

Recommendation Report for Planning Permission for Works or Extension to a Dwelling

REF NO: AB/29/26/HH

LOCATION: White Cottage
32 King Street
Arundel
BN18 9BW

PROPOSAL: Single storey rear extension to create an orangery. This application may affect the character and appearance of the Arundel Conservation Area and may affect the setting of listed buildings.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION As above.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

AB/109/20/HH	Rear single storey extension for new kitchen and living area, internal alterations, new and adjusted windows and doors, part replacement roof structure with 2 x conservation roof lights to the main building, re-covering of main roof and partial re-build of the detached garage with replacement pitched roof. This application affects the character & appearance of the Arundel Conservation Area & may affect the setting of listed buildings.	ApproveConditionally 03-03-21
AB/43/20/PL	Demolition of rear extension. This application affects the character & appearance of the Arundel Conservation Area & may affect the setting of listed buildings.	ApproveConditionally 14-07-20

REPRESENTATIONS

Arundel Town Council - No objection.

Conservation Area Advisory Committee - Noted that the use of UPVC rather than painted timber or powder coated aluminium is regrettable, however raised no objection given the siting of the extension at the rear.

No representations received from nearby occupiers.

CONSULTATIONS

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

Conservation Officer - The proposal is for a small-scale orangery extension to the rear of the property. Owing to its modest scale, form and location, the extension would sit comfortably within the site and would relate appropriately to the host building. It would have a neutral impact on the architectural interest of the property.

Whilst the use of uPVC would not normally be supported on heritage grounds, uPVC windows are already present throughout the building. Given that the extension is located to the rear of a non-listed property, and that the proposed windows would match those already within the building, there is insufficient justification to require timber windows in this instance. Consequently, no heritage objection is raised to the proposal.

The application is considered to not cause harm to the significance of the heritage assets. As a consequence, it should be determined in accordance with the relevant policies within the Development Plan, along with these comments. You will also need to take into account the contents of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

POLICY CONTEXT

Conservation Area.
Arun Valley Impact Zone.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

[Arun Local Plan 2011 - 2031:](#)

DDM1	D DM1 Aspects of form and design quality
DDM4	D DM4 Extensions and alter to exist builds (res and non-res)
HERDM1	HER DM1 Listed Buildings
HERDM3	HER DM3 Conservation Areas
HERSP1	HER SP1 The Historic Environment

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE:

SPD13	Arun District Design Guide (SPD) January 2021
-------	---

CONCLUSIONS

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

The site includes a detached, two storey cottage. The proposal is for a single storey, rear orangery extension. The site lies within the Arundel Conservation Area and is adjacent to listed buildings. The application follows a previous approval for a larger rear extension that appears not to have been implemented.

The proposed orangery would have a depth of 3.5m, exceeding, albeit marginally, Arun Design Guide (ADG) guidance of a maximum of 3.3m for detached dwellings. Given the previous, larger approval on

site and policy compliant resultant rear garden depth, the breach in ADG guidance would not result in harm to design or visual amenity.

The orangery would have a width of 4.5m, set in from the northern flank elevation by 0.5m. The bulk of the orangery would have a flat roof at a height of 2.8m. Inclusive of the roof lantern, however, the orangery would have a height of 3.2m. The roof lantern would be 2.5m x 2.5m, include a small opening and would be set centrally within the roof profile, in accordance with ADG guidance for roof lanterns / roof lights.

The use of quality materials should always be advocated for in conservation areas, however, the orangery would be constructed from UPVC. Whilst UPVC is not sympathetic to the broader character of the area, it is clear that efforts have been made to include positive design choices that complement the local vernacular. The brickwork chasing and woodfoil fascia perimeter combine to reduce any stark contrast between the host dwelling and extensive glazing proposed on the orangery. The windows will also include flush casements, sympathetic to the sensitive context of the site and locality.

The proposal is in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies D DM1 and D DM4 in regard to design and visual amenity.

NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

While extensive glazing is proposed, given that the orangery would be single storey, any views achievable would be of the rear garden only, resulting in no harm to neighbouring amenity by way of overlooking.

