



APPLICATIONS & APPEALS SERVICES

ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY NON-HABITABLE OUTBUILDING AND INSTALLATION OF NEW FENCE AND GATE. ERECTION OF EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO FENESTRATION OF EXISTING DWELLING. PROVISION OF RAMP/STEPS.

15 WEST FRONT ROAD, PAGHAM, PO21 4SY

PLANNING DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

JANUARY 2026



CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	4
2.0	PHYSICAL CONTEXT.....	5
3.0	PROPOSAL	8
4.0	PLANNING HISTORY.....	9
5.0	POLICY CONTEXT	10
6.0	APPRAISAL.....	17
7.0	CONCLUSIONS	21

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single-storey flat roofed incidental outbuilding, new boundary enclosures, the extension and alteration of the existing dwelling and the formation of a ramp leading up to the bungalow at 15 West Front Road, Pagham PO21 4SY.

1.2 The application follows the refusal of application P/84/25/HH and seeks to overcome the concerns raised by the Council through revisions to the design of the outbuilding and boundary treatments to ensure that the proposal is subservient in appearance to the dwelling and does not detract from the character and appearance of the area.

1.3 This supporting Planning, Design and Access Statement sets out the detail of the proposal which is described and appraised having regard to the following aspects.

- **Physical Context** – explains the physical context of the site and its surroundings;
- **Planning Context** – relevant planning history of the site and broad policy requirements;
- **Amount** – the extent of development on the site;

- **Scale** – details of the physical size of the proposed development;
- **Layout** – the relationship of the proposed development to the site and its setting;
- **Appearance** – details of materials, style and impact upon the existing and neighbouring properties;
- **Landscape** – impact of the proposal on the existing landscape and proposed planting and surfacing;
- **Access** – access to the proposed development and associated parking.

1.4 The Statement will demonstrate that the proposed development accords with the relevant planning policies and is acceptable in all respects.

2.0 PHYSICAL CONTEXT

- 2.1 The application site comprises a bungalow situated to the east side of West Front Road. Pagham Beach is directly adjacent to the southeast of the site, and like other dwellings, 15 West Front Road is oriented to the southeast.
- 2.2 There is an existing ancillary outbuilding to the “front” of the site between the dwelling and West Front Road. The remainder of this area is gravelled or hard surfaced, and there is space for the parking of vehicles.



Figure 1 - Site location plan



Figure 2 - aerial view of site

- 2.3 The land rises to the southeast, and the dwelling is accessed via steps leading up from the front garden area to the dwelling.
- 2.4 The application site is situated within an established residential area identified as the Pagham Beach Estate Character Area, a non-designated heritage asset. There is a boatyard to the land opposite (northwest) the site.
- 2.5 The area is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 as classed by the EA.
- 2.6 The following are photographs of the application site:



Figure 3 - southeast elevation - view towards 17 West Front Road



Figure 5 - site viewed from West Front Road



Figure 4 - northwest elevation and existing outbuilding



Figure 6 - view east along West Front Road showing setback of front boundary relative to neighbouring properties



Figure 7 - existing platform/terrace to northwest of dwelling



Figure 9 - view of 11 and 11A West Front Road frontage to northeast of site



Figure 8 - view northeast to 11A West Front Road from existing platform/terrace

3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 The application proposes the:

- Demolition of the existing outbuilding
- Erection of non-habitable single storey outbuilding,
- Erection of corner extension to rear/side elevations
- Alterations to dwelling to include installation of weatherboarding and alterations to fenestration,
- Installation of new gate to front boundary and fencing to side boundary.

3.2 The application follows the refusal of application P/84/25/HH. It is a revised scheme which seeks to overcome the reason for refusal. It also adds a small extension and minor alterations to the external facing materials of the existing dwelling.

3.3 The proposed outbuilding would be single-storey with flat roof measuring up to 3.4 metres in height. It would be positioned to the northeast corner of the application site with a footprint of 7.4m x 10.8m.

3.4 The proposed flat-roofed extension would measure 4.3m x 4.4m and would be positioned to the southwest corner of the

existing dwelling. The finished floor levels would match that of the existing dwelling.

