

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

REF NO: WA/48/26/HH

LOCATION: Ballina, The Street
Walberton
BN18 0QB

PROPOSAL: Proposed replacement rear side extension. Front porch roof extension. Front elevation and rear extension to be rendered off white colour. This application may affect the setting of a Listed Building and the character and appearance of the Walberton Green Conservation Area.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

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

REPRESENTATIONS

Walberton Parish Council - No response received.

No representations received from nearby occupiers.

CONSULTATIONS

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

Drainage Engineers - Objection.

Runoff destination

1.1.The Lidsey Drainage Statement whilst making recommendations does not formally proposed any discharge location and no evidence of any existing surface water drainage systems has been presented for review. It is expected that the proposed system should accord with Standard 1 of the NSfS. It is the responsibility of the applicant or their drainage designer to provide this evidence. Without it, we are unable to assess whether the proposed development would increase flood risk. For this reason, we object to the proposal. 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 and provided to us, 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 Walberton 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. Further details relating to groundwater monitoring, infiltration testing and other design aids, can be found at <https://www.arun.gov.uk/surfacewater>.

1.3.Standard 1 of the NSfS outlines the following hierarchy of sustainable means of draining a site, comments are provided regarding the viability of these options on this site:

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

3.To a watercourse - an ordinary watercourse (culverted) is located in the highway to the front of site.

4.To a surface water sewer - none available

5.To a highway drainage system - nearest located outside Willow Cottage

6.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.The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA - WSCC) is the risk management authority for the ordinary watercourse. Evidence will need to be submitted to demonstrate that they have consented to any proposed works through the Ordinary Watercourse Consent process. Furthermore, the proposed discharge rates, volumes or flow parameters will also need to be agreed by this Authority to support the Ordinary Watercourse Consent. Land Drainage Byelaw consent may also be required from ourselves. This is an expectation of the NSfS.

1.6.The application site falls within the Lidsey Wastewater Treatment Catchment Area. This catchment is the subject of a Surface Water Management Plan due, in part, to a recognised history of foul sewer flooding. The site is located within a Local Flood Risk Zone identified within the Surface Water Management Plan (LFRZ_003). The plan states that flood risk from fluvial and pluvial flooding and surcharge of the public sewer network is high. Ponding of this water occurs on The Street near the junction of Eastergate Lane.

Extreme rainfall and flooding

3.1.The front boundary of the site sits at a current day risk of flooding - Flood Zone 2. The same area is also at risk of surface water flooding in the 0.1 AEP event. This area extends when climate change allowance is included.

3.2.At present, no modelling or supporting evidence; such as ground investigations or drainage plans 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. For this reason, we object to the proposal.

Conservation Officer - No response received.

POLICY CONTEXT

Lidsey Treatment Catchment Area.

Lidsey Local Flood Risk Zone.

Walberton Green Conservation Area lies to the west and north of the application site.

A small part of the front of the application site lies within Flood Zone 2.

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
WDM3	W DM3 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems
HERDM1	HER DM1 Listed Buildings
HERDM3	HER DM3 Conservation Areas
HERSP1	HER SP1 The Historic Environment

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 includes a detached, two storey dwelling set adjacent to a row of listed cottages and a conservation area. The proposal is for a replacement rear and side extension, a replacement pitched roof on the front porch and alterations to external finishes.

The proposed side and rear extension would be equal in depth (5.14m, in line with the rear wall of the existing kitchen). The replacement western flank elevation would be set in by 0.35m (from the remaining western flank) and run perpendicular to the rear wall. The side extension would include a pitched roof with an eaves height of 2.6m, equal to the existing shallow pitched flat roof at a height of 2.6m. The addition of the pitched roof is positive, reflecting built form in the locality. Three rooflights would be set centrally and symmetrically on the roof slope, in accordance with Arun Design Guide (ADG) advice.

Similarly to the side and rear extension, a pitched roof is proposed to replace the existing flat roof serving the porch. While greater in height (3.8m rather than 2.6) the pitched roof will avoid the "bolt on" appearance that flat roof porches can create, in accordance with the ADG. The pitched roof will result in a softer, congruous relationship with the street scene compared to the bulky, angular existing structure. A new open porch canopy is proposed, with a pitched roof set atop two supporting posts. Set down from the top of the new porch roof and lightweight in appearance, the canopy would be a subservient and sensitive addition.

