

Recommendation Report for Planning Permission for Works or Extension to a Dwelling

REF NO: P/84/25/HH

LOCATION: 15 West Front Road
Pagham
PO21 4SY

PROPOSAL: Erection of single storey non-habitable outbuilding and installation of new boundary fence. Alterations to existing dwelling fenestration and front patio with steps.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION As above.

REPRESENTATIONS

Pagham Parish Council - Objection. Overdevelopment of the site and would not be subservient to the main building. The ridge height of the outbuilding would be higher than the existing property. There is no block plan provided showing the development, which would have been helpful. Parking spaces would be an issue as the road is narrow outside the property and on street parking is not viable. It notes the comments of Pagham Beach Holdings regarding the right to park on the road.

Pagham Beach Holdings - Objection. The proposals creates an over-crowded development with inadequate on-site parking and very little outside space for the existing dwelling. For many years, a large van and yacht have been parked on the site, neither of which could be accommodated following the proposals. Residents have no right to park on estate roads, and these are too narrow to accommodate roadside parking in this area. The height of the outbuilding is higher than the ridge height of the main building.

No representations were received from nearby occupiers.

CONSULTATIONS**CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:**

None.

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:
Pagham Beach Estate Area of Character
Pagham Interim Development Framework
Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

[Arun Local Plan 2011 - 2031:](#)

DDM1	D DM1 Aspects of form and design quality
DDM4	D DM4 Extensions and alter to exist builds (res and non-res)
HERDM4	HER DM4 Areas of Character
WDM2	W DM2 Flood Risk
WDM4	W DM4 Coastal Protection
TSP1	T SP1 Transport and Development

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE:

SPD13	Arun District Design Guide (SPD) January 2021
SPD11	Arun Parking Standards 2020

CONCLUSIONS**DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY**

The site is a detached bungalow with existing side and front wraparound extension, with a flat roof. There is an existing ancillary building on the site which would be demolished as part of the current proposals. The proposal is for an outbuilding to the front of the property, which would accommodate a sun room, games room, hobby room, garden store and small WC. The outbuilding will be to the front of the property, which is the usual arrangement for the street, as properties back directly onto the beach to the rear. The outbuilding measures approx. 7.3m wide and 11m long. The outbuilding is substantial in scale, and has a pitched roof with a height of 5.7m, which is slightly higher than the main dwelling. Due to the height and scale of the building, and its position to the front of the main dwelling, the outbuilding would not be visually subservient and does not have the appearance of an ancillary building. It would dominate the plot, rather than being subservient to the main dwelling.

It is acknowledged that outbuildings to the front of properties are a feature of the area, and there are examples of relatively large buildings to the front of dwellings on the street. However, these tend to be lower in height, often with flat roofs, and are more clearly subservient to the main dwelling within their plot. The outbuilding's height, siting and scale combined would make the structure unduly dominant, and would have a harmful impact on the street scene and the character of the area, in conflict with Arun Local Plan (ALP) policy D DM1.

The outbuilding is positioned with the gable end fronting the highway, meaning that the highest point of the building would be directly adjacent to the street. The height of the outbuilding would appear incongruous, and would be an imposing feature on the front boundary. Over half of the front boundary would be occupied by the new outbuilding, and the remaining section of the front boundary would have a sliding timber gate. The height of the gate would be 1.8m, which exceeds the height of the current boundary, and would be a more solid boundary treatment. The combination of the side of the outbuilding directly fronting the street and the higher and more solid boundary treatment would form an unduly dominant frontage, which would increase the sense of enclosure, and become a dominant feature of the street scene.

The alterations to the main dwellinghouse include the replacement of the steps to the front of the dwelling with a ramp and alterations to fenestration. The existing sliding doors to the front would be

replaced by a window, and it is presumed that the property would be accessed via an existing door to the side of the property. Overall the alterations to the main building would have a minimal impact on the appearance of the dwelling, and would not harm the character or visual amenity of the property in accordance with ALP policies D DM1 and D DM4.

The 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 be a visually intrusive feature, and would cause undue harm to the character and visual amenity of the area, in conflict with ALP policy D DM1.

NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The outbuilding would be positioned to the front of the property, against the front and north east boundaries. The property to the north east has an existing outbuilding close to this boundary, and the outbuilding would not result in overbearing or overshadowing impacts. The outbuilding has fenestration on the rear and south west elevations, which face towards the main property and into the property's front garden space. The windows are at ground floor level, and would not result in overlooking impacts.