3.5 A new gate would be erected to the northwest boundary comprising two five-bar gates, one fixed and the other sliding. A new 1.8m timber close boarded fence is proposed to the northeast boundary.

4.0 PLANNING HISTORY

Pagham Beach Estate area of character in conflict with ALP policies D DM1 and HER DM4.

4.1 The relevant planning history for the application site is as follows:

- P/84/25/HH - Erection of single storey non-habitable outbuilding and installation of new boundary fence. Alterations to existing dwelling fenestration and front patio with steps. Refused. 31/10/2025

4.2 This application is an amended scheme following the refusal of the above application and seeks to address the concerns details in the reason for refusal:

1. The proposed outbuilding does not have the appearance of an ancillary building, and is not subservient to the main dwelling, in conflict with the established spatial character of the area. Due to its siting on the front boundary of the property, its scale and height, the outbuilding would be an unduly prominent feature of the street scene, an impression which would be exacerbated by the proposed gates. The outbuilding would cause undue harm to the character and visual amenity of the area, and to the special character of the

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT

5.1 In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), the determination of an application must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This includes national and local planning policies.

5.2 On the national level, the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) and the following are material considerations.

- National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)
- National Design Guide
- Technical Housing Standards

National Planning Policy Framework (the “NPPF”) 2024

5.3 The NPPF sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and Wales and how these should be applied. It provides a framework for the preparation of local plans for housing and other development. The NPPF should be read as a whole.

5.4 Paragraph 2 of the NPPF sets out that **“Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be**

determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework must be taken into account in preparing the development plan, and is a material consideration in planning decisions. Planning policies and decisions must also reflect relevant international obligations and statutory requirements.”

Transport

5.5 Paragraph 109 requires transport issues to be considered at the early stages of plan-making and development proposals. This is to ensure that (inter alia) the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed.

5.6 Paragraph 110 acknowledges that **“opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.”**

5.7 Paragraph 112 states that if setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, policies should take into account the accessibility of the development, its type, mix and use, the availability of land and opportunities for public

transport, local car ownership levels and the need to ensure that adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles. Maximum parking standards for residential and non-residential development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network or optimising the density of development in city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport.

- 5.8 In assessing development proposals, paragraph 115 states that it should be ensured that there are appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes, that there is safe and suitable access to the site (for all road users) and that any significant impacts on the transport network or on highway safety terms can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.
- 5.9 Paragraph 116 makes it clear that **“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.”**

Design

- 5.10 In terms of design, Section 12 seeks to achieve well designed places sets out that the **“The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities”** (paragraph 131).
- 5.11 Paragraph 135 further states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping. Development should also be sympathetic to local character and history and should be designed with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
- 5.12 The contribution of trees to the character and quality of urban environments and to the mitigation of climate change is highlighted in paragraph 136.

5.13 Paragraph 139 states that **“Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to:**

- a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes: and/or*
- b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.”*

Environment & Climate Change

5.14 Paragraph 161 states that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050, taking into account all climate impacts. Local planning authorities should expect new

development to comply with any development plan policies pertaining to decentralised energy supply and minimise energy consumption through careful design (paragraph 166).

5.15 Development should plan for climate change, and paragraph 164 states that new development should be planned in ways that:

- a) avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. When new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through the planning of green infrastructure; and*
- b) can help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as through its location, orientation and design. Any local requirements for the sustainability of buildings should reflect the Government’s policy for national technical standards.*

- 5.16 Paragraph 166 continues and sets out that, in determining applications, local planning authorities should expect new development to a) comply with development plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply (unless it can be demonstrated that this is not feasible or viable) and b) take into account landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption.
- 5.17 Paragraph 170 states that development should also be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding (existing or future). Where development is necessary in these areas, the development should be “made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.” To ensure that development does not increase flood risk elsewhere, applications should be supported by site specific flood-risk assessments where appropriate (paragraph 181). Applications which could affect drainage on or around the site should incorporate sustainable drainage systems proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal. (paragraph 182).
- 5.18 Paragraph 187 states that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by (inter alia) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside; minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity; and preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air water or noise pollution or land instability.
- 5.19 If development results in significant harm to biodiversity which cannot be avoided, paragraph 193 states that planning permission should be refused unless this can be adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for.
- Historic Environment
- 5.20 When considering proposals which affect heritage assets, “local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting” (paragraph 207). Paragraph 216 sets out that the impact of development upon non-designated heritage assets is a material consideration, and any harm or loss to these requires a balanced judgement which takes into account the significance of the heritage asset.

Other national guidance

- 5.21 In addition to the NPPF, National Planning Policy Guidance (PPG), Written Ministerial Statements and other policy documents, such as the National Design Guide and Technical Guidance, are material planning considerations.

Development Plan

- 5.22 At local level, the Development Plan comprises the Arun Local Plan 2011 – 2031 which took effect in July 2018. The relevant local plan policies to this proposal are set out below:

- Policy SD SP1 – Sustainable development
- Policy SD SP2 – Built-Up Area Boundary
- Policy D SP1 - Design
- Policy D DM1 - Aspects of form and design quality
- Policy D DM4 – Extensions and Alterations to Existing Buildings (residential and non-residential)
- Policy T SP1 - Transport and Development
- Policy ENV SP1 – Natural Environment
- Policy W DM 2 Flood Risk
- Policy W DM4 Coastal Protection
- Policy HER DM4 Areas of Character

- 5.23 Policy SD SP1 (Sustainable development) states that a positive approach will be taken to development proposals that reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development and will work proactively to find solutions to secure development.

- 5.24 Policy SD SP2 (Built Up Area Boundary) requires development to be focused within the boundaries.

- 5.25 Policy H SP1 (The Housing Requirement) confirms that within the plan period of 2011-2031, at least 20,000 new homes will be accommodated within the District.

- 5.26 Policy D SP1 (Design) requires that new development makes efficient use of land whilst reflecting the characteristics of the local area in all aspects of design.

- 5.27 Policy D DM1 (Aspects of form and design quality) sets required criteria for the assessment of new development, having regard to character, appearance/attractiveness, impact, innovation, adaptability, crime prevention, trees and woodland, solar gain, public realm, layout, public art, density, scale and form.

- 5.28 Policy T SP1 (Transport and Development) requires development to minimise the use of the car, to provide for appropriate parking, and encourages healthy lifestyles.
- 5.29 Policy ENV SP1 (Natural Environment) encourages and promotes the preservation, restoration and enhancement of biodiversity and the natural environment through the development process.
- 5.30 Policy ENV DM5 (Development and biodiversity) requires that new development seeks to achieve a net gain in biodiversity and protects existing habitats on site. Regard is additionally given to ensuring that protected species is given appropriate consideration within development proposals.
- 5.31 Policy ENV SP1 (Natural Environment) seeks to encourage and promote the preservation restoration and enhancement of biodiversity and the local natural environment.
- 5.32 Policy W DM2 (Flood Risk) seeks to ensure that development in areas at risk of flooding have demonstrated that the proposals would be safe from flooding and would not increase risk of flooding elsewhere and within the local area.
- 5.33 Policy W DM4 (Coastal Protection) seeks to ensure protection of the coast and sea defences. Where development is situated in coastal locations, they will be permitted provided that they protect and enhance coastal habitats.
- 5.34 Policy HER DM4 sets out the criteria which proposals within Areas of Character must meet to be acceptable and requires new development to preserve and enhance the special character of these areas.
- 5.35 In addition to the above policies, the Development includes the following Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) which are material considerations for this proposal:
- SPD13 Arun District Design Guide 2021 and
 - SPD11 Arun Parking Standards 2020.
- Relevant Legislation**
- 5.36 In considering the issue of the principle of the proposed development it is necessary to also consider the legal framework within which planning decisions are made. Planning legislation holds that the determination of a planning application shall be made in accordance with the Development

Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise (as also confirmed at paragraph 2 of the NPPF).

