

To Mr Ross Leal,
Senior Planning Officer,

Arun District Council,
1st Floor
Arun Civic Center
Maltravers Road,
Littlehampton,
BN17 5LF

Dear Sir,

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

We are writing to object to the revised proposals. We welcome the omission of the freestanding garage to the front of property, however we are still of the opinion the remaining proposal are a gross over development of the site which will effect our enjoyment and amenity of our property. The proposals are also clearly contrary to the Middleton on Sea Village Design Statement, specifically the *Future Development Guidelines* which states;

- *be in keeping with the scale of existing developments and be well related to adjacent buildings and space,*
- *ensure that the orientation maintains the privacy enjoyed by neighbouring properties and seek to minimise overshadowing,*

As reference, one only has to look at the aerial view of the estate on the back cover of the Middleton Design Statement document or the original title deeds to see how No31 known as "The Little House" as been extended to fill the plot. If correct planning policy is not enforced which stops such over development the continual erosion of the design guidelines will result in the estate no longer having a special character but just another hotchpotch of densely built properties with no gaps or views to sea. This is not the vision my wife and I bought into.

In continuance of our previous objection letter, we would reiterate but revise our concerns about the proposals dominating nature, close proximity, overshadowing of our house and gross over development. The added risk to flooding presented by building close/over a main surface water sewer should also be considered.

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 again draw the planning authorities' attention to the misleading statements with regards the increased footprint of the development. Even with the omission of the garage block at 39.6m² the property is going to increase by 75% on top of an already extended building. This does not take into consideration the first floor. We have scheduled below the proposals and approximate areas for comparison.

Extension	Approx. Dimension	Footprint
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>156.86m2</u>
Existing stated footprint	<u>208.7m2</u>
<u>Proposed over all footprint</u>	<u>365.56m2</u>

This increase in area will greatly change the character and density of the area and should be refused on these grounds.

Two storey side extension

The revised proposal does not change any element of the two storey side extension and our previous objections are unchanged.

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 of the eaves of the roof creating an overbearing structure right on the boundary. 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. This extension obliterates this gap and forms a property which is developed from its west to east boundary.

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 is against the Middleton on Sea Village Design Statement, *Future Development Guidelines* and should be refused or reduced greatly so as not to affect our amenity. Rights of lights are also a separate issue we will be investigating further.

Swimming Pool Structure

The revised plans for proposed swimming pool extension has reduced the ridge height by **480mm** to approximately **4.00m** high but the length at **15.5m** has not changed and it is still extremely high and long and very bulky. If approved, 36m of my west boundary will have a structure built up against it, this equates to approximately 50% of the linear boundary. For a detached house on an "open plot" this is a considerable loss of western sunlight. 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 6m bulk of the pool.

No attempt has also been made to omit the window on the south east corner of the pool which will look directly into our garden again affect our privacy.

Surface water drain – flood alleviation

We are aware that national planning policy requires planners to take account of the effects of any development on the potential to cause flooding. It has come to our attention since our original objections that an important surface water drain runs directly along the eastern boundary of No31.

This drain transmits flood waters from areas to the north and Sea Way highway itself and is an important part of the flood alleviation system. The drain run requires maintenance the same as any system and also the ability to upgrade in the future should its capacity prove to be inadequate for future rainfall predictions. The increase in the footprint and loss of garden should also be taken into consideration in the effect run-off.

The proposed extensions do not appear to have taken any account of the drains existence or the requirement to maintain or replace the drain. **From a simple visual**

inspection of the location of the manholes they appear to be approximately 1.5 to 1.75 m from the boundary, which places them directly under the foundations of the extensions. The proposals should therefore be refused or greatly reduced to allow working area provision for maintenance or replacement of the drain.

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 75% increase of the existing house footprint.
- 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.
- Detrimental effect on the drainage system and potential flooding.
- 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 of the side extension loss of a gap between boundaries which should be at least 1.2m; does the pool structure require a 4.00m pitched roof? Maintenance and replacement of flood alleviation drain.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

E and E J Visram