



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2024

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/24/3350307

8 Hook Lane, Pagham, PO21 3NY

- 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 David Deadman against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref is P/28/24/HH.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension to existing store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the site and surrounds and b) on living conditions for neighbours.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with a large home to the west and two bungalows round the corner to the east in Lion Road. The property has two single storey sizeable outbuildings, or stores, in its rear garden. The neighbourhood is of established residential character and the varied buildings and gardens come together to create a scene of pleasing suburban appearance. The appeal proposal is as described above and would add a first floor with pitched roof and external staircase to the existing store in the south west corner of the rear garden.
 4. Whilst many local homes have a degree of garden paraphernalia, and some outbuildings, I did not see any towards the bulk now proposed. The development would be unusual in character terms and intrusive in the scene. The outbuilding would end up as disproportionate and not suitably subservient to the host dwelling and of a scale which would run contrary to the low-key nature one would expect to find in this residential neighbourhood. Even with subtle materials it would be jarring on the eye and simply look out of place as an out-sized incongruous anomaly.
-

5. Policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan (LP) are relevant. Amongst other matters, they seek to ensure that development is of good design quality with protection of a site's character and embodying suitable scale, massing and layout for its context including a degree of subservience to a host dwelling. I conclude that there would be conflict with these policies. It would also conflict with the aesthetic objectives of the Arun Design Guide (DG) and the Pagham Design Statement albeit these documents cannot be expected to cover every eventuality.

Living conditions

6. The Council is concerned with actual and perceived loss of privacy. However, imposing windows are not planned, the small window could have been obscure glazed, and screening could in all likelihood be arranged at the staircase and entrance door. However, on a built form matter, the locality generally has a sense of spaciousness and most people are able to enjoy their gardens with a relatively open and 'green' outlook. Unfortunately, this development would alter this asset for nearest neighbours. It would be bulky and run along two edges of the host property's plot making it an imposing out-of-place structure. It would be overbearing.
7. LP Policies D DM1 and D DM4 are also pertinent here. In parallel with relevant objectives in the DG, they seek to ensure that new development would protect standards of residential amenity for neighbours. Given the foregoing I would conclude that the appeal scheme would conflict with these policies and the DG.

Other matters

8. I understand the Appellant's wish to increase storage at the property and I can see that thought has been given to the choice of materials. I recognise that planning conditions could prevent more windows and also that the Appellant has sought to engage with the Council and has reduced massing from an earlier scheme. I note the offer to enclose the stairs but such plans are not before me and, in any event, would make the structure bulkier. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issues identified above.
9. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the site and surrounds as well as on living conditions for neighbours. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR