely hiding the impact of the planned changes in Fig 6. The large exposed parking area in front of the

house is not an imaginative design solution, given the flexibility of such a big plot, and does not enhance the character of the site.

4. We are also concerned that the planned additional driveway entrance opens on to a particularly narrow part of the road with a high grass bank and telegraph pole directly opposite, making manoeuvring difficult. The grass banks, maintained by individual residents whose gardens they abut, are ecologically and aesthetically very precious to the area and need to be preserved. This also needs to be taken into consideration while the demolition and build is underway.

Such a development seems ill-suited to a quiet, rural road. We strongly urge that this plan as it stands is rejected.

Mr & Mrs B Widdows

Kind regards