

John & Louise Lucas
12 Sea Way
Middleton-on-Sea
West Sussex
PO22 7SA



8th June 2017

Planning Ref. M/42/17/HH

Dear Sir/Madam,

We are writing to object to the proposed development at 14b Sea Way, Middleton-on-Sea.

Background

Whilst buying our house (12 Sea Way) in 2012, we were made aware of the planning history of the land to the rear, known as Plot 3. We discovered that in 2006 planning permission was refused for a three bedroom bungalow (incidentally, to a design and elevation of which we would not object). In particular, we noted the words of the Planning Inspector: -

"Having regard to the siting and scale of the two existing dwellings (i.e. 14 & 14a), I consider the addition of this bungalow as proposed would result in a closely-grouped enclave of development, which would have a cramped appearance and which would constitute a significant departure from the spacious character which typifies the estate as a whole"

We were pleased to proceed with our purchase secure in the knowledge that a relatively unobtrusive house situated on that plot had been ruled unacceptable by Arun District Council.

Last year it was again a relief to learn that the property developer who is the owner/occupier of what has now become known as 14b Sea Way was refused permission to erect a house far larger than the bungalow.

We are therefore surprised and dismayed to learn that permission is again being sought to construct such a large building. We recognise that an attempt has been made to address cosmetic issues relating to building materials, finishings and appearance however, those were not our primary concerns. The objections we raised during last year's failed attempt are still relevant and valid, specifically:-

1. Invasion of Privacy

The proposed house would be an invasion of our privacy. The design reveals 7 first floor windows (4 at the SW front and 3 to the SE side) overlooking our house and garden.

2. Size of Property

The proposal speciously describes the development as a "two storey side extension" to the existing property. However, the reality is that the intention is to subsume the existing ugly but relatively unobtrusive 2 bedroom dwelling into a 4 bedroom edifice at least 3 times the size.

3. Housing Density

The plot of land which originally accommodated just 14 Sea Way (a single storey property) has incrementally acquired two 4 bedroom properties (14 and 14a) along with the 2 bedroom property now known as 14b. Replacing 14b with a 4 bedroom property would impose an increased housing density at variance with previous planning decisions and the Middleton-on-Sea Village Design Statement. This is even more apparent when taking into consideration the adjoining properties in East Close and Sea Lane.

4. Noise and Disturbance

The gravel drive adjoining our property was constructed to serve one household. Adding a third 4 bedroom house to the original plot would further increase the traffic noise and inconvenience we suffer.

5. Site History and Context

The proposal makes no provision for the garaging of cars although the design retains the existing garage door, designating a "domestic/garden/cycle storage" area behind.

Is a newly constructed 4 bedroom property without a garage a realistic or feasible long term proposition? Or is a longer game being played and will subsequent incremental planning permission be sought for a "small extension" to provide garaging commensurate with a property of that scale?

History demonstrates that interspersed between a number of failed attempts to replace the existing building, a simple garage on Plot 3 has been persistently and insidiously transformed by:-

- a. Ceding garage space for living accommodation and then
- b. Acquiring 2 first floor bedrooms and so becoming a dwelling and then
- c. Obtaining a Certificate of Lawful Use or Development and then
- d. Acquiring a side extension conservatory and then
- e. Acquiring a postal address and then
- f. Acquiring a large concrete block storage shed

Coupled with last year's somewhat risible ploy of a "throwaway" proposal for 2 properties on the site preceding the application for just 1 large dwelling then a picture emerges of persistent probing and testing for weaknesses in the planning process. We strongly suspect that if this proposal were to succeed then there would be more to come.

6. Precedence

In 2006, Arun District Council refused planning permission for a smaller, less obtrusive single storey 3 bedroom house due to the increase in housing density that would be imposed.

7. Lack of Strategic Support

The proposal will not help address any of the emerging priorities identified in the Arun District Council Economic Strategy, neither will it assist the Arun Place Plan. What it will do, paraphrasing the words of the Planning Control Manager in 2006, is:-

"represent an over development and intensification of use of the site that would result in a development that is out of character with the area in general and by reason of its design would detract from the character and appearance of this attractive part of the estate. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Policies GEN2, GEN7 and AREA1 of the Arun District Local Plan, the Middleton-on-Sea Village Design Statement and the NPPF".

8. Lack of Social Consideration

Perhaps more significantly from a personal perspective, the proposal demonstrates an indifference toward the individual people in the immediate community. It causes worry and concern for the considerable number of neighbours who have not been consulted and would be directly and adversely impacted by such an over development.

Yours Sincerely

John & Louise Lucas