exp 16/7

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0303/07 **Recommendation - Permit**

Site: **373 Upper Shoreham Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5NB**

Proposal: **2 metal gates (each 3m wide and 1.7m high) and new brick wall and metal fence along front boundary to total maximum height of 1.7m** with brick piers 1.35m high

pl crend description

The Application

The application relates to a the railings and gates at the front of a detached house on the south side of Upper Shoreham Road. The proposal is for 2 metal gates (each 3m wide and 1.7m high), new a new brick wall and fence along the front boundary to total maximum height of 1.7m.

An application for a similar front boundary totalling 2.4m in height (ADC/381/06) was refused on the grounds that –

The fencing and gates together form an obtrusive and incongruous feature that is visually out of keeping with existing development and detrimental to the environment, thereby conflicting with the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (CH1, DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7).

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

WSCC- Highways & Transport – No objections.

Third Parties

The occupier of the property to the east (No.371) has written in and raised concerns that the maximum for any gate or wall at the front of a property was 4ft (1.2m). They feel that as their bungalow is set down low, a continuous length of gates, brickwalls and fencing up high would only serve to make them feel completely closed in. If the development is passed it would set a precedent for the rest of the road.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005): DEV1, DEV4-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7, AT12.

Planning Assessment

The main concern with the application is the effect on the visual amenities of the locality but also the highway safety implications resulting from reduced visibility from the access.

Policy DEV1 requires high quality development taking into account the need to have regard to local context including the varied traditions and character of different areas, the site characteristics, streetscape and use of materials and styles. Policy AH7, relating to householder proposals, requires design and materials sympathetic to the original dwelling and the area in general. AT12 requires safe and adequate access.

The unauthorised railings and gates previously refused were judged, due to their height, to have been extremely obtrusive in the street scene and appeared highly incongruous with other frontages in the locality. The highly ornate design was considered to add to the obtrusive impact.

An appeal in 2002 related to fencing/trellising up to 2m tall at 402 Upper Shoreham Road was dismissed. The site lies obliquely opposite the present site. Subsequent to the dismissed appeal approval was granted for a brick wall with iron railings, and gates which range from 1.6m in height to 1.8m in height. The variation in height occurs due to the slight gradient in the street. 1.5 on plan

The current submission shows the gates at a maximum height of 1.7m returning down to the brick piers which themselves would be a maximum of 1.35m. The iron fence panels would match the 1.7m height of the main gates and it is considered that with the property at No.402 already having a boundary which is of similar size that a precedent would not be set by the current proposals.

The proposed reduction of the gates, brick piers and fence panels is considered sufficient to prevent the height from appearing obtrusive or incongruous within the streetscene. The undulating form of the fence and gates would mean that the overall impact of the fence would not be of a solid 1.7m high structure. The fence panels and gates although highly decorative would allow for views through them and would help to ease the feeling of enclosure that the objector has concerns about. The highly decorative design, although unusual, would not have an obtrusive impact at this reduced scale.

The ability to see through the gates prevents the proposals from having an adverse effect on pedestrian visibility or highway safety.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPii.

1. C1Ci.

Case Officer: [signature] C. [signature]
Date: 28.06.07 28.6.07

Head of Planning & Community: [signature]
Date: 2/7/07

Chair of the Planning & Regulatory Committee: [signature]
Date: 2/7/07