

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

REF NO: CM/16/26/HH

LOCATION: 3 New Thatched Cottages
Climping Street
Climping
BN17 5RJ

PROPOSAL: Construction of detached garage/workshop with studio over.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION As above.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

CM/35/25/HH	Proposed rear porch.	ApproveConditionally 19-11-25
CM/16/25/CLP	Lawful development certificate for a proposed single storey side extension.	PP Not Required 04-06-25
CM/40/24/HH	Proposed side extension and detached garage/workshop with studio over.	Refused 09-01-25

REPRESENTATIONS

Clymping Parish Council: Objection on the basis of;

- Visual impact would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- The development would disrupt the established character of the street scene.
- The proposal would fail to relate sympathetically to its own and neighbouring properties and would erode the visual harmony and sense of place of the surrounding area.
- The development and proposed finishing material would have a harmful visual impact from surrounding street and neighbouring properties.
- The building would become an unduly dominant and intrusive feature, appearing out of character and affecting the visual amenity of the area.
- Drainage Concerns were also raised regarding the adequacy of the proposed drainage provision, with questions raised as to whether it would be sufficient to meet the needs of the development.

1 No. letter of objection received:

- Overlooking.
- Block views.
- Urbanisation of countryside location.

CONSULTATIONS

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

SOUTHERN WATER: Not within Southern Water's statutory area for water supply. Please contact Portsmouth Water who are the relevant statutory undertaker.

No new soakaways should be located within 5m of a public or adoptable gravity sewer, rising main or water main. No Soakaways should be connected to the public surface water sewer.

Hierarchy of Building Regulations H3 for disposal of surface water - not yet provided documentation proving compliance. Southern Water would encourage the consideration of reuse for new developments. Proposed works involve demolition: In order to protect and safeguard the existing water supply apparatus, requests formal notification of demolition works prior to such works being undertaken.

DRAINAGE ENGINEERS: Objection on the grounds of runoff destination and extreme rainfall and flooding on the basis of insufficient information regarding surface water drainage has been submitted to evidence that flood risk will not be increased as due to the proposed development. In the absence this evidence, we cannot assess if flood risk will be increased by the surface water drainage of the proposed development.

Further evidence was submitted by the agent and Drainage Engineers reconsulted.

An objection was retained regarding extreme rainfall and flooding. Stating Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should ideally be entirely within areas of Flood Zone 1 (FZ1) to avoid any interaction with areas identified as being at future risk of flooding. Product 4 data has been provided, indicating that approximately half of the site (to the west) will be at future risk of flooding from tidal sources during the 0.5% AEP event. The peak flood level is predicted to be 4.94 mAOD, which would result in flood depths across the site of between 2 cm and 9 cm. As the source and level of flooding has been evidenced, the proposed SuDS design is considered acceptable in this instance.

The proposed finished floor level shown on the plans is 5.15 mAOD. This is only slightly above the predicted flood level. The Environment Agency should be consulted in this respect.

Storm calculations provided have not modelled the 1 in 2-year (50% AEP) event.

A contributing area plan should be provided showing all positively drained areas including open surface water storage plan areas. Urban creep at a rate of 10% is required to be applied to residential roof areas is required.

POLICY CONTEXT

Lidsey Treatment Catchment
 Prone to Groundwater Flooding
 Flood Zones plus Climate Change (2070-2125)
 Outside Built-Up Area
 2km Buffer for Site of Special Scientific Interest
 CIL Zone 5

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIESArun Local Plan 2011 - 2031:

WDM2	W DM2 Flood Risk
WDM3	W DM3 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems
DDM1	D DM1 Aspects of form and design quality
DDM4	D DM4 Extensions and alter to exist builds (res and non-res)

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**BACKGROUND**

CM/40/24/HH sought permission for a single-storey side extension and detached garage. The garage details are the same as those proposed under this application. The application was refused on the grounds that insufficient information had been provided to demonstrate that the site could drain sustainably. The single-storey side extension was achieved under permitted development.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

The site comprises an end-of-terrace thatched dwelling at 3 New Thatched Cottages, Climping Street. This application seeks planning permission for the construction of a detached two-storey garage and workshop, with studio space above, following the demolition of the existing shed.

The proposed two-storey workshop and garage would be located in the south-eastern corner of the site and would be visible within the street scene. However, views would be partly screened by hedging and vegetation along the front southern boundary, as well as by its position at the end of the terrace. The outbuilding would measure 6.1m in depth by 6.1m in width, with a maximum height of 5.7m. At ground-floor level, it would provide space for two vehicles. The proposed staircase on the north elevation would lead to the first floor and would be positioned so that it would not be readily visible from the street scene.

Two front dormers would be inserted within the front western roof slope of the outbuilding and would be visible from the street scene. The dormers would be proportionately positioned within the roof plane and would each measure 1.6m in width, 2.3m in depth and 2.3m in height. They would sit below the roof ridge and maintain an overall symmetrical appearance. The dormer walls would be clad in black softwood featheredge weatherboarding, with clay tiles to the roofs. The windows would be white timber casements.

Part M of the Arun Design Guide (ADG) requires front dormers to be centrally located and designed so that they do not harm the original character and appearance of the building or its surrounding area. Although front dormers are not characteristic of the host dwelling or neighbouring dwellings, the proposed dormers would be positioned at first-floor level and would be proportionate in scale and balanced in appearance. As such, they would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene. On balance, the visual impact is considered acceptable.

The rear dormer would be larger in scale, measuring 2.3m in width, 2.3m in depth and 2.9m in height. However, given its rear-facing position and the fact that it would not be visible from the street scene, it would appear as a subordinate addition to the roof slope of the outbuilding and would not result in harm in this regard.

Overall, the development would not harm the character or visual amenity of the property or the surrounding area, in accordance with Arun Local Plan (ALP) policies D DM1 and D DM4 and the Arun Design Guide (ADG).

NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Part M of the ADG states that householder extensions should protect neighbouring amenity in terms of privacy and overshadowing, considering the positioning of neighbouring buildings, and should respond to existing elevations through the size and positioning of doors and windows.

Given the siting of the outbuilding in the south-eastern corner of the site, and the 17m separation retained between the outbuilding and the closest neighbouring property, the development would not appear overbearing or result in overshadowing of neighbouring properties.

The introduction of first-floor windows within the outbuilding would provide an outlook over the front driveway and rear garden of the property. Some views would be obtained beyond the site towards the front of Nos. 1 and 2 New Thatched Cottages; however, given the minimum separation distance of 17m, this would not result in harmful overlooking. The rear dormer would not result in overlooking of neighbouring dwellings due to its siting and orientation.

The proposal would not give rise to overshadowing, overbearing, or overlooking effects that would affect residential amenity, and is in accordance with ALP policies D DM1 and D DM4 and Part M of the ADG.

DRAINAGE

The site is within the Lidsey Wastewater Treatment Catchment Area. This catchment is subject to a surface water management plan, due in part to the recognised history of foul sewer flooding. Any surface water added to this system should therefore be assumed to increase flood risk.

Section F7 of the NPPF (2026) states that development proposals should not present a risk from flooding to potential occupiers, users, or visitors, and should not increase flood risk elsewhere. Where development is proposed in a location known to be at risk from any form of flooding, now or in the future, it should be refused unless: a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons which justify a different arrangement; b) the development will be safe throughout its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users; c) any residual risk can be safely managed, and safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan; d) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment; and e) it can be demonstrated that flood risk will not be increased elsewhere.

ADC Drainage Engineers were consulted and their response refers to paragraphs 181, 182 and 187(e) of the NPPF (2024). Following the recent updates to national policy, the application has been considered and assessed against the NPPF (2026). The Drainage Engineers objected to the proposal on the basis that insufficient evidence had been provided in relation to the destination of surface water runoff as well as extreme rainfall and flooding.

Following the submission of further drainage details that were excluded from the initial submission, the Drainage Engineers were reconsulted and maintained their objection to the proposal in relation to extreme rainfall and flooding.

Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should ideally be entirely in areas of Flood Zone 1 (FZ1) to avoid any interaction with areas identified as being at future risk of flooding. Product 4 data has been provided, indicating that approximately half of the site (to the west) will be at future risk of flooding from tidal sources during the 0.5% AEP event. The peak flood level is predicted to be 4.94 mAOD, which would result in flood depths across the site of between 2 cm and 9 cm. As the source and level of flooding has been evidenced, the proposed SuDS design is considered acceptable in this instance.

The proposed finished floor level shown on the plans is 5.15 mAOD. This is only slightly above the predicted flood level. The Environment Agency should be consulted in this respect. Storm calculations provided have not modelled the 1 in 2-year (50% AEP) event. A contributing area plan should be provided showing all positively drained areas including open surface water storage plan areas. Urban creep at a rate of 10% is required to be applied to residential roof areas is required.

While it is acknowledged the outbuilding would be partially built over existing hardstanding, there is no permitted development fallback, as the outbuilding is forward of the principal elevation of the dwelling. As insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate how the applicant intends to drain surface water, the application is contrary to the NPPF (2026). The imposition of conditions rather than overcoming the objection could result in a circumstance where the condition cannot be discharged.

The proposal is contrary to ALP policies W DM2 and W DM3 as the site lies in the Lidsey Treatment Catchment and insufficient information has been provided to ensure that the site drains sustainably. There is insufficient information to prove that the development will not increase flood risk elsewhere, contrary to the NPPF (2026).

SUMMARY

The proposed development is contrary to ALP policies W DM2 and W DM3 and the NPPF (2026) and is therefore recommended for refusal.

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), Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). It is not considered that the recommendation for refusal of permission in this case interferes with applicant's right to respect for their private and family life and their home, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of neighbours). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest and the recommendation for refusal 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**REFUSE**

- 1 The site lies within the Lidsey Treatment Catchment, insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the site would drain sustainably or that the proposed development would not increase flood risk elsewhere. The proposed development is contrary to Arun Local Plan policies W DM2 and W DM3 and the NPPF (2026).
- 2 **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 identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.