5.37 Specifically, Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states that in dealing with planning applications, the Authority shall have regard to the provisions of the development plan (so far as material to the application), a post examination draft neighbourhood development plan, any local finance considerations (so far as material to the application) and any other material consideration.

5.38 Section 38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides:

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purposes of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

5.39 When considering whether or not a proposed development accords with a development plan, it is not necessary to say that it must accord with every policy within the development plan. The question is whether it accords overall with the development plan (Stratford on Avon v SSCLG [2014] JPL 104). Even if a proposal cannot be described as being in

accordance with the development plan, the statutory test requires that a balance be struck against other material considerations. The Courts have emphasised that a planning authority is not obliged to strictly adhere to the development plan and should apply inherent flexibility: Cala Homes (South) Limited v SSCLG [2011] JPL 1458 and Tesco Stores Ltd v Dundee City Council [2012] 2 P.&C.R. 9.

5.40 More recently in Corbett v Cornwall Council [2020] the appeal court judge emphasised the importance of considering the plan as a whole when he said;

"Under section 38(6) the members' task was not to decide whether, on an individual assessment of the proposal's compliance with the relevant policies, it could be said to accord with each and every one of them. They had to establish whether the proposal was in accordance with the development plan as a whole. Once the relevant policies were correctly understood, which in my view they were, this was classically a matter of planning judgment for the council as planning decision-maker."

6.0 APPRAISAL

Design

- 6.1 The design of the proposed outbuilding has been revised to overcome the Council's concerns regarding the design of the proposed outbuilding and boundary treatment. As noted in the officer report for the previous application, the position of the outbuilding to the front of the property would reflect the "usual arrangement for the street" given the beach to the rear, and "outbuildings to the front of properties are a feature of the area" with "examples of relatively large buildings to the front of the dwellings." However, the Council was concerned that the pitched roof design of the previous proposal would lead to an unduly dominant structure to the detriment of the street scene and character of the area.
- 6.2 This revised scheme proposed a building of similar footprint (measuring 7.4m x 10.8m) but with flat roof with a height of 3.4m. Given the elevated position of the bungalow, this proposed flat roof would be 500mm below the line of the existing flat roof of the bungalow behind. In combination with the spacing between the two structures, the proposed outbuilding would be visually subservient to the main dwelling.
- Although visible within the street scene, this would not result in a discordant feature given the presence of similar such development within the local area.
- 6.3 The proposal now proposes a double five bar gate to the front boundary. This allows the security of an enclosure to the site while preserving its visual openness when viewed from the road. Moreover, the proposed hedging along the northwest boundary would soften the appearance of the outbuilding as viewed from the road. The development would therefore not appear unduly prominent or discordant within this particular locality.
- 6.4 The fencing to the side boundaries as shown in the drawings would accord with permitted development rights for boundary enclosures up to 2m when not adjacent to highway. It would also not be readily visible or discordant within the street scene.
- 6.5 Turning to the extension and alterations to the existing dwelling, the proposed extension is modest in scale. It's flat roofed form would be in keeping with previous extensions to the dwelling and would not detract from the overall appearance of the dwelling as viewed from the beach. The addition of weatherboarding to the elevations would alter the

appearance of the dwelling, but it would be in keeping with this coastal location where boarded elevations are not uncommon. The alteration to fenestration is modest and would not be readily apparent from the surrounding area. As such, the resulting design and appearance of the dwelling would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the local area.

- 6.6 The works to provide mobility ramps would not be readily visible from the road by reason of its setback. The proposal effectively balances design with the requirements for inclusive access to the property and would not detract from the overall appearance of the dwelling or the site.
- 6.7 For the above reasons, the proposal would accord with Policies D DM1 and D DM4.

Neighbour amenity

- 6.8 The Council did not object to the previous scheme on the grounds of neighbour amenity, and the revised proposal would not detract from the privacy, light or outlook of neighbouring residents. This proposal maintains the position of the proposed outbuilding while reducing its height and bulk. Given the presence of an outbuilding within the neighbouring

property to the northeast and the position of windows with the proposed development which would face the existing dwelling and its garden, the proposed outbuilding would not result in harm to neighbour amenities.

