Expiry: 7/9

Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0831/26 **Recommendation – Refuse**

Site: **8-12 Penhill Road, Lancing**

Proposal: **Proposed 1.8m high wrought iron fence with gates to North boundary.**

Date of site visit: 17/7

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

Gardner and Scardifield occupy this corner site which includes 57-61 (odd) South Street and 2–12 (evens) Penhill Road. These are retail premises selling DIY related goods. To the east on Penhill Road is a Builders Merchants yard also belonging to Gardner and Scardifield, beyond which is a working men's club. Opposite the site on Penhill Road is an Education facility/offices.

The site is not in a conservation area and is not a listed building. There are no TPO's on the site and no known associated flood risk.

Permission is sought to enclose part of the site's forecourt on Penhill Road. This area is currently used, during opening hours, to display goods for sale. The application has been revised since first submitted to show a reduced height railing of 1.8 metres, with a simpler design. As originally proposed, the railings were shown as 2.4 metres and with a more intricate metal work design. The railing would extend to the back edge of the footpath and would be 22 metres in length to the back wall of the building. It is set back from the South Street frontage by 11 metres. In the revised plans gates have been added at either end as well as those in the Penhill Road frontage originally proposed. It is to be painted blue in the Gardner and Scardifeld colour.

Relevant Planning History

L/173/96/TP – Storage building at side. Granted

Consultations

Highways:

The proposal is for a wrought iron fence and gate positioned around the frontage of 8-12 Penhill Road. The fence is to be positioned approx. 3.3m north of the northern exterior wall and extend for approx. 22.5m along the boundary.

I have independently consulted the WSCC Highway Boundary team regarding this location and have been advised that the relevant field sheet shows the highway boundary extent to be the back edge of footway, with an average width of 2.0 metres from the edge of the carriageway.

Expiry: 7/9

> Can the applicant please confirm and provide evidence that the fencing will not obstruct access to these assets and that it will not at any point along its length be constructed within or overhang onto the Publicly Maintained footway along Penhill Road.
>
> I have discussed the presence of both WSCC and City Fibre assets in the maintained highway in this location, with the Area Highway Engineer. The fencing should be situated to the rear of these assets to ensure maintenance and access is available in perpetuity within the publicly maintained highway.

Lancing Parish Council: supports the application.

Representations

13 neighbours notified plus a SN: no responses received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15
National Planning Policy Framework (2026)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal involves upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The scale and height of the proposed fencing represents a visually intrusive compound style enclosure that would be harmful to general visual amenity.

Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan states that development '*should be of a high architectural quality and respect and enhance the character of the site, and the prevailing character of the area',* and '*enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character*' and '*make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area'.*

There are no other frontages enclosed with such high fencing in the vicinity. Penhill Road is a largely residential road where frontages are enclosed with typically low walls or are open. The proposal will not enhance local character or the sense of place. There does not appear to be a significant security need or otherwise to encourage permanent enclosure of the forecourt in this manner.

Residential amenity

There is no direct harm to residential amenity.

Expiry: 7/9

Highways

The agent has confirmed no encroachment of highway land is intended. It would appear that the enclosure would not intrude into the designated highway but this is not certain as Highway's comments refer to the highway having 'an average width of 2.0 metres'. This matter could be dealt with by condition.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the following reason:

1. The proposed enclosure of the forecourt with 1.8 metre high blue railings would be out of character locally and would be harmful to visual amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? Y

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 for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Case Officer:	MOK	Date: 1/10
Authorised by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 1 October 2026