Minor alterations to fenestration are proposed; new folding doors on the east and south elevations are proposed, as well as amendments to the garage door and fenestration serving the rear and side extension. The amendments are uncontroversial and would not result in harm to design or visual amenity.

Part of the proposal involves the introduction of off-white render to the entirety of the front elevation and replacement side and rear extension. Render is not a common external finish in the locality, with most dwellings exhibiting red brick. However, the neighbouring dwelling (Willow Cottage) is finished in cream painted brick. There is also variation in material palate across the road at Honeywood House, where white paint is used on the front elevation. Considering the varied materials in the locality, the render would not result in undue harm to design or visual amenity.

Dove grey windows are proposed as part of the amendments. It is noted that grey windows have been used within the adjacent conservation area and at Honeywood House. Given that the host dwelling is a more modern addition than the adjacent listed cottages, and the existing variation within the street scene and wider area with regards to materials and windows, the proposal would not result in harm to character or visual amenity.

The proposal is in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies D DM1 and D DM4 in regard to design and visual amenity.

NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Given that the replacement side and rear extension is, albeit marginally, smaller in footprint than the existing extension and incorporates a pitched roof sloping away from neighbouring properties, there would be no harm by way of overbearing or overshadowing impacts. Similarly, the front porch canopy and new pitched roof would be retained well within the site, resulting in no harm to neighbouring amenity by way of overbearing or overshadowing.

While alterations to fenestration are proposed, these are all isolated to the ground floor, therefore providing views of the rear, side and front amenity areas only, resulting in no harm to neighbours by way of overlooking.

The proposal is in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies D DM1 and D DM1 in regard to neighbouring residential amenity.

HERITAGE

Paragraph 207 of the NPPF (2024) requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by a proposal, including the contribution made by their setting. In this instance, the applicant has submitted a Heritage statement in support of the application, which is sufficient to meet this requirement.

Paragraph 208 of the NPPF (2024) requires the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to identify the significance of the heritage asset affected by a proposed development. The site lies adjacent to a row of Grade II Listed Cottages (15-20 Barrack Row) The buildings are considered to be of historical significance and were listed in 1984. The site also lies adjacent to The Walberton Green Conservation Area, characterised by an impressive combination of both individual and groups of buildings benefiting from attractive boundary treatment (often flint or hedging).

Paragraph 212 of the NPPF (2024) states that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets when considering the impact of development proposals, irrespective of whether any harm would be categorised as substantial or less than substantial.

The removal of the flat roof extensions is positive; the proposed pitched roofs are more sensitive to the historic character of the adjacent listed buildings and conservation area, avoiding stark contrast in design. The proposed footprint of the side and rear extension would remain very similar to the existing and the proposal would be a sympathetic addition. The proposed extension would not result in harm to the setting of the adjacent listed buildings or conservation area.

The dove grey windows are a modern, but not entirely new, addition to the locality. Furthermore, given that Ballina is a modern addition to the area and the other examples of grey windows in the locality, the proposed windows would not result in harm to either the listed buildings or conservation area. Similarly, the introduction of white render, while more sensitive approaches would be preferable, would not harm the significance of the heritage assets.

The proposal would not result in harm to the significance of the setting of the heritage assets and is therefore in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies HER DM1, HER DM3 and HER SP1 and the NPPF.

LIDSEY TREATMENT CATCHMENT AREA

The site is located within a Local Lidsey Flood Risk Area. As such, the Council's Drainage Engineers have been consulted on the proposed development.

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). They also objected on the grounds that flood risk may be increased elsewhere, owing to a small pockets of potential surface water flooding.

The proposal does not increase the amount of hardstanding or the footprint of the dwelling. As such, given the scale and siting of the development and existing circumstances on site, it would not be reasonable to refuse this application on drainage grounds.

The proposal is therefore in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies W DM1 and W DM3.

FLOOD RISK

The front part of the application site lies within Flood Zone 2. The proposed extensions and alterations would not fall within the Flood Zone and as such, the proposal is acceptable in this regard, in accordance with Arun Local Plan policy W DM2.

SUMMARY

The proposal is in accordance with relevant development plan policies and is therefore 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 Block Plan 04
Proposed Plans and Elevations 02A
Flood Risk Assessment
Heritage Statement
Lidsey Drainage Impact 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 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.