



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6th June 2025

by **Simon J Cater MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/25/3363949

142 Barnham Road, Barnham, Bognor Regis, West Sussex PO22 0EH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs H Buschhaus of A J Salter & Son against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref is BN/2/25/HH.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a detached garage at 142 Barnham Road, Barnham, Bognor Regis, PO22 0EH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BN/2/25/HH and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed garage plan No. 2924:10 and Existing details plan No. 2924.3.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on the planning application form and on the Proposed garage plan No. 2924:10.

Preliminary Matters

2. Following the submission of the appeal, the Appellant provided a copy of the Decision Notice for application reference BN/142/24/HH, along with the associated proposal plan. This relates to granting planning permission for the extension of the vehicular crossover to the boundary on the right-hand side when viewed from the road, and the removal of a section of hedgerow and a tree to facilitate a wider access. I have considered this information, but it does not materially affect my assessment or findings in relation to the appeal before me.
3. The Parish Council has indicated they resolved no objection to the proposal. This is noted as a neutral response, reflecting no specific concerns based on the submitted information.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:

- the effect of the proposed garage on the character and appearance of the area.
- the effect of the proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site comprises a detached Edwardian-style dwelling located on the corner of Barnham Road (B2233) and Drovers Way. Vehicular access is taken from Barnham Road, leading to a gravelled parking area situated in front of the property.
6. The proposed detached garage would be located in the southwest corner of the site, replacing an existing cycle store. The site benefits from substantial hedging along the southern and western boundaries, which is of a significant height, contributing to a well-defined sense of enclosure and providing effective visual screening. The eastern boundary also includes a hedge of slightly lower height, supplemented by mature trees and vegetation within the neighbouring property.
7. Owing to the height and density of the boundary hedging and the neighbouring mature trees and vegetation, views into the site from Barnham Road are significantly restricted. During my site visit, the existing cycle store was not visible from the public realm. Based on its apparent scale, the proposed garage, of a broadly similar height, would remain similarly screened. In any case, the proposed garage and materials would be recessive in appearance and it would not have a significantly greater visual impact than the existing cycle store. I therefore find that the development would not result in any material visual impact from Barnham Road.
8. On my site visit I observed that several properties along Barnham Road, including No. 140 as referenced by the Appellant, feature garages or outbuildings to the front of the properties. These are both attached and detached in form. In this context, the proposed detached garage would not appear incongruous or out of keeping with the established character of the area.
9. The Council has raised no objection to the proposed materials and consider these to be appropriate and sympathetic to the host dwelling. I also find that the external appearance of the garage would be in keeping with the architectural character of the host building.
10. Although the garage is positioned forward of the host dwelling, it is not readily visible in the same visual frame as the host building from Barnham Road. Its scale and position, combined with the intervening site vegetation, ensure that it remains visually subordinate and does not detract from the prominence or character of the host building.
11. Accordingly, I find that the proposed garage would not harm the character or appearance of the area. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not conflict with Policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan (ALP), and Policy ES5 of the Barnham and Eastergate Neighbourhood Development Plan (BENDP). It would also accord with the aims of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Historic environment

12. The Council contends that the proposal would cause harm to an Area of Character, which it considers to be a non-designated heritage asset. Reference is made to Policy HER DM4 of the ALP and Policy ES7 of the BENDP, which seeks to protect such areas. The Council also suggests that areas of character may be comparable to conservation areas or could be considered for future designation.
13. However, no substantive evidence has been provided to this appeal to demonstrate how the area of character in question possesses heritage significance. The only material before me is the policy reference noted above and the Officer's opinion that the siting and scale of the proposed garage would appear obtrusive and out of keeping with the area, thereby causing harm to the area of character. In this regard, Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that such assets should be clearly identified and supported by evidence of their significance.
14. As set out above, I have found that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. In that context, even if I considered the Area of Character to be a non-designated heritage asset, then the proposal would not result in any harm to it. In this regard, the garage would be modest in scale, sympathetic in its materials, and would have limited visibility within the street.
15. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed garage would not harm the significance of a non-designated heritage asset. It would therefore accord with Policy HER DM4 of the ALP, Policy ES7 of the BENDP, and guidance in the Framework relating to non-designated heritage assets.

Conditions

16. In imposing the conditions, I have had regard to the tests for planning conditions in paragraph 57 of the Framework and the guidance in the PPG. In this respect there is a need for the standard implementation condition and a condition listing the plans to which the proposal should accord, in the interests of certainty.
17. To ensure the satisfactory appearance and form of development, a condition ensuring that the materials match those listed on the planning application form is necessary.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Simon J Cater

INSPECTOR