Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1471/13 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 2 The Marlinespike Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5RD

Proposal: Retrospective application for boundary wall with new piers 1.55 m high and decorative brickwork on east and south east boundary.

Date of site visit: 27th November 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a detached bungalow situated on a corner plot in a residential area characterised by dwellings of similar scale and era. The plot is bounded by a part brick and part screen block wall with piers and overall approximately 1.8m high.

The proposal is a retrospective application for the retention of the wall as built.

Representations: No third party representations have been received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The erection of a wall above 1m in height adjacent to a public road used by motor traffic requires planning permission. The main issues in this instance are the impact of the wall upon visual amenity in the locality, highways safety and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Visual Amenity

The wall presents a noticeable element in the street scene on a relatively visible corner plot. In the context of the street, it is considered that the scale and design of the wall is a contrast to what is present on the other plots in the two roads forming the apex where the subject property is located.

In The Marlinspike and Winterton Way, the road to the side of the application site, the predominant and prevailing form of frontage boundary is characterised by low/dwarf walls or hedges. There are however, several properties in the area that have taller means of enclosure. These are located around 105 Old Fort Road where tall fencing encloses the Winterton Way frontage and along the side of 86 Old Fort Road and surrounding 109 Old Fort Road where there are walls of similar heights and designs to the wall proposed to be retained, albeit in the latter instance, rendered in white finish.

Regard is had therefore to the examples of means of enclosure of similar height along boundaries as above described. It is acknowledged that permission for some of these may not have been sought. It is considered however, that, whilst these enclosures are distinct to a certain degree in their immediate and wider surroundings, they do not create such markedly incongruous features as to materially disrupt the general character of the area. Similarly, it is considered that the wall as built on the boundaries of the application site is not so jarring in the street scene as to cause significant harm to the character of the area. Moreover, the afore-mentioned walls have already altered the context of the area so that any new wall of similar design would not appear uniquely at odds with what is already present. In reaching this view, regard has been had in this particular case to the use of materials that match the host dwelling, their muted colour and the fact that the upper blocks provide a degree of through visibility that all together serve to reduce any impression of adverse visual impact.

Residential amenity

The wall is not of sufficient height and in a position that would cause any material loss of light or outlook to neighbouring property. In reaching this view, account is taken of the wall of similar height that is subject to the current application that is positioned along the boundary with 15 Winterton Way, the neighbouring property to the north. This wall would already serve to limit light and outlook to the neighbouring property and it is not considered that the newly built wall would add significantly to loss of amenity in any regard. No other property is affected.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The boundary wall as built does not detract from neighbour amenity, visual amenity or highways safety. It does not consequently conflict with saved policies AG1 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan or the National Planning Policy Framework.

1. Approved Plans

Informatives

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning

permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Case Officer: Lawrence Simmons Date: 17 December 2013

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 17 December 2013