461/463 Upper Shoreham Road
Shoreham
West Sussex
BN43 5WQ

2 December 2016

ADUR & WORTHING
- 6 DEC 2016
PLANNING SERVICES

Dear Mr Peck,

Amsterdam Public House, Upper Shoreham Road, Shoreham
Applications nos. 1643/16, 1644/16 and 1645/16

We write with reference to the application for planning permission and the two applications for Listed Building Consent at the above address. We would point out that the works the subject of these applications are now nearing completion.

Generally we welcome the refurbishment of the pub which has been in a poor state for several years. There are a few aspects of the applications as submitted that give us cause for concern however.

Firstly, the site plan shows the public highway, which provides access to our property, as part of the application site. This is not correct, the road is not in the ownership of the pub but is public highway.

Secondly, there is an existing door on the east elevation of the pub which we allowed the previous owners to use as a fire escape. The door is shown as being retained but it is not clear from the plans what its status is. I do appreciate that this is not a planning matter but it would be good to have clarification on this point.

Thirdly, the plans are in error since they show a new air vent on the east elevation through the wall from the gents toilets. If this were fitted it would come through the wall into our lounge area, which clearly we would not allow!

It does raise a couple of points though. The reason the architect made this mistake is that his/her drawings do not show the adjoining property (ours) other than on the site plan. In our view it would be good practice to require applicants to submit plans indicating abutting properties to avoid mistakes like this occurring in the future.

We are assuming that the architects have realised their mistake and have found other means of ventilating the toilets but we will be checking out the situation with the contracted Building Regulations company at Wolverhampton.

The other issue is whether the extension of the 'public' area of the pub into the original domestic cottage area could be argued to be a change of use by intensification. Although the original cottage at 465 was partly subsumed into the pub many years ago this area has previously been used for ancillary

storage etc. and has never previously formed part of the publicly accessible area. We are a little concerned to have publicly accessible gents toilets on the other side of the party wall to our living area although would not object if this did not cause us any actual disturbance by reason of noise or smells.

We have no objections to the new pergola or the new lighting, and it seems from the plans that the new kitchen extraction system will be in the same location as the previous one, although hopefully more efficient.

It would be helpful to receive your comments about the inclusion of the road in the site plan and the point about possible change of use by way of intensification.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Chris Whitwell

[redacted]

Linda Beanlands