- 6.9 The proposed extension to the dwelling would be situated near the southwest boundary, but the single-storey extension would not include windows within the side elevation. Thus, it would not appear overbearing to the neighbouring property or result in overshadowing or overlooking.
- 6.10 Although the proposal includes alterations to the front of the existing property, the resulting height of the terrace/platform area would not be increased. As such, there would be no greater risk of overlooking of the neighbouring properties from this area. The replacement of the sliding window with a smaller window would also have no material impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents.
- 6.11 As such, the proposal would not result in harm to neighbouring residential amenity and would accord with Policies D DM1 and D DM4.

Heritage

- 6.12 The site is within the Pagham Beach Estate Area of Character, a non-designated heritage asset as identified by the Council. The estate historically comprised holiday chalets and railway carriages, and these are still visible within the area which now includes a mix of newer, permanent residential properties. The character of the area is derived from the generally single-storey height and scale of the buildings, and the varied and informal appearance of the street scene in terms of the design and materials present on properties.
- 6.13 The proposed extension and alterations to the existing dwelling would preserve its overall proportions and scale. The addition of weatherboarding would be in keeping with the mix of materials visible within this locality.
- 6.14 The revised design of the outbuilding ensures that it remains subservient to the main dwelling and clearly ancillary in function. The open design of the gate would also ensure that there is no visible enclosure of the front boundary. It therefore would not look out of place within the estate where outbuildings to the front of the dwellings are not uncommon. This therefore accords the Pagham Design Statement, which

advises that on the Pagham Beach Estate, there should be one bungalow per plot.

- 6.15 The proposal therefore would not harm the special character of the area or its significance as a non-designated heritage asset. It accords with Policy HER DM4, the Pagham Village Design Statement and NPPF paragraph 216.

Parking

- 6.16 The site is located in Parking Zone 2. The proposed development would leave sufficient space to the front of the property to accommodate two car parking spaces. This complies with the Arun Parking Standards, and the proposal would retain sufficient off-road parking in accordance with Policy T SP1.

Flood risk

- 6.17 The proposal is in Flood Zones 2 and 3, is prone to groundwater flooding, and is at risk of flooding from rivers and sea. The proposed extension is very modest (19sq.m.) and its finished floor levels would match the existing dwelling. It is also cited within an existing hard surfaced area. Therefore, it would not result in increased flood risk elsewhere.

- 6.18 The proposed outbuilding is classed as a less vulnerable use, and the proposal complies with EA guidelines for householder development, in that the finished floor levels will be set no lower than the existing. The proposal is in accordance with Policy W DM2 of the Local Plan.

Coastal Protection

- 6.19 The site lies within the Pagham Beach Estate where the Pagham Interim Development Framework applies. The proposed extension to the dwelling would fall within category 4 of the Framework ((Reconstruction). This is permitted where the floor levels matches existing levels as is proposed under the scheme.
- 6.20 The proposed non-habitable annexe would fall within category 5 of the Framework (non-habitable development). It is understood that the Council would attach a condition to any approval to ensure that it remains non-habitable, and this would be acceptable to the Applicants.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a non-habitable outbuilding, the erection of boundary enclosures, the formation of a ramp and alterations to the fenestration of the dwelling. It has been demonstrated that the development would overcome previous concerns raised by the Council by reason of the modified design of the outbuilding and the more open character of the proposed gate. The development would not result in a unduly prominent or dominant feature within the street scene to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area, which is categorised as a non-designate heritage asset.
- 7.2 It is further demonstrated that no harm will result to the amenities of neighbouring residents. The development would preserve sufficient space for car parking to meet local adopted standards.
- 7.3 The proposal would not contribute to added flood risk within the area and would not lead to harm to the coastal environment.

- 7.4 Overall, it is confirmed that the proposal complies with the relevant national and local planning policy in all respects, and it is therefore hoped that planning permission will be granted.