



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2025

by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/25/3363681

113 West Front Road, Pagham, West Sussex PO21 4TB

- 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 Allen Miller against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref is P/117/24/HH.
 - The development proposed is raising of the roof and roof redesign with side gable and side dormer. First floor rear balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area as a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

3. West Front Road comprises a mix of dwellings that offer variety both in terms of their appearance, size and height. Nonetheless, there is broad homogeneity insofar as the houses are set back within their plots and they are single storey with no particular building unduly dominating the street scene. This gives the area a spacious character to which the appeal site positively contributes.
4. The appellant does not dispute that the single storey, low key nature of the buildings forms a central reason for this part of Pagham having been identified as an Area of Character; nor that it is a non-designated heritage asset.
5. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) outlines that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications directly or indirectly affecting non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the asset.
6. Many of the houses in the area which have a generous or usable roof space have sought to take advantage of it. There are examples of dwellings in and around the appeal site where it is clear that internally there is an upper floor. By and large this has been achieved without the expansion of the dwelling and in particular without the enlargement of the roof. Consequently, the overarching single storey character of the buildings and thus the area has been retained.

7. Similarly, some occupiers have sought to take advantage of the views out towards the beach and beyond. This too has generally been achieved within the envelope of the existing building, thereby maintaining the innate low-key aesthetic.
8. The proposed scheme would involve a number of hip-to-gable extensions and the introduction of a large side dormer. To the rear, a new balcony area would be created. The overall height of the building would also be increased by approximately 0.7m. There are both hipped and gabled roofs in the vicinity but as noted above, roof extensions generally, and dormers in particular, are not prevalent in the area.
9. The proposal would change the appearance of the property and there would be an increase in the building's height, bulk and scale. While the existing property is not of any architectural merit, I find that collectively the works would result in a building that would be overly prominent and out of keeping with the low-key single storey approach to building design in the area.
10. The proposal would cause moderate harm to the character and appearance of the non-designated heritage asset which, with a balanced judgement, I find is sufficient to warrant refusal having regard to the scale of harm which would arise. Cumulatively the extensions are not insignificant and, based upon the evidence before me, the benefits arising from the proposal are private benefits to the occupants of the dwelling seeking to achieve more habitable space within the property. At this stage, there is nothing before me to indicate that more habitable space could not be achieved within the property but in a less harmful manner.
11. It is acknowledged that extensions and alterations to heritage (and non-designated) assets are undertaken as part of the inevitable process of change to meet current day to day requirements. Such buildings are noted as sometimes needing sympathetic alteration, adaptation, or extension to ensure their continuing usefulness. However, I do not find the proposal before me to be modest, sympathetic new works which positively contribute to the building's story. While a pragmatic and flexible approach is important in achieving positive change, in this case I find that the changes carry adverse implications to both character and appearance of the building itself and the wider views along West Front Road and thus the area as a non-designated heritage asset.
12. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies D DM1, D DM4 and HER DM4 of the Arun Local Plan 2018 which require, amongst other things, that the design of developments have sufficient regard to local character, relate sympathetically to the existing built form and in Areas of Character make a positive contribution to the area.
13. The proposal is similarly contrary to the Arun Design Guide 2024 and Pagham Village Design Statement 2007 which require, amongst other things, proposals to respond to the local character and for extensions to have regard to such matters as the scale, height and character of the existing building as well as their context.

Other Matters

14. It is said that no harm would arise to such matters as the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and that mechanisms could be employed to minimise light leaking from the new glazed areas. However, these factors would represent a lack of harm which would accordingly be neutral in any balance.

15. The appellants also point to the absence of objection from neighbours. However, this in itself does not mean that the current scheme is acceptable and does not in any event absolve me from making an assessment as to its effects in regard to the main issue of the case.
16. References have been made to a number of other planning permissions which have been granted in the area. However, I have not been provided with the full details or drawings of those schemes so cannot be sure that they represent a direct comparison to the appeal scheme.
17. References are also made to human rights in the appeal submission although the appellant does not elaborate on this. I have interpreted this as the appellants' rights under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (right to respect for private and family life) as incorporated by the Human Rights Act 1998.
18. These rights are not unfettered and can be interfered with by a public authority in accordance with law in a number of circumstances. In this case, there is a legitimate and established planning policy aim to protect the character of the area. Dismissing the appeal would not, for example, render the appellants or their family homeless and no case has been made that the personal circumstances of the existing occupants are such that the accommodation must be altered in the way proposed. As such, I attach greater weight to the public interest. Dismissal of the appeal is proportionate and so it would not result in a violation of the appellants' human rights.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stewart Glassar

INSPECTOR