

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2016

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 11 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/16/3163071

27 Sea Lane, Pagham, Bognor Regis PO21 4UN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr D Isom against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application, Ref. P/105/16/HH, dated 26 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is a boundary wall and sliding gate.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a boundary wall and sliding gate at 27 Sea Lane, Pagham, Bognor Regis in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. P/105/16/HH, dated 26 August 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision;
 - 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Composite plan showing existing and proposed street elevation (1:50); block plan (1:500); location plan (1:1250) entitled 'Proposed Boundary Wall at 27 Sea Lane, Pagham for Mr D Isom'.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed boundary treatment on the character and appearance of the street scene of Sea Lane.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that this side of Sea Lane has a variety of front boundary treatments, including some 'open plan', and for the most part with the forms of enclosure having a low profile.
 4. The proposal is for a wall surmounted by railings to a height of about 1.6m. Although a higher form of enclosure than many others, this height is in evidence along other property frontages. Indeed, as the grounds of appeal state, just a few doors away at No. 19 there is a brick wall with infill wooden close-boarded fencing of approximately the same overall dimensions.
 5. In the case of this appeal the wrought iron railings would allow some perception of openness for the higher part of the structure and the planting already in place will be visible through them.
-

6. For the Council's refusal to be justified the appeal scheme would have to draw the eye and be perceived negatively as an inappropriately high and solid form of enclosure clearly out of keeping with existing front boundaries. I do not consider this to be the case, as the proposal would fit in with the variety of existing enclosures along Sea Lane.
7. There would therefore be no conflict with saved Policy GEN7(ii) of the Arun District Local Plan 2003; Policies D DM1 & D SP1 of the emerging Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 and paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. The appeal is therefore allowed.
8. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. The Council has also requested a condition in respect of the colour of the render, but this is specified on the application plan and the condition is not therefore necessary.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR