

Recommendation Report for Planning Permission

REF NO: LU/234/25/PL

LOCATION: 5 Selborne Place
Selborne Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5NH

PROPOSAL: Single storey rear extension and alterations. This application affects the character and appearance of the Littlehampton Sea Front Conservation Area and is in CIL Zone 4 (Zero Rated) as other development.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Single storey rear extension.
SITE AREA	672 sqm.
TOPOGRAPHY	Predominantly flat.
TREES	None of any significance affected.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Brick/flint wall and fence.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Day nursery for pre-school children.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Predominately residential and a mix of flats (both purpose built and conversions) and large dwellinghouses. To the immediate east of a large bar/restaurant/club establishment.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

PAA/32/25/	Part single storey/part two storey rear extension and alterations.	Refuse Pre App 05-06-25
------------	--	----------------------------

REPRESENTATIONS

Littlehampton Town Council -

- Subject to support from the Conservation Officer, the committee had no objections to the application.
- It is encouraged that the applicant consider swift boxes, further increasing their biodiversity enhancements.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

Noted.

CONSULTATIONS

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

Environmental Health - No objection.

Arun Conservation Area Advisory Panel - Objection

- Both front and rear elevations of the buildings are important in that they are prominent in the Selborne Road and Irvine Road street scenes as a result of the Gothic Revival detailing. This makes a distinctly positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- The extension, which is basically a flat roofed box in form, will obliterate an important hood moulded Gothic Revival double arched window and door, and the lower part of what is currently an attractive two storey angled bay window. It has to be questionable whether any form of extension could be accommodated successfully in this particular location.
- The proposal by reason of its scale, form, design and siting will materially detract from the host building, and its important architectural features.

Conservation Officer - Less than substantial harm.

- 5 Selborne Place is one of six houses designed by renowned Victorian architect William White, adapting the Gothic Revival style for domestic use. Constructed in brown brick with tiled roofs and terracotta ridge, the property has three storeys plus attics, featuring three windows on the south elevation and irregular fenestration on the north (entrance) side. Staircases are at the entrance front, while the main rooms face south towards the sea.
- Like the other properties, it retains its original brick-walled service yard with an arched doorway and upper clay honeycomb walling. The north side (front) is enclosed by a low flint wall. The building is regarded as architecturally significant.
- The property is in a conservation area containing terraced and semi-detached houses that reflect the town's development as a seaside resort.
- The extension is a flat-roofed, box-like structure, and its design does not appear to respond to the distinctive character of the host building. It would compromise the clarity of the original rear elevation, requiring removal of the rear ground floor wall, which includes a hood-moulded Gothic Revival double-arched window and door, as well as the lower section of an attractive two-storey angled bay window. These elements contribute significantly to the building's architectural interest, and their loss would be harmful.
- The proposal should seek to enhance or better reveal the heritage asset's significance, for example through sympathetic joinery and design. This does not seem to have been addressed.
- While similar extensions exist nearby, such as at the rear of Nos. 3 and 4, they generally do not relate well to their host buildings.
- In this sensitive heritage setting, the extension would be visible from the rear road, creating a negative visual impact.
- The proposal would detract from the host building's architectural features and harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- The impact is considered to cause "less than substantial harm" in line with paragraph 215 of the NPPF (2024).

COMMENTS ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Comments noted.

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:
Built-up Area Boundary

Locally Listed Building

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)
HERDM3	HER DM3 Conservation Areas
HERDM2	HER DM2 Locally Listed Buildings or Structures of Character
QESP1	QE SP1 Quality of the Environment
TSP1	T SP1 Transport and Development
WDM2	W DM2 Flood Risk
WSP1	W SP1 Water

[Littlehampton Neighbourhood Plan 2014 Policy 1](#) The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Littlehampton Neighbourhood Plan 2014 Policy 17 Buildings and Structures of Character

Littlehampton Neighbourhood Plan 2014 Policy 2 A Spatial Plan for the Town

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE:

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

POLICY COMMENTARY

The Development Plan consists of the Arun Local Plan 2011 - 2031, West Sussex County Council's Waste and Minerals Plans, The South Inshore & South Offshore Marine Plan and Made Neighbourhood Development Plans. The policies are published under Regulations 19 and 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:-

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

The proposal is considered to comply with relevant Development Plan policies in that no harm to the character of the area is identified, no harm to the amenities of others is identified and the less than substantial harm identified to the Heritage Assets is outweighed by the public benefits.

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that

(2) in dealing with an application for planning permission the authority shall have regard to -
(a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,

(aza) a post examination draft neighbourhood development plan, so far as material to the application,
 (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
 (c) any other material considerations.

Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

"In considering whether to grant Listed Building Consent for any works, the Local Planning Authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

Where the building is located in a Conservation Area, Section 71(1) of the Act states:

In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a Conservation Area of any powers (under the Planning Acts), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

The proposal is considered to comply with these criteria in that it is not considered to materially affect the character or the setting of the Grade II Listed Building or the character of the Conservation Area.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

There are no other material considerations to be weighed in the balance with the Development Plan.

BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN

This application is not liable for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) as the proposal is considered de minimis due to the existing hard surfaces on site.

CONCLUSIONS

PRINCIPLE

The site is in the Built-up Area Boundary (BUAB) where Arun Local Plan (ALP) policy SD SP2 supports development subject to compliance with other policies in the Plan. The site is within a sustainable location close to the town centre.

Policy 1 of the Littlehampton Neighbourhood Development Plan (LNDP) states that permission should be granted where applications accord with the relevant policies in the Neighbourhood Plan. It goes on to set out circumstances where applications in conflict with policy 1 would be acceptable. Policy 2 of the LNDP seeks to focus development in the built up area boundary. The proposal would accord with these policies since the site is within the BUAB.

The principle of development is established.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

The site is a three-storey building along Selborne Road. The application seeks to construct a single storey rear extension with other minor fenestration alterations. The extension would be to the rear of the dwelling, however, given that there is a road (Irvine Road) to the rear of the site, views of the extension would be visible from the public realm.

The rear extension would measure 6m in depth and 8.5m in width at ground floor level. It would be constructed in brick and have a standard flat roof design. The height of the extension would be similar to the neighbouring flat roof structure, at approximately 3.3m.

The Arun Design Guide (ADG) states that 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. In terraced houses, single storey extensions should extend no more than 3m from the rear elevation of the original dwelling. While the property is not a terraced house, the context is similar.

In this case, the proposal does not accord with this guidance, as the rear extension is double the recommended depth at ground floor level. However, given that the neighbouring building features a rear extension of similar depth, on balance, the ground floor extension would be acceptable in terms of its depth.

The extension's visual appearance is simplistic and of standard design, which is at odds with the architectural style of the host building. The host property features a number of characterful elements, including gothic arched windows, scalloped tile hanging, and a double height bay window. As the extension is nearly full width, some of these features would, in part, be lost. Despite being at odds with the host building's appearance, the style of the rear extension is not incongruent within the setting of the BUAB, as the adjacent restaurant has a similar modern extension across the full width of its rear elevation.

Despite the acknowledged conflicts, given the context of the extension these are justifiable. The development is acceptable in terms of its design and character and in accordance with policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the ALP and Part M of the ADG.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The ADG states that extensions should not negatively impact, and instead protect neighbouring amenity in terms of privacy, consider the positioning of neighbouring buildings, and respond to existing elevations through the positioning of doors and windows.

At ground floor level, the fenestration within the rear elevation would have an outlook over the rear garden amenity and would not result in any overlooking to neighbouring properties.

Section M of the ADG states rear extensions should not negatively impact neighbouring amenity in terms of privacy and overshadowing by following the 45-degree, 60-degree and 25-degree rules. The single storey rear extension would be set in from the eastern and western side boundaries, and it would not extend beyond the existing rear elevation of the neighbour to the east. The rear extension complies with the 60-degree rule, and will not overshadow or be overbearing on either neighbour.

The development would not result in significant adverse overbearing or overshadowing impacts and is in accordance with policy D DM1 and D DM4 of the ALP and the ADG.

PARKING AND TRANSPORT

Policy T SP1 ensures development of the transport network so that it reduces the need for car travel, promotes green infrastructure, protects the major road network, maintains appropriate levels of parking standards and requires applications to consider and design for development in relation to transport infrastructure.

It is not proposed to increase the parking capacity on site. The site is served by a residential road with on street parking, and the building is in close proximity to the town centre. The development is conveniently located within an urban environment, such that many users would be expected to arrive by means other than private vehicles.

It is noted that the proposal will result in a small increase of 10 children attending. As this number would be spread across the week, there is not expected to be any significant negative impact arising from this,

especially given that there are few restrictions to parking in the area.

Given the use is as existing with only a small increase in users, the existing on-site parking and on-street capacity are acceptable. The proposal accords with ALP Policy T SP1.

HERITAGE

Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Paragraph 212 of the NPPF (2024) states that when considering the impact of a 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).

The site is in the Littlehampton Conservation Area and is a Building of Character. A Heritage Statement has been provided. This has identified and described the significance of the heritage assets affected which include Littlehampton Seafront Conservation Area, the setting of nos. 1 and 2 Selborne Place (Grade II Listed Building), and the setting of nos. 3 and 4 and no. 6 (Locally Listed Buildings; LLB). This accords with para 207 of the NPPF (2024).

In accordance with para 208 of the NPPF the Local Authority have identified the affected heritage assets (as above) and described their significance. The building is of architectural significance.

The extension, which is of a simple modern design will lead to the loss of various architectural features including the gothic style arches over door and windows at ground floor and the bay window which make a positive contribution to the architectural merit of the building. The proposed design has not effectively integrated with the host building. Views of the extension will be possible albeit limited from the highway running to the rear of the property. The loss of features and lack of visual integration has led to a level of harm occurring to the Conservation Area and setting of the Listed Building and Non-designated Heritage Assets. This harm can be described as less than substantial.

Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case, public benefits include retaining the property in use and economic benefits; both in the running of the business and the fact it allows parents to also work by providing needed nursery provision.

The the single-storey rear extension would result in less than substantial harm to the Building of Character and Conservation Area and public benefits have been identified which would outweigh this harm. As such, the development accords with policies HER DM2 and HER DM3 of the ALP and the NPPF (2024).

FLOOD RISK

Policy W SP1 of the Arun Local Plans seeks to ensure that new development encourages water efficiency, enhances the quality of water environments and makes effective use of surface water design.

The site lies in Flood Zones 3a but is at very low risk of surface water flooding. A small pocket of low surface water flood risk exists to the very front of site; this does not interact with the proposed extension. According to Annex 3 of the NPPF, the use is classified as 'more vulnerable'. Paragraph 003 of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that developments within Flood Zone 3 should be supported by a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). FRAs provide standardised information to assess current and future flood risk, potential increases in risk elsewhere, proposed mitigation measures, and, where necessary, justification through the sequential and exception tests.

The proposed extension's floor area is less than 250 square metres, exempting it from the sequential and exception tests. The development is for commercial use and falls to be assessed against the NPPG 'Preparing a flood risk assessment: standing advice - Advice for minor extensions'. An FRA addressing these points has been submitted.

Paragraph 181 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and footnote 63, stipulate that development should only be permitted where the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that flood risk will not be increased elsewhere, the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient, residual risks can be safely managed, and safe access and escape routes are provided. ALP policy W DM2 also requires a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment.

NPPF Paragraph 170 states that where development is necessary in areas at risk of flooding, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

Details have been provided to indicate that, taking defences into account, the site should not experience flooding until 2115 in the 0.5% Annual Event Probability (AEP) event; at that point, it would experience flood depths of approximately 570mm. As the lifespan or maintenance of flood defences cannot be guaranteed, we are required to assess the undefended levels. In a present day 0.5% AEP flood event, the site area would experience a flood level of 3.74m AOD. As the floor level is set above this, at 3.79m AOD, the building would remain dry. By 2070, the flood level (taking account of climate change) would rise to 4.35m AOD; this would result in flooding of the building by up to 560mm.

The site utilises the building as a whole; as such, there is good access to upper floors. These floors contain other nursery rooms and facilities, including toilets and a kitchen, meaning there would be no immediate danger in a flooding event. An emergency flood evacuation plan has been prepared, which includes signing up to the Flood Warning Service and provides details of where to go if evacuating the building.

Where floor levels cannot be raised (as in this case), a water exclusion strategy is suggested by the Environment Agency, along with resistance and resilience measures to enable the building to be brought back into use after a flood. The proposed exclusion strategy does not appear to have regard to the fact that most of the ground floor is existing, and some of the resilience measures would have little effect if flood waters could enter the building through other routes (such as alternative access points). In any case, where flood depths exceed 600mm, and without a structural engineer's design, it is not recommended to prevent flood water from entering a building, as this can cause greater structural damage due to pressure build up. Given that flooding levels are expected to be close to this threshold, allowing controlled flooding of the building is likely to be preferable.

Even when considering the levels for the undefended event in the year 2115, or when considering the less frequent but more severe 0.1% AEP event, flood levels would not breach the first floor level. Therefore, in any event, there would be safe refuge for users of the site.

The proposal is acceptable, will be safe for its lifetime and complies with ALP Policy W DM2 and relevant provisions of the NPPF and NPPG.

SUMMARY

The proposal is in general accordance with the Plan and is recommended for approval with 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

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 as other development.

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:
 1. Location and Block Plan 8400-P01 A
 2. Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans 8400-P02 A
 3. Proposed Second Floor and Roof Plans 8400-P03
 4. Proposed Rear Elevation 8400-P04
 5. Proposed Side Elevations 8400-P05
 6. Proposed Front Elevations 8400-P06
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of amenity and the environment in accordance with Arun Local Plan policy D DM1.
- 3 No development above damp-proof course (DPC) level shall take place unless and until a detailed colour schedule of materials and finishes to be used for external walls, roofs and windows of the proposed extension have been submitted to and approved in writing by the

Local Planning Authority and the materials so approved shall be used in the construction of the extension.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail in the interests of character and appearance of the heritage asset in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies D DM1, HER DM2 and HER DM3.

- 4 The development shall be carried out and managed in accordance with the submitted Floor Risk Assessment (Ref QFRA 2788 - 14/11/2025). In particular it should be ensured that the proposed floor level shall be set no lower than the existing ground floor level, the owners/occupants shall sign up to the Environment Agency's free Flood Warning Service in line with paragraph 6.3.1, and the development shall be managed in accordance with Appendix F - Flood Evacuation Plan. These flood mitigation measures shall be fully implemented and retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To protect the development and surrounding area from the risk of flooding in accordance with Arun Local Plan Policy W DM2.

- 5 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 within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the NPPF.