

FILE COPY

Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex, BN17 5LF

Tel: 01903 737500
Fax: 01903 730442
DX: 57406 Littlehampton
Minicom: 01903 732765
e-mail: simon.davis@arun.gov.uk



10 December 2014

Your Ref: P/70/14/PL

Our Ref: P/70/14/PL

Please ask for:
Simon Davis
Planning Department
Direct Dial: 01903 737874

Dear Mr Huntley

Re: Application Number P/70/14/PL 64 Harbour Road, Pagham

I refer to your letter of the 1st December 2014 as received by us on the 5th and passed to me on the 9th December. I have now had the opportunity to look at the questions/issues that you raise and I respond as follows.

I am sure that you are aware that this application received planning permission at the Development Control Committee Meeting on the 22nd of October. This being the case, we are not able to rescind or review the decision.

The Officer decided to recommend approval on the basis that the proposed first floor living space was to be accommodated discretely with an absence of any dormer windows and a 30 degree roof pitch. It was therefore considered that the proposed replacement dwelling would not on balance harm the character and appearance of the local area. The following two paragraphs are taken from the Officer's report to Committee:

"The proposed scheme will replace the existing bungalow dwelling with a chalet style building. The slope angle of the roof will be 30° and will therefore be in keeping with the shallow pitched roofing that is a prevailing characteristic on neighbouring dwellings and a key feature of the Area of Special Character. It is noted that the Pagham Village Design Statement discourages first floor accommodation at dwellings on Harbour Road. However, whilst dwellings on Harbour Road are generally single-storey only, it is considered that the first floor living space within the proposed dwelling is accommodated discretely, with no dormer windows present whilst the overall height of the building will be comparable to that of nearby bungalows, including the neighbouring dwelling to the north.

The building will be set back a similar distance from the road as neighbouring dwellings. Gaps will be maintained to the side of the dwelling and the roof will pitch away from side boundaries. It is

therefore considered that the sense of spaciousness within the surrounding environment will not be breached and that the building will be in keeping with the surrounding area."

These arguments were accepted by the Development Control Committee and in the absence of anyone speaking against the application; the decision was made in accordance with the recommendation.

Turning now to your comments about the validity of the site notice, I myself displayed the site notice. I placed the notice on a telegraph pole located almost immediately opposite to the front of the property. It was therefore noticeable to passers-by and anyone with an interest in the local area would have seen the notice and been able to read its contents. There was nowhere else to place the site notice and in particular, no way of attaching it to the low wall to the front of 64 Harbour Road. Planning Officers do not regularly carry posts and hammers with them on site visits and although there are some occasions where posts are erected, these are only done in streets where there is an absence of street furniture/lamp posts/telegraph poles/timber fencing etc. This was not the case here.

I trust that this answers your questions and that you are satisfied with my response.

Yours sincerely,

Simon J Davis
Principal Planning Officer