

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

REF NO: M/103/25/HH

LOCATION: 22 South Walk
Middleton-on-sea
PO22 7RN

PROPOSAL: Single storey front extension and alterations to fenestration, following demolition of existing conservatory.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION As above.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

M/2/01/	Single storey front extension to form a conservatory. Single storey rear extension to form a study. Single storey building to form a double garage and garden storage room.	ApproveConditionally 09-03-01
---------	--	----------------------------------

REPRESENTATIONS

Middleton Parish Council - No objection.

Middleton on Sea Association - No objection.

CONSULTATIONS**CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:**

Drainage Engineers - Objection.

0.General

0.1.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.No formal drainage strategy has been provided. As it is unclear how surface water will be drained, the proposal may not accord with the drainage hierarchy as outlined in Standard 1 of the NSfS. Given this uncertainty, we cannot ensure that flood risk on the site or elsewhere will not be increased. Therefore, we object to the proposal, as it has not been demonstrated that the surfacewater drainage for the carport will not increase flood risk. The submission of such evidence may have an impact on the size and scale of development.

1.2.The runoff destination for the proposed drainage strategy should comply with the hierarchy for sustainable drainage found in Standard 1, which can be summarised as follows:

- 1.Water reuse - not proposed but will not provide a full design solution and can be secured via condition.
- 2.Infiltration - may be viable but not investigated - see below.
- 3.To a watercourse - none available.
- 4.To a surface water sewer - a private surface water sewer can be found to the southwest in the highway, not investigated.
- 5.To a highway drainage system - none available.
- 6.To a combined sewer - none available.

1.3.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.

1.4.Infiltration viability can only be confirmed with site investigations, including groundwater monitoring and infiltration testing. Winter groundwater monitoring must be undertaken to confirm that a minimum of 1 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 Middleton 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.

1.5.If it is later demonstrated that infiltration is not viable, then the only option for surface water disposal that we are aware of is the private surface water sewer system. The applicant has not demonstrated that they have a right to connect to this system or provided any agreed discharge information.

1.6.Surface water must not be discharged into the foul sewer. Any historic connection to the foul sewer does not justify future connections, in fact the NSfS and the SuDS Manual do not recognise the foul sewer as a discharge location.

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. The site is within a local flood risk zone identified within the surface water management plan . The plan states that flood risk from pluvial water and public sewers is high. With flooding during times of prolonged rainfall at the lowest point at the northern part of West Close. Therefore, it is important to ensure that future development does not exacerbate this problem.

POLICY CONTEXT

Lidsey Local Flood Risk Zone.
Area of Character.

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)

HERDM4	HER DM4 Areas of Character
WDM1	W DM1 Water supply and quality
WDM3	W DM3 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

CONCLUSIONS**DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY**

The site comprises a two storey detached dwelling with a large outbuilding in the rear garden. The proposal is for a single storey front extension, to replace an existing rear conservatory, and amendments to fenestrations at the rear. The proposal would be visible from the street scene, albeit effectively screened by mature hedging. The site is within the Middleton-on-Sea Area of Character.

The single storey front extension would have a flat roof, at 3.3m high, 0.2m less than the existing conservatory. The extension would have a rooflight within the flat roof. The extension would be equal in width and depth to the existing conservatory and would mirror the form of the existing bay windows to create an octagonal shaped room. Full length windows are proposed to maintain the glazed frontage. The extension would be accessed via doors on the south elevation, rather than on the east elevation as existing. The extension would be constructed from painted rendered block work and would be a subservient addition to the host dwelling and in keeping with the varied character of the area.

Sliding doors are proposed at the rear, close to the western flank, to replace the existing patio doors and small window. A further door and window are proposed, closer to the eastern flank, in place of the window currently serving the ground floor. These amendments are necessary to accommodate the amended ground floor layout and would continue the open, glazed character established at the front of the host dwelling. The windows would be constructed from white UPVC, to match the existing.

The proposal would not harm the character, appearance or visual amenity of the area and is in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies D DM1 and D DM4.

NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The amendments to the proposed fenestration at the rear elevation are all at ground floor level and would not introduce any views that could not be achieved from the rear garden or existing fenestrations. The amended fenestration arrangement would have no harm to residential amenity.

The front extension would be set centrally on the front elevation in the same position as the existing conservatory and would not cause harm by way of overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies D DM1 and D DM4 in terms of neighbouring amenity.

HERITAGE

22 South Walk sits within the Middleton-On-Sea Estate Area of Character (AOC), which is a non-designated heritage asset. The dwellings and street scenes on the South Walk, West Close and East Close part of the AOC are described as having large plots with well maintained lawn frontages and mature shrubs and trees. The streets are attractive with a low density layout with a wide variation in design. However, the majority of buildings are of a low aspect ratio, broad and low rather than narrow and tall. Each property has an individual character but incorporates similar height and dimension

characteristics.

The proposal would not detract from the host dwellings character and would continue to contribute to varied design in the AOC. The extension would not increase the massing of the dwelling, nor would it result in a reduced front amenity area.

The proposal is therefore in accordance with Arun Local Plan policy HER DM4.

LOCAL LIDSEY FLOOD RISK ZONE

The site is located within a Local Lidsey Flood Risk Area, which warranted a consultation with the Drainage Engineers.

The drainage engineers have objected on the grounds that no surface water runoff location has been provided, as required by Standard 1 of the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS (NSfS).

In this instance, the extension would be constructed over an area of existing hard standing (replacing an existing conservatory) and would not result in an increase in impermeable or hard surfaces within the application site.

The proposed development would not result in an increase in the risk of flooding elsewhere and is in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies W DM1 and W DM3.

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:

- Location and Site Plan 460/01.
- Proposed Ground Floor and Roof Plan 460/04.
- Proposed Elevations 460/05.
- Heritage Statement.
- Flood Risk Assessment.

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