

For the attention of; Mr Ross Leal

Planning Department
Arun District Council
1st Floor
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Dear Sirs

Application M/56/15/HH
31 Sea Way, Middleton-On-Sea, West Sussex, PO22 7RZ

My wife and I recently purchased No.29 Sea Way for the open nature and peaceful quality of the estate which are laid out clearly in the Middleton on Sea Village Design Statement. However we are now shocked to find that our enjoyment and amenity of our own property and that of the harmonious and well planned layout of Sea Way is potentially to be ruined by the over development of our neighbouring property to the west.

We will address our concerns for each of the distinct proposals below but primarily the over development of the site, dominating nature of the proposal the close proximity to our of the site and the relationship to the building line are our main concerns.

Over development

The Design and Access Statement in section *4.4 Amount*, states the ground floor footprint of the Main house is **208.7m²** and then states the proposed ground floor footprint will be **242.2m²**.

We are not sure whether this is a mathematical error or blatantly meant to mislead the planners and residents, but from a simple viewing of the proposal you can appreciate the increase in footprint is nearly a doubling of the existing, not taking into consideration the first floor. I have scheduled below the proposals and approximate areas for comparison.

Extension	Approx. Dimension	Footprint
New Garage and store	(6 x 6.6m)	39.6m ²
New Playroom	(9.8 x 3.8)	34.96m ²
New Gym and veranda enclosure		32.00m ²
New Pool enclosure	(15.5 x 5.8)	89.9m ²
Total New build footprint		<u>196.46m²</u>
Existing stated footprint		<u>208.7m²</u>
Proposed over all footprint		<u>405.16m²</u>

Even taking into account possible scaling errors, a doubling in footprint of a property which has already been extended is going greatly change the character and density of the area and should be refused on these grounds.

Garage Block

This two storey development is literally the size of a small detached house only **0.39m** from our boundary and **6.23m high**. This imposing structure built in the front garden will significantly change the street scene and be closer to the road (2.7m) than any other house or garage on the estate altering the building line and creating a precedent which would difficult to control subsequently.

One of the important characters of the Sea Way is the gaps created between properties not just for the enjoyment of residents but for passers-by viewing the built environment from the coastal path. The garage proposal completely obliterates this gap and forms a property which is developed from its west to east boundary.

The Design and Access Statement states;

“hedging/shrubbery forming the boundaries to the north and east of the site will be kept to provide screening of the proposed extensions”

No species of hedge or shrub will survive in a **0.39m** space containing foundations and a brick wall and the view from our drive will be **6.23m** high solid block (refer to East Elevation dwg 14039/05). The garage would greatly reduce the area of front drive and restrict the parking area and turning circle, for a property of 5 bedrooms probably with a minimum of three cars possibly leading to on street parking for visitors.

A cynic would also question way a roof space with headroom of **2.5m** is being created above the garage with a conveniently placed wet store the size of a stairway. In the future this area could be easily converted into living accommodation under permitted development unless planning control and conditions are enforced.

We therefore believe this should be refused in accordance with national and local planning policy.

Two storey side extension

Planning applications are to be judged on an individual basis but also viewed against the previous developments on the site and it would appear that No. 31 has been evolving vertically from bungalow to house and now horizontally to fill the site from each neighbour's boundary. This two storey side extension will dominate our house overshadowing our front windows and entrance foyer particularly the evening sunlight.

The 1m side access does not take into consideration the 0.3m overhang to the verge of the roof creating an overbearing structure right on the boundary and again reduce the space between properties. There is also the loss of privacy and overlooking from the new first floor dormer window to the 5th bedroom which looks directly down into our front facing window. The loss of light particularly to this window will be dramatic and we will be assessing any “rights of lights” issues separately.

Swimming Pool Structure

The proposed swimming pool extension has a ridge height of **4.47m** and a length of **15.5m** making it both extremely high and long and very bulky. With the proposed other extensions and proposed garage, if approved, nearly **48m** of my west boundary will have a structure built up against it, that is approximately 70%. The small south west section of our garden

being the only boundary free for sunlight to penetrate. Looking from our first floor the 15.5m of pool roof will be the main feature, not the sea!

Should the hedge between the two properties, that is claimed to form a visual screen, survive the construction process it is only 3m tall and will not really obscure the 15.5 x 5m bulk of the pool. The window on the south east corner of the pool will also look directly into our garden again affect our privacy.

Summary

It is clear from our detailed analysis of the proposals that the development should be refused on the following grounds;

- Over development of the site. A doubling of the existing house footprint
- Overbearing detached garage block, breaking existing estate building line.
- Potential for garage to be adapted to living accommodation.
- Proximity to boundary (0.39m).
- Loss of light from side extension.
- Overlooking from first floor bedroom.
- Length and height of pool structure
- Loss of amenity to our property, both front and rear.
- Loss of gap between dwellings on Sea Way
- Effect on views from coastal path
- Departure from Middleton on Sea Design Statement.
- Contrary to National and local planning policy with regards privacy, loss of amenity and over development.

There are numerous planning conditions which could be attributed to the scheme but the overall scale of the development we feel requires to be addressed. The size and location of the garage block; a gap between boundaries of at least 1.2m should be maintained; does the pool structure require a 4.7m pitched roof?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Mr and Mrs E J Visram