

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

REF NO: CM/41/25/HH

LOCATION: Mead Cottage
Climping Street
Climping
BN17 5RQ

PROPOSAL: Single storey rear extension, replacement of balcony, and alterations to fenestration. This application may affect the setting of Grade II Listed Buildings.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above.
----------------------------	-----------

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

CM/18/24/S73	Variation of condition following the approval of CM/47/23/HH relating to condition 2 - approved plans.	ApproveConditionally 16-07-24
CM/47/23/HH	Demolition of existing outbuilding and construction of annexe accommodation for use in connection with Mead Cottage, including widening of existing access and installation of replacement gate. Resubmission of CM/35/23/HH.	ApproveConditionally 14-02-24
CM/35/23/HH	Demolition of existing outbuilding and construction of annexe accommodation for use in connection with Mead Cottage.	Refused 04-12-23
CM/27/23/CLE	Lawful development certificate for existing change of use of agricultural land to garden land.	Approve 11-07-23

REPRESENTATIONS

Climping Parish Council - No response received.

No representations received from nearby occupiers.

CONSULTATIONS

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:**DRAINAGE ENGINEERS - Objection.**

1.Runoff destination.

3.Extreme Rainfall and Flooding.

0.General

Insufficient information regarding surface water drainage has been submitted to evidence that flood risk will not be increased as due to the proposed development.

1.Runoff destination

1.1.It is proposed to drain surface water via infiltration into an existing soakaway (assuming that it has sufficient capacity). Although infiltration is the highest-priority discharge option, as required by Standard 1 of the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS (NSfS) (after water re-use), neither infiltration nor the capacity of the existing soakaway has been investigated or demonstrated to be viable. As insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate how the applicant intends to drain surface water, we are unable to assess whether the proposed development would increase flood risk. It is the responsibility of the applicant or their drainage designer to provide this evidence. For this reason, we object to the proposal, as the submission of such evidence may affect the scale and layout of the development.

1.2.To support an infiltration-based design, winter groundwater monitoring must be undertaken to confirm that a minimum of one metre of unsaturated ground can be maintained between the base of the soakaway or infiltration structure and the peak groundwater level. Ground conditions and infiltration potential in Climping are highly variable. While infiltration may be feasible in some areas, others experience high groundwater levels or poor infiltration rates that render it unviable. This must be robustly demonstrated by the applicant by undertaking winter infiltration testing at the depth and location of any proposed infiltration features, providing one metre freeboard is achievable. To aid the SuDS design, further information can be found at <https://www.arun.gov.uk/surfacewater/>.

1.3.If infiltration is not viable, then alternative sustainable means of draining the site are summarised as follows:

1.Water reuse - not proposed but will not provide a full design solution and can be secured via condition.

2.Infiltration - not investigated.

2.To a watercourse - none available.

3.To a surface water sewer - available within highway, no details provided.

4.To a highway drainage system - none available according to our records.

5.To a combined sewer - none available.

1.4.It is essential that each discharge destination is considered in strict priority order, with higher priority options fully explored and demonstrably exhausted before progressing to lower priority alternatives. Robust evidence must be provided to discount a higher priority destination.

1.5.There is a public surface water sewer located within the highway. No information regarding this option has been submitted. If infiltration is not viable, the applicant would need to investigate the possibility of connecting surface water to the sewer at the front of the site.

1.6.It is demonstrated that if infiltration is later found not to be viable, then the applicant has not submitted a compliant alternative disposal destination for surface water.

1.7.The application site is in the Lidsey Wastewater Treatment Catchment Area. This catchment is the subject of a surface water management plan due in part to the recognised history of foul sewer flooding.

3.Extreme rainfall and flooding

3.1.The site is at future risk of flooding, being within Flood Zone 3a by 2111. The source of flood risk has not been identified, although it is acknowledged that it is likely to arise from tidal sources. It is the applicant's responsibility to provide further details in this regard. Should it be demonstrated that the site is solely at risk of tidal flooding, the implementation of SuDS would remain a viable design option. The northern half of the site is also at high risk of surface water flooding. This may need to be addressed within the surface water drainage design if it is found that surface water from elsewhere would flow to this area. The design must either account for additional surface water volumes entering the site from elsewhere or ensure that no SuDS features are located in this area and that ground levels are not altered. For further guidance, please refer to our SuDS in Flood Areas document available online at www.arun.gov.uk/surfacewater.

3.2.At present, no modelling or supporting evidence; such as ground investigations, drainage plans or product 4 data have been submitted for engineering assessment. In the absence this evidence, we cannot assess if flood risk will be increased by the surface water drainage of the proposed development. Therefore, this application does not accord with the NPPF as set out above.

POLICY CONTEXT

Outside Built-Up Area.

Within an area with potentially high ground water.

