expires 29.11.07

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0606/07 **Recommendation - Permit**

Site: **382 Upper Shoreham Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5ND**

Proposal: **Boundary wall/fence heightening with double gates (retrospective)**

The Application

The application property is the western half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings on the north-west corner of Upper Shoreham Road and Erringham Road. The application is retrospective and for boundary fence/ piers heightening with double entrance gates.

The attached property No.380 has similar front (south) boundary treatment with brick piers and close boarded fence panels 2.0m in height. A pair of gates of similar design with access onto Upper Shoreham Road were introduced as part of planning approval SU/224/05/TP.

The detached bungalow on the other side of the junction with Erringham Road (NE side) as a 1.2 high brick wall with higher piers (approx 1.8m) and infill hedges. To the rear the access onto Erringham Road has 1.8m high brick walls.

Other properties on Upper Shoreham Road have made applications for higher than usual boundary fences and walls which front the main road. Notably on the south side of the road at No.373, a detached bungalow on lower ground had refused a highly ornate wall and gate combination 2.4m in height. Subsequent approval was granted for a similar design lowered to 1.7m in height (gates) and 1.35m in height (wall and piers).

An appeal in 2002 also relating to fencing and trellis up to 2.0m at 402 Upper Shoreham Road was dismissed. The inspector concluded that it was 'unsympathetic to the prevailing form of frontage boundary found hereabouts and detracts from the open and spacious appearance of the streetscape.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There have been no third party representations on the application.

County Planning Transport Services: Initially raised an objection to the lack of pedestrian visibility, but on the basis of evidence provided by the applicant

they accept that leaving the site in a forward gear far outweighs these concerns. The objection has been withdrawn.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005): LOC1, DEV1, DEV4-5
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising:- Dev Control Standard No.3 ' Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' PPS1 ' Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

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

Policies
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. DEV4 requires development ensures safe and adequate access to the highway network.

Visual amenity.
The fence and piers have already been erected and appear to have been increase in height by approximately 0.3 – 0.5m. Visually the fence and wall are not dissimilar to the boundary that originally existed. Given the context of the large semi-detached house, its set-back from the highway and the boundary treatment of the attached property it is considered that the scale of the fence is acceptable in terms of it dominance.

Highway safety.
The applicant has provided photographic evidence which shows that the original boundary fence and wall would still have impeded pedestrian visibility. Notwithstanding this the shrubs and trees in and around the gate area would have obscured a view from the driveway irrespective of the boundary height.

The applicant has included a turning area which allows the vehicles exiting the site to do so in a forward gear. This represents an improvement in the visibility that would have been attainable prior to the alterations to the fence and walls.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

The developer does not detract . . . and has taken place without . . .
. . It consequently does not conflict with . . ADLP (AH7) . . . WSSP (DEV1 & DEV4

1PPii amended

Case Officer:
Date: 26.11.07