

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

REF NO: CM/29/25/HH

LOCATION: 2 Rose Cottages
Climping Street
Climping
BN17 5RH

PROPOSAL: Part single, part two storey side and single storey rear extensions and creation of a drive, following demolition of existing extensions. This application may affect the setting of a Grade II Listed Building.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION As above.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

CM/45/24/HH	Part single, part two storey side and single storey rear extensions. Creation of a drive following demolition of existing extensions.	Refused 29-01-25
CM/9/14/HH	Two storey side and rear extension	ApproveConditionally 28-05-14

REPRESENTATIONS

Climping Parish Council - No Objection.

No representations were received from nearby occupiers.

CONSULTATIONS

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

WSCC HIGHWAYS (LHA) - No Objection

The LHA does not consider this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal. If the LPA are minded to approve the application, the following condition and informative should be applied.

ADC ENGINEERS- Objection summarized below.

The applicant has not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate the development would not increase flood risk. The submission relies on existing informal drainage arrangements, assumed to discharge to ground, but this has not been proven. No winter groundwater monitoring or infiltration testing has been carried out, and the historic borehole log provided is inadequate. If infiltration is not viable, no alternative drainage solution has been identified, despite the presence of a public surface water sewer nearby.

No modelling or supporting evidence has been submitted to address extreme rainfall or future flood risk under climate change scenarios. Other standards relating to interception, water quality, amenity, biodiversity, and maintenance have not been met, but these could generally be secured by condition without affecting the layout. However, the lack of a robust drainage strategy means the application does not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems.

POLICY CONTEXT

Within an area with potentially high groundwater levels.

Lidsey Treatment Catchment.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

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

DDM1	D DM1 Aspects of form and design quality
DDM4	D DM4 Extensions&alter to exist builds(res and non-res)
WDM2	W DM2 Flood Risk
WDM3	W DM3 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems
TSP1	T SP1 Transport and Development

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE:

SPD13	Arun District Design Guide (SPD) January 2021
SPD11	Arun Parking Standards 2020

CONCLUSIONS

SITE HISTORY

CM/45/24/HH - sought permission for a part single, part two storey side and single storey rear extensions. The works were the same as those in the current application. The application was refused on the grounds that insufficient information had been provided to demonstrate that the site could drain sustainably. It was recommended that winter groundwater monitoring be undertaken and that alternative solutions for connecting surface water be investigated.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

The site is a semi-detached dwelling along Climping Street and features a large side (south) garden amenity. The application seeks permission for the construction of a part single, part two storey side and single storey rear extensions. Additionally, a driveway is proposed to southern boundary with two parking bays, following demolition of existing extensions.

The works would add significant bulk to the dwelling, especially to the rear (east) and side (south) of the property. To the side (south), a porch and dining area are proposed following demolition of an existing porch area. These works would be visible in the street scene. The porch would be a single storey structure with a pitched roof, set back 8.4m from the street (Climping Street). The porch would measure 1.5m in depth by 2.1m in width and it would be set back from the front building elevation line and is acceptable. To the rear (east) of the porch a two-storey side extension is proposed, extending in line with the rear elevation of the dwelling.

Following the demolition of the single storey side extension, a two-storey side extension measuring 4.5m in depth and 3.7m in width is proposed. The total height would be approx. 6.4m and the eaves height would measure approx. 5m. The extension would extend from the south elevation and it would be visible from the street scene. Although the extension would alter the appearance and massing of the building, this would not be unduly harmful to the visual amenity of the property and the wider street scene. The proposed two storey side extension would adjoin the front porch and rear extension creating a wraparound extension to the south flank elevation. The side extension would feature a pitched roof at first floor level, adjoining the ridge height of the extension and it would be set down from the main ridge height of the dwelling. The extension would appear well integrated to the main dwelling in accordance with Arun Local Plan (ALP) policy D DM4. The materials would match the existing helping to integrate the extension with the main dwelling.

According to the Arun Design Guide (ADG), side extensions should respond to building design in terms of roof pitch and use complementary and integrated materials and elevational design. Although large in scale, the proposed extension would not unduly obtrude on the dwelling, and it would integrate well with the existing. It would retain the character of the property by featuring similar materials to existing and of the locality, and it would not appear adversely out of place within its context.

The single storey rear extension would adjoin the two-storey side extension to the rear (east). The extension would have a depth of approx. 1.2m and a width of approx. 5m. The extension would have a flat roof form with a maximum height of 2.8m. Fenestration is proposed within the rear elevation of the extension, and a rooflight is proposed within the flat roof. The ADG states rear extensions should respond to the distinctive characteristics of the building and surrounding area, preserve external garden amenity space and exploit opportunities for innovative and contemporary design where appropriate. Rear extensions which project up to 3.3m are generally acceptable. The proposed rear extension complies with the ADG.

