PDN MAB COOMBES
ADC/0175/09
Keith Morgan

13th May 2009

Planning Services Manager
Adur District Council
DX 59765
Shoreham-by-Sea

Dear Sir,

Mr. & Mrs. J. A. Coombes of 57 Penhill Road, Lancing West Sussex BN15 8HB

We have received a copy of your Notification of the 30th April for proposed development by way of a single storey office building with store in roof space (attached to the sides of 57 and 61 Penhill Road under reference ADC/0175/09).

Our clients have requested us to strongly object to the proposed development on their behalf. Our clients object on the following grounds:-

(a) Having a business premises "sandwiched" between themselves and No.61 and, therefore, not in keeping with the residential aspect of the road; in addition to which our clients have not given their consent, nor would they give their consent to the building being attached to the side of their property, as the Application appears to envisage. To attach a building to their building without their consent would be unacceptable to them.

(b) When applying for planning permission to have a hard standing and dropped kerb in front of their house, they were required by West Sussex County Council to ensure that "the existing wall along the eastern boundary of the property be reduced to a maximum height of 600mm for a distance of at least 2 metres measured from the front of the boundary". This affords our clients the necessary visibility when moving the car on and off the driveway. From the proposed plans, it would appear that a space has been allotted for a vehicle, which could block their vision.

(c) Our clients understand there are a number of aquifers running under Penhill Road and they are concerned that any excavation for foundations could divert them, causing potential damp problems to their house and No.61. In addition, no matter what precautions are taken, any ground works could undermine the existing foundations and thus endangering the stability of both properties, particularly as they are over 100 years of age.

(d) According to plans, the rear of the building overlaps our clients' conservatory by approximately one-half and although this does not butt right up to the windows, it is, obviously, going to cut out a lot of their light. It would also be impossible to clean the conservatory windows.

(e) There is also the point that there appears to be no exit from the rear garden of the proposed building in the event of an emergency which, presumably, would be required under Health and Safety.

We would further add that our clients have had, temporarily, to leave their wheelie bins in the access road, since it is impractical and inconvenient to keep them in their own rear access way and can find no other suitable site. The current freeholder of the access way has, at the present time, blocked our clients' access to the same. Our clients have claimed a prescriptive right of way over the access way in question and this is subject to adjudication by the Land Registry. Statements of case have been supplied to the Land Registry Adjudicator by both parties and further directions are awaited. We would further add that the adjoining property, No.61 Penhill Road, has a legal right of access over the access way in question which would certainly, in our opinion, prevent the development of the site in any event. We assume that the adjoining owner would seek injunction proceedings against the proposed developer if the Application is passed. No doubt, you will bear in mind our clients' concerns and objections.

Yours Faithfully,

Gates & Moloney