Lidsey Treatment Catchment Area.

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)
HERSP1	HER SP1 The Historic Environment
HERDM1	HER DM1 Listed Buildings
WDM1	W DM1 Water supply and quality
WDM3	W DM3 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems

[Clymping Neighbourhood Plan 2015 Policy CPN11](#) Quality of Design

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 is a detached two storey dwelling located at Mead Cottage, Climping Street. This application

seeks planning permission for the construction of single storey rear extension, a replacement balcony, and alterations to fenestration.

The proposed development is sited within a rural area with a wide variety of detached dwellings. The proposed design of the extension would be in keeping with the established varying character of the area and would not be visible from the street scene as it would be sited to the rear of the host dwelling.

The proposed single storey rear extension and replacement balcony would have a width of 7.7m and a depth of 4m. It is noted that the depth of the rear extension would exceed the 3.3m guidance depth for rear extensions to detached dwellings outlined within the Arun Design Guide (ADG). However, given the rear siting of the proposal, and the spacing maintained between the proposed extension and the neighbouring dwellings the increased depth of approximate 0.7m from the existing deepest part of the rear elevation, the proposed rear extension would not result in harm to visual amenity.

The mono-pitched roof would have a maximum height of 3.7m and an eaves height of 2.3m and would form the replacement rear balcony at first floor level. The balcony would be finished with a timber balustrade along the side, with the roof providing a balustrade to the rear.

Fenestration to the rear (south west) elevation at ground level would be a five-casement window and a two-casement double glazed door. Fenestration at first-floor level would remain unchanged. Fenestration on the side (south east) elevation would be a three-casement window and the repositioning of a two-casement double glazed door. On the north flank of the front (north east) elevation the two-casement first floor window would be removed and the opening adjusted to install a new window to match the master bedroom. This would be visible to the street scene.

The proposed development would be finished with materials to match the existing which would ensure the proposal integrates appropriately with the host dwelling and would not harm the character of the area, in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies D DM1 and D DM4, the ADG and Clymping Neighbourhood Plan (CNP) policy 11.

NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The proposed single storey rear extension and replacement balcony would be set in approximately 8.7m from the south eastern side boundary, set in approximately 58.2m from the south western rear boundary and set in approximately 22.2m from the north western side boundary. Given the large separation distances between the proposal and neighbouring dwellings, the proposed extension and replacement balcony would not result in harm to neighbouring residential amenity by way of overshadowing or overbearing impacts.

The alterations to fenestration on the front (north east) elevation would retain its existing position and approximate size, ensuring the outlook and spatial relationship with neighbouring dwellings would remain unchanged. On the rear (south west) and side (south east) elevations, the proposed fenestration, including the proposed replacement balcony, would have an outlook of the host dwelling's rear amenity and would not cause harm by way of overlooking to the neighbouring dwellings.

The proposed development would not result in harm to neighbouring residential amenity by way of overbearing, overshadowing, or overlooking. The proposed development is therefore in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies D DM1 and D DM4 and the ADG.

LIDSEY TREATMENT CATCHMENT AREA

The application site is located within the Lidsey Treatment Catchment Area, where the management of surface water drainage is a consideration in reducing flood risk in the locality. The Drainage Engineers objection is noted and that the proposal is not compliant with national standards (Standard 1 of the

NSfS). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that although the proposal would result in an increase in the footprint of the dwelling, it would extend over existing impermeable hard surfaces to the rear of the host dwelling. Therefore, the proposal would not result in an increase to the impermeable areas within the application site and on balance, the proposed development would be acceptable in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies W DM1 and W DM3.

HERITAGE

The host property is sited adjacent to Grade II Listed Buildings and as such, the proposal may affect the setting of Grade II Listed Buildings. Therefore, the proposal needs consideration under Arun Local Plan policies HER DM1 and HER SP1 and the National Planning Framework (NPPF).

Paragraph 207 of the NPPF (2024), states when determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. A heritage statement was not submitted with the application however the application outlines the proposed materials would match the existing to avoid harm to the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Paragraph 212 of the NPPF (2024), states when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great 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 harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

The proposed single storey rear extension, replacement balcony, and alterations to fenestration would be suitable in design, form, scale, colour, and appearance. The use of materials to match the existing would ensure the proposal integrates well with, and is sympathetic to, the host dwelling and its setting. Furthermore, given the large separation distances between the proposal and the neighbouring dwellings, the proposed development would not result in harm to the setting of nearby Grade II Listed Buildings and is in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies HER DM1 and HER SP1.

SUMMARY

The proposed development is in accordance with relevant development plan policies and is 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:

Site Plan, Location Plan & Proposed North-East Elevation - 01 Revision A.
Proposed Elevations and Floor Plans - 02 Revision C.

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

- 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.