Part of the mature hedge would need to be removed to accommodate the extension. The hedge would screen half of the proposed orangery from the northern neighbours. The hedge would continue to function as the boundary treatment and is intended to sit flush with the flank of the orangery. It is noted that climbing plants are proposed on the exposed section of the northern flank, sympathetic to the existing boundary treatment.

The proposal accords with the 45-degree and 60-degree rules, as described by the ADG, and would be set lower than the existing boundary hedge. Given this, there would be no harm by way of overbearing or overshadowing.

The proposal is in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies D DM1 and D DM4 in regard to neighbouring residential amenity.

HERITAGE

The site is located within the Arundel Conservation Area as a result the proposal is considered under Arun Local Plan policies HER DM3 and HER SP1 and the National Planning Framework (NPPF). The site is adjacent to listed buildings, therefore ALP policy HER DM1 is also relevant.

White Cottage is an attractive two-storey detached dwelling. The building has white-painted elevations comprising a combination of painted brickwork and render beneath a pitched tiled roof. It contains replacement UPVC casement windows and fronts directly onto the road, with a wide frontage. Its simple vernacular form and strong relationship with the street contribute positively to the character and appearance of the road, giving the building a degree of local architectural interest.

The property has undergone alterations in recent years, including the removal of a substantial rear extension.

Policy HE5 of the NPPF (2026) states that development proposals affecting heritage assets should be

accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting) and of the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is necessary to understand the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The applicant has not satisfied this requirement in their brief Planning, Design and Heritage Statement. However, this requirement has been satisfied by the comments provided by the Conservation Officer.

Policy HE6 of the NPPF (2026) states when considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance.

Policy HE9 of the NPPF (2026) states development proposals within or affecting the significance of conservation areas should retain and conserve buildings and other features which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area where possible; and consider the area's special architectural or historic interest (as identified as part of the designation of the conservation area) in the design of development.

The proposed extension would not be viewable from the public realm. Regardless of this, the use of UPVC should not be supported in most cases for application in a conservation area, however given lack of visibility it is considered that the proposed orangery would have a neutral impact on the character and appearance of the Arundel Conservation Area. It should be noted that UPVC has been used on site already.

The choice of materials (discussed in the design section) are sensitive to the heritage context that the site sits within. In particular, the woodfoil fascia and brick chasing, avoiding the "bolt on" appearance that conservatory-style extensions can present.

The scale and siting of the proposed orangery would protect the original design of the dwelling, resulting in no harm to the significance of the conservation area.

In terms of the adjacent listed buildings, the mature screening on either side of the property, as well as its modest size, would not result in harm to the significance or setting of the adjacent listed buildings.

Given existing surrounding high boundary treatments, scale of development and material palette, the proposal would not result in harm to the character or setting of the conservation area or adjacent listed buildings. Therefore, the proposal would be in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies HER DM3, HER DM1 and HER SP1, and the NPPF (2026).

SUMMARY

The proposal is in accordance with relevant local plan policies and is therefore recommended for approval, subject to the following conditions and informatives.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

The Council in making a decision should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as Arun District Council to act in a manner, which is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights.

Consideration has been specifically given to Article 8 (right to respect private and family life) and Article 1

of the First Protocol (protection of property). It is not considered that the recommendation for approval of the grant of permission in this case interferes unreasonably with any local residents' right to respect for their private and family life and home, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest and the recommendation for approval is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.

DUTY UNDER THE EQUALITIES ACT 2010

In assessing this proposal the following impacts have been identified upon those people with the following protected characteristics (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation).

The proposal would have a neutral impact on the protected characteristics.

CIL DETAILS

This application is not CIL liable.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE CONDITIONALLY

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location Plan
Block Plan 10E
Proposed Floor Plan 04B
Proposed Rear Elevation 05B
Proposed Side Elevation 06B
Proposed Side Elevation 07B
Proposed Side Elevation 08B
Biodiversity Enhancement Statement
Ecology Appraisal
Design, Access and Heritage Statement

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of amenity and the environment in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies D DM1, D DM4, HER DM1 and HER DM3.

- 3 Based on the information available, this permission is exempt from the requirement to provide a biodiversity gain plan under Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The following exemption applies:

This planning permission is for development which is a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Reason: In accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 4 **INFORMATIVE:** Statement pursuant to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the NPPF.