Overall, the footprint of the main dwelling would increase as a result of the development, however, the increase mostly occurs to the south and east (side and rear) of the dwelling, and it is noted that the adjoining neighbour has implemented extensions of a similar scale. The alterations to the roof and footprint of the dwelling are acceptable in terms of scale and massing and would not adversely impact upon the street scene, given the presence of high-level boundary treatment and hedging to the front and side of the dwelling. The proposal is in accordance with ALP policies D DM1 and D DM4.

The proposal would not result in harm upon the character of the area and is in accordance with ALP policies D DM1 and D DM4.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

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

Given the siting of the single storey side extension to the southern flank of the host dwelling, and that

there are no immediate neighbours to the south, the extension would not result in any overshadowing or overbearing impacts to neighbouring properties. A door is proposed within the front (west) elevation, and this opening would primarily have an outlook of the front amenity space and would not give rise to any adverse impacts by way of overlooking.

The two storey side extension would extend the built form to the south. The fenestration within the two-storey side extension would mainly have an outlook of the large side amenity space (approx. 13.8m) and would not give rise to any adverse impacts by way of overlooking. The new first-floor windows of the two-storey side extension would have an outlook of the rear, front and side amenity space, these also would not give rise to any adverse impacts by way of overlooking due to proposed location of the extension that would mainly have an outlook of the road to front (west), garden amenity to the side (south) and farm land to rear (east).

The rear extension would extend close to the rear boundary wall of the application site and would result in some impact to the neighbouring amenity in terms of overshadowing, however given the presence of a boundary fence, this impact is limited. The window proposed to the rear (east) elevation have an outlook of the rear amenity. The extension would overall not give rise to harmful overlooking effects.

The proposal is in accordance with ALP policies D DM1 and D DM4 in that it would not result in harmful overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing effects on neighbouring properties.

WSCC HIGHWAYS

WSCC Highways have raised no objections. The Highways Officer confirmed the proposed driveway would be of suitable size to accommodate two off-street parking spaces. Although on-site turning cannot be achieved, it is not anticipated that this would result in adverse highway safety impacts. This is due to the demonstrated adequate vehicular visibility and the fact that Climping Street benefits from good forward visibility at this location. WSCC Highways have recommended the inclusion of a condition requiring details of visibility splays to be submitted and approved to ensure road safety.

The applicant is advised that a separate application for a crossover licence must be submitted to WSCC prior to the commencement of works as part of any subsequent planning application.

PARKING

The proposed development would result in an increase in off-site parking provision, thereby reducing reliance on on-street parking. The proposal would not result in any harm to highway safety, and the proposal is acceptable in accordance with policy T SP1 of the Arun Local Plan and the Arun Parking Standards SPD.

FLOOD RISK

The site is in the Lidsey Wastewater Treatment Catchment Area which is the subject of a surface water management plan. It is noted that the Drainage Engineers raised an objection to the proposed development.

The public sewer in the Lidsey Wastewater Treatment Catchment Area has a history of flooding and any surface water added to this system should be assumed to increase flood risk.

No site-specific groundwater monitoring has been submitted to demonstrate that infiltration would be feasible in this area. To achieve an infiltration design, winter groundwater levels must be monitored to ensure that 1m of unsaturated ground is allowed for between the base of the soakaway or infiltration structure and the peak groundwater level.

It is proposed to drain the surface water via existing means which is assumed to drain directly to the

ground. Despite infiltration to the ground is the highest priority discharge location as required by Standard 1 of the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS (NSfS) (after water re-use), this would represent an informal arrangement which remains unproven. As insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate how the applicant intends to drain surface water, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) cannot assess if flood risk will be increased by the development. This application is contrary to the NPPF (2024).

There is a surface water sewer on the opposite side of Climping Street which the applicant could investigate connecting surface water to if an infiltration solution is not viable. The applicant would need to evidence that there is capacity in the sewer to receive the additional flow, that a gravity connection to it could be achieved, and that permission from Southern Water and third-party landowners can be obtained to allow the connection. No information regarding this option has been submitted, therefore, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) cannot assess if flood risk will be increased by the proposed development. Therefore, this application is contrary to the NPPF (2024).

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 (2024).

SUMMARY

The proposed development is contrary to ALP policies W DM2 and W DM3 and with the NPPF, as such is 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, and insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the site drains sustainably, thus insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the development would not increase flood risk elsewhere. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Arun Local Plan policies W DM2 and W DM3 and the NPPF (2024).
- 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. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.