

From: Daun Johnson on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 24 June 2026 07:46
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Reference AL/35/26/RES

Please upload email to AL/35/26/RES, planning, rep

Daun Johnson
Technical Support Unit Assistant
Planning Services

T: 01903 737762 Ext 37762
E: Daun.Johnson@arun.gov.uk



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>



From: Daun Johnson <Daun.Johnson@arun.gov.uk> **On Behalf Of** Planning
Sent: 24 June 2026 07:29
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Reference AL/35/26/RES

Daun Johnson
Technical Support Unit Assistant
Planning Services

T: 01903 737762 Ext 37762
E: Daun.Johnson@arun.gov.uk



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>



From: Helen Freeman [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 June 2026 21:58
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Reference AL/35/26/RES

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

I wish to object to this latest planning application.

I am disappointed that, despite previous applications and meetings between the developer, the Parish Council and local residents, many of the concerns raised about this site appear to have been disregarded in this proposal.

Whilst outline planning permission may allow for up to 89 dwellings, this does not mean that the maximum number of properties must be built. A lower-density development would be more appropriate for the character of the village and surrounding area. Furthermore, the inclusion of some bungalows would be more in keeping.

I am also concerned that the proposed affordable housing appears to be clustered within specific areas of the development rather than being integrated throughout the site. A more balanced approach would create a more cohesive community.

The proposed children's play area remains part of the scheme, despite the village already benefiting from a well-used and suitable play area, playing fields and social club. From previous consultations many residents would prefer to see this space used as an orchard or planted with appropriate native trees, providing greater environmental benefits.

I remain unable to understand why access is proposed via Meadow Way, requiring the demolition of part of an existing semi-detached property, when access from Hook Lane is available. The fact that the latest layout appears to retain Hook Lane access as an option raises questions about the suitability of the proposed development.

I do not believe either access route is suitable. Hook Lane struggles to accommodate existing traffic levels, while the Meadow Way junction has a history of accidents and near misses and is widely regarded as dangerous.

Meadow Way is frequently used during school drop-off and pick-up times as a safer alternative to parking on the busy A29. Additional traffic generated by this development would significantly increase safety concerns for residents, parents and children.

The local road network lacks the capacity to accommodate the additional vehicle movements that this development would generate.

I believe an updated ecological assessment is now required. Recent developments in the surrounding area are likely to have displaced wildlife into this field. I have photographic evidence showing that deer are now in this field and would ask that this be taken into account through an updated assessment.

I am also concerned about the impact of the development on flood risk. The field itself has flooded repeatedly in recent years, and local residents have already experienced flooding problems which have been exacerbated by other recent developments in the area. The loss of permeable land could further worsen these issues.

I question Southern Water's conclusion that there are no issues with connecting the development to the existing sewer network. Local residents have experienced repeated incidents of raw sewage entering nearby fields, and it is my understanding that wastewater is already being tankered away in Barnham because the current infrastructure is unable to cope with demand. This raises serious concerns about the capacity of the existing system to support a further development.

Since the purchase of No. 24, the property proposed for demolition has been subject to criminal activity, resulting in it being secured in a visually unattractive manner. This has had a detrimental impact on the character of the area and raises concerns regarding the ongoing management of the site pending development.

The developer erected promotional signage without the necessary consent and was subsequently required to remove it. Whilst this may appear to be a minor matter, it raises concerns regarding the developer's regard for planning requirements and local regulations.

A development containing up to 89 dwellings will place additional pressure on local services. Access to GP appointments is already limited, and residents are frequently directed to urgent treatment centres requiring triaging at Accident and Emergency. The cumulative impact of continued housing growth on local infrastructure must therefore be given significant weight in the determination of this application.

For all of the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that this application be refused.

Kind regards

Helen Freeman

28 Meadow Way

Westergate

PO20 3QT

████████████████████