

From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 March 2025 17:28:52 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 5:28 PM from Miss Carol Pople.

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:	Miss Carol Pople
Address:	5 Mill Hill, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5TG

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:	I live at 5 Mill Hill which is immediately next door and to the southern side of 7 Mill Hil. I have lived here for 30 years and during that time there has been limited building work on the west side of the hill, and the footprints of the properties have not significantly increased. Whilst there has been building on the east

side of the road, the increase of footprints have been minimal. Having seen the proposed planning application for 7 Mill Hill, I note that the footprint of the property would be significantly increased across the width of the property and I would like to strongly object by virtue of the scale which does not respect the current dwelling and would result in the overdevelopment of the site and is out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area. In addition, the removal of hedging and vegetation will be detrimental to local wildlife and biodiversity.

The west and east sides of Mill Hill are significantly different in their appearance and development. The western side of the road contains the first houses built in Mill Hill over 100 years ago and still remains rural. There are 10 properties with large gardens and established hedging and trees on the well-used walking, cycling and horse riding route up to the South Downs National Park. The biodiversity is a significant backdrop to the National Park and enhances the area of outstanding natural beauty.

The eastern side of the road has greater density with more than twice the number of properties consisting of smaller plots and is more aligned to the properties behind in northern Shoreham. During my time living on Mill Hill, any additional building work, which has taken place, has not significantly increased the footprint of the property concerned.

The planning application considered here, states that the current site is underutilised. There is currently a large 4 bedroom detached house with a big conservatory, detached garage and summerhouse on the site. This width and use of the site is similar to mine and smaller than number 9 Mill Hill. This reflects the historical position whereby properties were built on the northern part of the plot to maximise the view. This is not due to "underdeveloped and visual anomaly given its large side garden". It is totally representative of neighbouring properties.

In addition, there was an ancient walnut tree, which was planted in 1923, shortly after the house was built. The previous owner of the property had maintained the tree in good condition and had it regularly inspected. This tree was felled soon after the new owners took possession as well as a large beech tree and a silver birch tree to the west of the property and two tall fir trees to the east of the property.

The west side of Mill Hill, particularly going north from the junction with Mill Hill Drive provides a virtual boundary of vegetation including long standing trees and hedges. This planning application will remove all vegetation surrounding the premises. All those to the front boundary, the rear boundary and to the south including a very large holly tree. Only two small shrubs are shown as being planted as a replacement for the front boundary. A very large void will be created which is only mirrored on the western side of the road by the current applicant who owns 1A Mill Hill and over the past two years has been opening up the driveway in a similar fashion.

The existing boundary between my property and 7 Mill Hill is a large established hedge, which will be demolished. This hedge

provides a significant habitat for birds which will shortly be nesting. In addition, there are bats which frequent the back of the properties on the western side of Mill Hill which is attractive to them as the area is not well lit at night. The proposed building which has extensive glazing will significantly change the light pollution and be detrimental to the bats. The applicant has, at his property at 1A Mill Hill, installed a significant amount of external lighting including uplighting in the planted areas which are illuminated at night. It is unclear whether this will be replicated with the proposed application.

The proposed dwelling appears to have a lot of hard surfacing, particularly across what is the current garden. At the moment, rain runs off the driveway, across the road and runs down the eastern side of the road in significant quantities. The proposed building with lack of vegetation will increase this. This does not appear to be addressed by the applicant who has not referenced any flood risk.

The building will extend across the width of the property to my boundary. It is not visually appealing and together with the proposed landscaping is not in keeping with the western side of Mill Hill which has always retained a sense of character. The proposed property does not respect that character.

I am also concerned that any windows on the south side of the proposed development will be within a few feet of my existing bedroom to the north of my property which has a Dormer window, with a view to the north.

In relation to the hedge, to the east of the property and adjacent to the road, I believe it must remain in order to retain our mutual privacy, reducing light pollution from any potential installation and maintain all wildlife benefits whilst reducing additional noise from the proposed development. The inclusion of a driveway alongside my own existing drive would be extremely detrimental to the location in all those areas listed.

It should be noted that the first I had heard about the proposed application was a letter from the applicant a few weeks before the formal application notifying me of a submission. In particular, where the letter stated that the finalised plans were 'likely to be approved by Officers with whom the applicant had been working'. Whilst I understand this is not a ground for objection, it does feel like a fait accompli in that the application will be agreed without any consultation or consideration for the neighbours.

For all of the above reasons I would strongly object to the proposed plans. If planning officers decide to approve the planning application, I would request that this application is referred to the planning committee for further consideration and also for them to refer to the photographs I have included with this objection but have emailed to the Planning Office and my two

Councillors, Emma Evans and Nigel Jenner separately.

Yours sincerely

Carol Pople

Kind regards