



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2023

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/22/3312037

42 Felpham Road, Bognor Regis, PO22 7DF

- 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 Ms Helen Godfrey against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref FP/127/22/PL, dated 8 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of boundary wall at 42 Felpham Road, Bognor Regis, PO22 7DF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref FP/127/22/PL, dated 8 July 2022, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 06 07 22: 004 Location & 003 Elevations.

Preliminary Matter

2. The development has been part constructed; this does not alter the way in which I assess the merits of the appeal

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is on a corner site and is a two-storey dwelling with brick and flint walling and a thatched roof. The building was previously used as a public house. The locality is residential in character with a mix of house types, generally of fairly high density, and the building arrangement and street pattern come together to form an area of varied but in the main pleasing appearance. The appeal proposal is to erect a boundary wall of around 17 metres in length and 1.7m tall comprising a brick and flint lower level with brick piers and timber infill panels. It would run along most of the appeal property's 'side road' return, Barn Field. The case is made that this enclosure is needed to provide private garden space.
 5. The Council is concerned that given siting and height the wall would be unduly dominant and harmfully impact the open character and appearance of the area.
-

6. However I do not share the Council's opinion that this locality has an open character; fencing and other boundary delineation, main elevations, small gardens, garage doors, parked cars and so forth all feature as principal elements in the local scene. The side road has considerable variety and it would be very much the norm to see a return on a corner plot dwelling have increased height in its boundary treatment to, usually, run alongside a rear garden and offer privacy and security. In this case because of building configuration the would-be garden area would only be to the side of dwelling and not wrap around to the rear of the home but that strikes me as visually irrelevant. The height of wall proposed would not be out of the ordinary or dominate a reasonably wide side street and be only glimpsed from the main road and it seems to me that the choice of materials has been thoughtful given the nature of the host building and its surrounds.
7. In the circumstances to my mind the proposal would not be at all jarring on the eye or harmful to the visual merits of the scene, in character or appearance terms. I can entirely appreciate why the Appellant would wish to create some private garden area to provide amenity for the newly converted property and I consider that the scheme before me would be a logical and well-designed way to achieve this.
8. Policy D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan and Policy ESD1 of the Felpham Neighbourhood Development Plan are relevant. Amongst other matters, they seek to ensure that development is of high quality design with suitable materials, scale and siting to be sympathetic to the character of a site and its surroundings and to deliver hard landscape with an appearance which reflects the local area. I conclude that the proposal would not run contrary to these policies. It would not conflict either with the pertinent aesthetic objectives of the Arun Design Guide or the Felpham Design Guide, neither of which could, in any event, be expected to cover every eventuality.

Conditions

9. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition but this is not necessary as development has commenced. I see no need for a condition relating to the submission and approval of a schedule of materials as this matter is clear from the application forms and the work done to date. However, I do agree that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR