

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

REF NO: M/42/26/HH

LOCATION: 2 Old Point
Middleton-on-sea
PO22 7RY

PROPOSAL: First floor rear extension, single storey side extensions and an additional 3 No. roof dormers.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION As above.

REPRESENTATIONS

Middleton Parish Council - No objection.

Middleton-on-Sea Association - No objection.

CONSULTATIONS

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

Engineers (Drainage) - Objection raised in relation to runoff destination and extreme rainfall and flooding.

POLICY CONTEXT

Areas of Character - Middleton-on-Sea Estate
Built-Up Area Boundary.
Lidsey Flood Risk Zone.

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)
WDM1	W DM1 Water supply and quality
WDM2	W DM2 Flood Risk
HERSP1	HER SP1 The Historic Environment
HERDM4	HER DM4 Areas of Character

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
------	------------------------------------

SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE:

SPD13 Arun District Design Guide (SPD) January 2021

SPD7 Middleton on Sea Village Design Statement

CONCLUSIONS**DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY**

The site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling. Planning permission is sought for the construction of two single-storey side extensions, a first-floor extension, associated dormer windows, and fenestration alterations.

A single-storey side extension is proposed to the western flank elevation, replacing the existing conservatory. The extension would measure approximately 3m in width and 5m in depth and would incorporate a flat roof with a maximum height of approximately 3.8m, including the proposed rooflight. External materials would comprise white render to match the existing dwelling. Fenestration would consist of three-pane windows within the front and rear elevations, a glazed patio door flanked by casement windows, and a lantern rooflight within the flat roof section.

The extension would be visible within the street scene and would be set back approximately 2.8m from the principal elevation, exceeding the Arun Design Guide (ADG) recommendation of a 1m to 1.5m setback. Due to the flat roof form, it would be set down by more than 0.5m from the existing ridge height, in accordance with ADG guidance. It would be modest in scale, would replace the existing conservatory, and due to its setback siting, the extension would appear subordinate to the host dwelling.

A further single-storey extension is proposed to the eastern side of the dwelling, adjoining the existing garage following the demolition of an existing outbuilding in a broadly similar location. The extension would measure approximately 7.5m in width and 3.4m in depth and would incorporate a hipped roof form with a maximum height of approximately 5.1m and an eaves height of 3m. The extension would be finished in white render to match the host dwelling. Fenestration would comprise a patio door flanked by two two-pane windows.

Although visible from the street scene, the extension would be positioned approximately 11m behind the principal elevation, substantially exceeding the ADG recommendation for side extension setbacks. The proposed roof form and detailing would reflect those of the existing dwelling and the ridge height would remain lower than the existing house in accordance with ADG. Due to the width, the extension would not appear as a wholly subservient addition, however it would occupy a position broadly comparable to that of the existing outbuilding and would therefore not appear incongruous or out of character within the street scene in accordance with Arun Local Plan (ALP) policy D DM4 (a).

The proposal also includes a first-floor rear extension. The existing hipped roof would be extended southwards, partially over the existing garage, in order to enlarge an existing bedroom and provide an en-suite bathroom. The extension would project approximately 2.5m beyond the existing rear elevation whilst maintaining the existing width of approximately 4.9m. The existing ridge height of approximately 7.3m would be retained. In addition, a false crown roof is proposed above the remaining garage section, replacing the existing flat roof. This alteration would create a more cohesive roofscape and would integrate appropriately with the existing dwelling.

Three dormer windows are also proposed, comprising two within the front (north) roof slope and one within the side elevation serving the first-floor extension. The dormers would each measure approximately 1.6m in width and 1.5m in depth and would incorporate hipped roofs with an overall height

of approximately 2.3m. The dormers would represent modest additions within the roof plane, would be evenly and symmetrically positioned, and would reflect the design of the existing dormer on the western elevation. As such, they would not appear visually dominant or out of keeping with the character of the dwelling, in accordance with the ADG.

Additional alterations include the installation of a four-pane first-floor window within the western elevation, the replacement of two existing sash windows with patio doors on the eastern elevation, two rooflights serving the proposed first-floor extension, the enlargement of an existing first-floor window on the rear elevation, and the introduction of a further rooflight within the existing southern roof slope. All new windows, doors and rooflights would be finished in white uPVC to match existing fenestration.

Overall, the proposal would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the dwelling, street scene or wider area, and as such, the proposed development would be in accordance with Arun Local Plan (ALP) policies D DM1 and D DM4 and the ADG.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The application site occupies a corner plot, with no immediately adjoining residential properties to the north or west. The nearest dwelling to the east is set well within a substantial plot, whilst the nearest dwelling to the south is located approximately 15m from the application boundary. Given the scale, siting and separation distances involved, the proposed extensions would not give rise to unacceptable overbearing impacts, loss of outlook or material overshadowing to neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed front dormer windows would introduce additional first-floor openings, however, their principal outlook would be towards the frontage of the site and the highway. As such, these windows would not introduce any additional opportunities for overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

The remaining ground-floor openings, together with the first-floor southern window and western dormer, would be located broadly in line with the existing arrangement. As a result, they would not introduce any additional opportunities for overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

The proposed rooflights, by virtue of their positioning and angle, would not afford direct views towards neighbouring properties.

The development would not result in harm to neighbouring amenity, in accordance with ALP policies D DM1 and D DM4 and the ADG.

FLOOD RISK

The application site lies within Lidsey Flood Risk Zone, where the management of surface water drainage is a consideration in reducing flood risk in the locality. It is recognised that the public sewer network within the catchment has a history of flooding, and the introduction of additional surface water flows to this system has the potential to exacerbate existing flood risk.

The proposed western side extension would replace the existing conservatory and would occupy a broadly equivalent footprint. Similarly, the eastern side extension would largely replace an existing outbuilding that is proposed to be demolished. It is also a material consideration that a side extension of broadly similar scale could potentially be implemented under permitted development, provided a gap was retained between the rear projection. There are no planning conditions in place removing such rights. Consequently, an extension of comparable footprint could be constructed without the need for planning permission and would likely have a similar impact in drainage terms. Significant weight is therefore attributed to this fallback position. Furthermore, the eastern extension would be constructed largely over an existing area of hardstanding, whilst the first-floor extension would be built above the existing garage

and would not increase the site's impermeable area. Overall, the proposal would result in only a limited increase in impermeable surfacing, estimated at approximately 16sqm.

It is noted that the Council's Drainage Engineers have raised an objection to the proposal. However, given the limited increase in impermeable area, the replacement of existing built form, together with the fallback position afforded by permitted development, the proposal would not materially increase the chances of flooding elsewhere in the district. On balance, the proposal is therefore in accordance with ALP policies W DM1 and W DM2.

HERITAGE

The application site is located within the Middleton-on-Sea Estate, which is identified as an Area of Character and considered a non-designated heritage asset under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Developments within such areas should aim to preserve and enhance the special character and significance of the non-designated heritage asset.

The significance of the Middleton-on-Sea Estate derives from its spacious, low-density layout, originally conceived as a seaside village community. Old Point contributes positively to this significance through its informal street pattern, varied architectural styles, grass verges and detached dwellings set back from the road behind boundary treatments. The distinctive arrangement of curved, linear plots at the end of the road provides an important visual focal point within the Area of Character.

Policy HER DM4 sets out criteria for which proposals within Areas of Character must meet to be acceptable. These include the retention of buildings and other features that preserve and enhance the special character of these areas.

Policy HE5 of the NPPF (2026) states that development proposals affecting heritage assets should be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting) and of the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is necessary to understand the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The applicant has submitted a Heritage statement, which adequately addresses this requirement.

Policy HE7 of the NPPF (2026) requires the impact of development on non-designated heritage assets to be carefully assessed. Where harm is identified, this must be balanced against the benefits of the proposal, taking into account both the significance of the asset and the scale of the harm.

The proposed works would be appropriate to their context and would not harm the character or visual appearance of the property or the wider Area of Character. They retain the character of the area and preserve the significance of the asset. The proposal would not result in harm to the non-designated heritage asset and as such would be acceptable in accordance with ALP policies HER SP1 and HER DM4 and the NPPF (2026).

SUMMARY

The 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 and documents:

- Location Plan
- Block Plan
- Proposed ground and Elevation plans. CO.SC.03
- Proposed first floor and roof plans. CO.SC.02

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 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 National Planning Policy Framework.