The alterations to the front of the dwelling result changes to the height and location of the platform to the front of the dwelling. The platform on the south west side of the front elevation is currently 0.85m high, and would be lowered to form part of the ramp to the front of the property. On the north east side of the front elevation, a platform would be installed at the top of the ramp, which would measure 0.85m. Although some views of the front garden of the neighbouring property might be gained when standing on this section of the platform, given that there is already a platform of this height at the front of the dwelling, and the platform would be used to facilitate access to the dwelling, rather than as a seating area or an area where occupiers are likely to spend any substantial amount of time, these impacts will not be unduly harmful.

The proposals would not result in unacceptable impacts on neighbouring residential amenity, in accordance with ALP policies D DM1 and D DM4.

AREA OF CHARACTER

The property falls within the Pagham Beach Estate Area of Character, which is defined as a non-designated heritage asset. All works in this area should aim to preserve and enhance the special character and significance of the non-designated heritage asset. 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. The estate has a distinctive character, which strongly reflects the historic background of the estate, where the original development was comprised of holiday chalets and railway carriages. A high proportion of the carriages are still visible, many have been encased by later structures but still retain evidence of original features, such as windows. Today, the area displays a mix of newer, permanent residential properties and the original holiday chalets and railway carriages. The character of the area is derived from the height and scale of the buildings, which are generally single storey and the varied and informal appearance of the street scene in terms of the design and materials present on properties.

Although the area has a strong informal character, the area is characterised by regular plot sizes, with one single storey dwelling per plot, which is normally set at the rear of the plot close to the sea front, with ancillary buildings to the front. Due to its height and scale as outlined above, the proposed outbuilding appears as a second dwelling which is on the front boundary of the plot, and disrupts the established spatial pattern. This appearance as a second dwelling conflicts with the Pagham Design Statement, which advises that on the Pagham Beach Estate, there should be one bungalow per plot. The outbuilding

does not have the appearance of an ancillary building, and its height, together with the proposed boundary treatment would erode the area's sense of openness. Due to its height, the pitch of the outbuilding roof is also greater than the roof pitches of most buildings within the area, which rarely exceed 30 degrees, contributing to the unease with which the outbuilding would sit in its surroundings.

The outbuilding does not have the appearance of an ancillary building, and its positioned prominently on the front boundary of the property. The outbuilding disrupts the established spatial pattern of the area, and would be an unduly dominant feature on the street scene. The proposals would harm the special character of the area, and would not preserve the significance of the area as a non-designated heritage asset in conflict with ALP policy HER DM4, the Pagham Village Design Statement and NPPF paragraph 216.

FLOODING

The proposal is in Flood Zone 2 and 3, is prone to groundwater flooding, and is at risk of flooding from rivers and sea. The proposal has been supported by a Flood Risk Assessment, which states that the outbuilding is classed as a less vulnerable use. The application 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 Arun Local Plan.

COASTAL PROTECTION

The site lies within the Pagham Beach Estate where the Pagham Interim Development Framework applies. The proposed non-habitable annexe would fall within category 5 of the Framework (Reconstruction) and is permitted. A condition would be attached to any approval of a non-habitable annexe in the area, to ensure that it remains non-habitable. Developments which increase occupation will not be supported within the Pagham Beach Estate, as the area is vulnerable to increased risk of erosion and flooding due to the dynamic local coastal processes.

PARKING

Although the outbuilding would occupy a significant proportion of the are to the front of the property, sufficient space for parking two cars on the site would remain. The number of parking spaces complies with the Arun Parking Standards, and the proposal would retain sufficient off-road parking in accordance with ALP policy T SP1.

SUMMARY

Whilst the alterations to the front of the property would be acceptable, the proposed outbuilding and gates conflict with ALP policies D DM1 and HER DM4. The 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 Pagham Beach Estate area of character in conflict with ALP policies D DM1 and HER DM4.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

The Council in making a decision, should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as Arun District Council to act in a manner, which is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights.

Consideration has been specifically given to Article 8 (Right to respect private and family life), Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). It is not considered that the recommendation for refusal of

permission in this case interferes with applicant's right to respect for their private and family life and their home, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of neighbours). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest and the recommendation for refusal is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.

DUTY UNDER THE EQUALITIES ACT 2010

In assessing this proposal the following impacts have been identified upon those people with the following protected characteristics (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation).

The proposal would have a neutral impact on the protected characteristics.

CIL DETAILS

This application is not CIL liable.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

- 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 Pagham Beach Estate area of character in conflict with ALP policies D DM1 and HER DM4.
- 2 INFORMATIVE: Statement pursuant to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm, which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.