Kausar, Safia

From: John Sarcoe <[redacted]
Sent: 12 February 2021 11:32
To: RT1
Subject: Appeal: Penhill Court, Penhill Road, Lancing, West Sussex. APP/Y3805/W/20/3261736

To the Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House, Bristol

Representation sent Date: 12th February 2021
Our Names: John Sarcoe and Leslie Sarcoe
Our Address: 99 Penhill Road, Lancing, West Sussex BN15 8HF
Planning Inspectorate appeal reference number: APP/Y3805/W/20/3261736
Address of the appeal site: Penhill Court, Penhill road, Lancing, West Sussex
Application reference: Notice/0014/20

We are against the appeal proposals for the same reasons as given by the LPA and for other reasons given below. The full details of our objection to the proposed development was submitted to the Adur and Worthing Council planning department and we understand you will have received these.

Our main objections to the proposed development are summarised here: The design is not in keeping with the area since it is significantly taller than the bungalows that surround it on three sides and the houses opposite. We will experience some loss of privacy due to the proposed 3rd floor front balcony overlooking a bedroom. More on street parking will result in increased pollution due to restrictions in the road impeding the traffic flow. We think it will cause more road traffic accidents and increased risk of emergency vehicles being held up. The increased height will likely cause a greater wind funnelling effect with potentially more damage to fence, trees and property. Damage to the fence and trees has occurred in the last year when the winds were from the West to North West direction although the strongest and prevailing wind direction is usually South West, which has not cause damage. We consider the building already overbearing.

We suspect the prior approval application fails the criteria of Part 20, Class A "New dwelling houses on detached blocks of flats", of the Town & Country Planning Regulations 2020 in several areas and in some cases this will only become apparent after the development should start. We feel insufficient supporting information was given on the prior approval application form and the prior approval should have been rejected for this in addition to the reasons given by the LPA. We think likely there was deliberate intention to move this to appeal because, our understanding is, there is strong unanimous rejection of this proposed development in this area.

John Sarcoe
Leslie Sarcoe