


Middleton-on-Sea Association

17 East Close

Middleton-on-Sea, West Sussex

PO22 7RS



Planning Department

25.1.2019

Arun Civic Centre

Maltravers Rd

Littlehampton


BN17 5LF

Re: **46a Sea Lane, Middleton-on-Sea M/153/18/PL**

Dear Sir/Madam,

I act on behalf of the Middleton-on-Sea Residents Association and have enclosed the Association's objection to the **Planning Application M/153/18/PL** relating to a proposed new dwelling at 46a Sea Lane, Middleton-on-Sea. If this application is the subject of an evaluation at a public meeting of the Arun District Council this Association wishes to register its intention to make a **brief presentation** regarding the basis of its objection at that meeting.

Yours Sincerely,



Maria Bradshaw

Honorary Secretary, Middleton-on-Sea Association

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

Representations of Middleton on Sea Association in respect of Planning Application

M/153/18/PL - Land adjacent to 46 Sea Lane, Middleton on Sea.

Whilst accepting that planning consent (M/7/16/PL) has been granted by Arun District Council for a 3 bedroom detached dwelling and garage on the subdivided plot within 46 Sea Lane, the Middleton on Sea Association (MOSA) consider that the revised scheme for a significantly larger and taller 4 bedroom detached house and garage within the same plot now represents a significant and unacceptable overdevelopment of what is a compact, sensitive, road side site that lies within an adopted Area of "special" Character. This is particularly the case given that Arun District Council (within their Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents) have recognised the spacious nature of the area as being a fundamental part of its character and where protection is needed through rigorous control over new development.

MOSA have carefully examined the application submissions and identified a number of matters that are considered not only misleading but which serve to highlight the significant increase in scale/massing and hence the degree of overdevelopment when compared to the previously approved scheme.

Firstly, the existing and proposed eastern elevations in context are significantly misleading being taken from an unrepresentative and non-public viewpoint to the east of Bywater House and 2 Old Point, (ie from a viewpoint on the south side of properties within Old Point) rather than from a location on Sea Lane. This gives a very false impression of the scale and massing of existing buildings that form the relevant setting and backdrop to the proposed development located as it is on the western side of Sea Lane. However this drawing, when seen in that context also serves to highlight how unrepresentative and overbearing the proposed development (in height, scale and massing) would be when compared to 46 Sea Lane, Bywater House and 2 Old Point and when seen in the context of the compact plot on which it is sited.

Secondly, the plot size and building footprint sizes stated in the application give a false impression of a low density development particularly when this is contrasted with the Block Plan and roof plan submitted. This is because of the significant roof projections that enclose the spacious balconies/terraces to the north and south elevations, resulting in a significant increase in the scale, height and massing of the buildings compared to the development previously approved. In addition the floorspace of the proposed dwelling represents a 50% increase (some 100 sq m) over the development previously proposed.

This is clearly shown when comparing and contrasting the Block Plans of the approved and proposed developments.

Furthermore the elevation drawings show a significant increase in the massing of the dwelling alongside Sea Lane, compared to that previously proposed including a significant reduction in the open space buffer between the eastern facade and Sea Lane thereby resulting in a dramatic change to the street scene at this point.

In addition, unlike the approved scheme, the proposed dwelling now projects some 4 m forward of the building line to 46 Sea Lane that fronts the Greensward at this sensitive gateway location, further increasing the dominance of the proposal.

From a policy perspective, the planning law section 38(6) PCPA 2004 of the Local Development Framework, together with related advice in section 70(2) of the TCPA 1990 makes it clear that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

In this instance, the proposal (M/153/18/PL) is considered to be a clear overdevelopment of this compact and sensitive site. It is also considered to be contrary to policies D SP1 "Design", D DM1 "Aspects of Form and Design Quality", HER SP1 "The Historic Environment" and Policy HER DM4 "Areas of Character" of the Arun Local Plan 2018, in that by way of its scale, height and massing it fails to conserve and enhance the Area of "special" Character or to make a positive contribution to it, particularly with regard to the characteristics prepared by the Council and listed in "Supplementary Planning Guidance".

It is also considered to be non-compliant with the philosophy and criteria set out in the Village Design Statement which (whilst not part of the Development Plan), the Council have committed to have regard to as a "material consideration" when determining planning applications (para 13.1.7 of the Adopted Local Plan refers).

Accordingly, Middleton on Sea Association, strongly object to this revised application (M/153/18/PL) and would urge the District Council to reflect their policy position and provide protection to this Area of "special" Character through rigorous control over new development and the refusal of planning permission in this instance.