Dr. JENNIFER ANDREWS

BDS (EDIN), DIP FOD U.HERTS

Dental Surgeon

Mr James Appleton and Mr Keith Morgan
Development Management Section
Adur District Council
Civic Centre
Ham Road
Shoreham-by-Sea
BN43 6PR

22nd June 2010.

DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT
30 JUN 2010

Dear Sirs,

Re Planning Application Reference ADC/0199/10
Proposed development at rear of Nos 65 and67 South Street Lancing.

Thank you for your letter dated 3rd June 2010 informing me of this new planning application.

I wish to repeat my objections to the previous application No ADC/0274/06 and enclose copies of relevant correspondence for your ease of reference.

This new application, like the 2006 one, is confused and likely to mislead by amended and conflicting drawings.

Drawing No 584-08E and 584-07E show the existing garden wall to No 67 retained.
Drawing No 584-08G shows the garden wall removed and replaced by a fence about 2m to the North and the entrance re-positioned. Which arrangement is correct and being applied for?
Drawings No 584-08E and 584-08G are not included in box 6 of the application form

The application states that surface water will be disposed of by soakaways. The building covers the whole area of the site leaving no place for soakaways.

I have seen a copy of Mr MacBain's letter dated 11th June 2010 and I believe that his comments deserve serious consideration particularly as to how construction activities can be confined to the developers land so as not to affect the public and adjoining owners and tenants.

I still consider the proposals to be a gross over development of the area which, if allowed, could create a precedent for widespread similar back garden developments in this area of Lancing.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

Jennifer Andrews.

63 South Street Lancing West Sussex BN15 8AP Tel: 01903 752228

The Planning Division
Civic Centre
Ham Road
Shoreham by Sea
West Sussex
BN43 6PR

25th September 2006.

Dear Sirs,

Proposed Development 63-67 South Street Lancing and Public Car Park.
Planning Application No. ADC/0274/06.

Thank you for your letter dated 18th September 2006 enclosing further amended plans for this application.

The removal of the garden wall of No 67 to widen the two way entry/exit to South Street is some improvement but is still a potential bottleneck problem with no pedestrian footpath and miimum sight line vision to the south.

The proposed Health Care Unit has been increased in size but would still be unsuitable for use by my Dental Surgery and it would not comply with current Dental requirements.

The provision of 18 public car parking spaces is some improvement but they are very restricted where the width available is only 10.750m.

Otherwise my comments 1 to 8 as previously submitted still apply. In addition the back door of the Meeting Room opens into a passage which

requires exit through No 63 land. This would not be acceptable to me and would not provide a fire escape route.

I have received your further letter dated 21st September 2006 regarding attending the Committee meeting. I confirm that I wish to speak at the meeting.

Yours faithfully,

Dr Jennifer Andrews.

The Planning Division
Civic Centre
Ham Road
Shoreham by Sea
West Sussex
BN43 6PR

1st September 2006.

Dear Sirs,

Proposed Development 63-67 South Street Lancing and Public Car Park.
Planning Application No. ADC/0274/06.

I had no knowledge of this matter until I received a phone call from Mr Brendan Coffey, Architect, practicing as GTS Design Consultants, followed by his letter dated 10th August 2006 enclosing notice of his planning application and drawings no 584-01C, 584-05A and 584-06A, a planning statement, letter to the Planning Dept dated 10th August 2006 and other related documents and drawings. There had been no prior courtesy advice, consultation or discussion by GTS or his clients with me.

I then received from GTS revised drawings No. 584-01C, 584-07A dated 16th August 2006, a Design and Access Statement, copy of planning permission No. L/118/05/TP and drawings No 584-08A and 09A dated 18th August 2006.

Finally, I received, from Mr Peter Davies of Planning and Community, official notification of the planning application and a printed form inviting comments and the right to speak on the application. I return this form herewith. I also enclose two stamped addressed envelopes for your acknowledgement and the outcome of the application.

I attach my comments on the application on a separate sheet and I apologise for burdening you with this letter but I believe feel that this application could have been more appropriately designed if the applicant had sought prior consultation before preparing proposals.

No 63 South Street or any part of its site has not been offered for sale and no proposal to purchase has been made to me.

Yours faithfully

Dr. Jennifer Andrews

Comments on Planning Application No ABC/0274/06.
By Dr Jennifer Andrews.

1. I am the owner of No.63 South Street, Lancing which is my Dental Surgery. No part of the property or its site has been offered for sale. In the absence of any acceptable proposal for the future of my Practice and appropriate compensation, the development cannot be carried out as proposed using my land.
2. I have planning permission for parking at the rear of the site with access from South Street across the car park and exiting by the public lane to Penhill Road. This parking area is continually used by staff and has accommodation for four cars. The proposal of two parking spaces on land owned by others is not acceptable.
3. My patients use the adjoining public car park which the proposal eliminates thereby putting further pressure on street parking which is already very limited. GTS engineer's car parking survey has not been submitted to justify the statement that on average only 4 spaces of a possible 36 were ever used. This cannot be accurate when there is a wedding or funeral service at St Michaels Church opposite my practice, or community activities at the Parish Hall or Methodist Church.
4. Access entrance from South Street could be improved as proposal on drawing No 584-08A for the footpath crossing only but as the drawing clearly shows the bottleneck problem would still exist between the boundaries of No 67 and No 71 which narrows from 4.350m to 2.930m. This would not solve the potential congestion problem when a fire appliance, refuse vehicle or ambulance arrived at the entrance and a car was emerging.
5. The proposed Health Care Unit as Drawing No 584-09A, proposed for use by my Dental Surgery would not be suitable being detached, without a waiting room, without materials storage, compressor space, staff facilities and partly inadequate ceiling height. I wish to retain my option to extend with comprehensive facilities and updating to current regulation requirements.
6. I wish to retain my options for the future of No 63 including the possibility of change of use to residential in which case the back garden and garage/parking space would be necessary.
7. In general terms I believe that the proposed development is contrary to existing planning policy for public parking and previous decisions, being piecemeal and prejudicial to any potential future regeneration by comprehensive redevelopment of the area which could include some reasonable amount of off-street

public car parking and two or three storey appropriate use buildings.

8. I believe that the Council Engineers will wish to see the GTS parking survey and will advise on the proposed improved access from South Street and potential traffic and parking problems which I have raised in paragraph 4 above.

Dr Jennifer Andrews 1st September 2006.

PLANNING APPLICATION ADC/0274/06.

Reiterate.

1. No 63 has not been offered for sale

2. No consultation prior to application

3. No proposal for purchase by the applicant

4. Proposed Health Care Unit is unsuitable for use with my Dental Surgery and would not satisfy current Dental requirements as a separate surgery.

5. I have outline proposals for how I can extend my surgery when required to increase capacity and update facilities

6. I intend to continue my practice at No 63 for the foreseeable future and retain my options for extension or change of use to residential

7. In the absence of any offer, which would have to cover the cost of purchase of a suitable property in a satisfactory location, all necessary alterations, refurbishment, plumbing, wiring, staff car parking, installation of equipment, loss of earnings and patients, and adequate compensation for disruption, this development cannot take place.

8. The application material gave no reasons why the proposed buildings had to be squeezed into adjoining owners land while the car park site was largely left vacant