

Caroline Grist

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 May 2025 20:29
To: Caroline Grist
Cc: Simon Hicks (Cllr); Anne Eves (Cllr)
Subject: DM/24/0578 - Planning Application Leylands Rd.

[REDACTED]
Good evening,

As the residents of 101b Leylands Road RH15 8AA we would like to voice our objection to the proposed planning application Ref: DM/25/0856.

Firstly, I would like to put on record my utter dismay that this planning is being put forward again within months of being rejected. This is becoming a repeated bother for residents of Leylands Road and for Millbank that we are constantly being put through this process of having to object to this absurd planning which we have repeatedly said will negatively affect our quality of life.

As per the last plan, I believe that the development cannot take place as the application fails to meet the "protection of public apparatus" as set out by Southern Water. This states "No development or tree planting should be carried out within 3 metres of the external edge of the public gravity sewer without consent from Southern Water." the plans clearly show both development and tree planting within 3m of the highlighted sewage line without any permission in place from Southern Water just as it did in last years rejected application.

I note there is a flood risk assessment carried out and attached on the case notes, however no risk assessment has been carried out on my property for flooding which can already get quite boggy around that boundary outside of the summer months. I fear that given the incline of the land as shown in Indicative Site Section 7113-PL-11B the removal of a garden into the foundations of a house and the sloping of the roof allowing for rain water to drain downhill towards my property would effectively turn my backgarden into a bog. This would prevent my young children from being able to play in their own garden as well as damaging my property.

One of the reasons cited for the previous rejection was that "the location of the property frontage facing these rear gardens and the associated comings and goings is considered to be unneighbourly and, overall, these issues would result in significant harm to their privacy and outlook. As a result, the proposal would not comply with Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework." I do not see how moving the front door a couple of metres negates the unneighbourly nature of the comings and goings.

I do not see how the comings and goings of large vehicles required to build a property of a number of months will not have an accessibility impact to the resident of millbank. The noise and dirt of the construction will also have a long negative impact on all nearby residents.

Last year there were issues surrounding the ownership of some aspects of the land, right to access on mill bank and a heightened risk of flooding and I see in no way have these matters been addressed in

this "new" proposal. I have CC'd in the councillors listed on the planning website as 21 different residences objected last year which shows you the scope of the harm these plans present.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]