DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: WB/11/0197/FULL – 2 Haynes Road

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 13/04/11

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): N

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The site is on a prominent street corner on a mini-roundabout at a junction of five highways, including one that carries a considerable amount of north-south traffic. The land is slightly elevated from the immediate highway.

The application property is a detached bungalow with vehicular access onto Rectory Road and a pedestrian gate access off Haynes Road. It is surrounded by a mature hedge that is an established feature in its own right in the street.

PROPOSAL:

The development sought for has been advertised as remove existing Privet hedging and erection of timber close boarded feather edged fencing to a total height of 1.8 metres

The proposal consists of:

- Erection of length of timber featheredge fence panel and support posts, some 29 metres in length at a height of 1.8 metres

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

None

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

South East Plan
CC1, CC6, BE1

Worthing Core Strategy
16

Worthing Local Plan 2003
H16, H18

Government Advice
PPS1

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Borough Environmental Health consultation response received:

Please add precautionary contamination condition

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

Introduction

The principle planning concern with this development is its impact visually.

The site is not one identified as contaminated so an informative is sufficient to raise the applicant's awareness of the risk.

Visual

The application site occupies a prominent location, close by to a Conservation Area. The immediate area has a verdant appearance, with mature protected trees around, well maintained domestic gardens, and grass verges.

The mature hedge surrounding the site is a significant and attractive feature in its own right, and it contributes to the greenery in the street. Due to the site's elevated and expansive corner plot, your eye is drawn to the hedge when looking north and from the east. It appears in good health; the applicant has not presented any evidence to support his claim the hedge is diseased and dying.

This hedge would be lost to facilitate the erection of a solid featheredge panel run of fence, at a uniform 1.8 metres in height. The introduction of this would greatly diminish the green and pleasant appearance of the area, to its detriment.

Its bland and solid design would, instead, present a stark and forbidding hard boundary treatment at odds with the area's wider character. Such a detrimental impact would be exacerbated by its long, continuous length wrapping around the entirety of the exposed corner of the plot, and its uniformly tall height. Both offer little respite to its hostile and inhospitable appearance, which is emphasised further still by its suggested position hard up against the back edge of pavement leaving no scope for additional planting to soften its appearance.

Conclusion

For the above reasons the proposal would have an unacceptable impact, and should not be supported.

RECOMMENDATION:

Refuse for the following reason:-

The fencing due to its long continuous length, uniformly tall height, bland design, and position hard up against the back edge of pavement, would introduce a stark and forbidding hard boundary treatment and necessitate the removal of an attractive hedge, so diminishing the local distinctive soft verdant character and appearance of the street scene to the detriment of wider visual amenity.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The proposal conflicts with the Worthing Core Strategy Policy 16 and South East Plan policy CC6 and BE1.

HUMAN RIGHTS:

Article 8 (Right to Respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to this application. It is accepted that the proposal, if refused, would have some impact on the applicant's Rights. However, it is considered that the harm caused by the development outweighs these and that in the public interest the application should be refused. Accordingly it is considered that this decision complies with the Human Rights Act 1998, with regard to Article 8 and Article 1

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

N/A

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign..... [redacted] .....Date..... 9/6/11.....

Authorising Officer
Sign..... [redacted] .....Date..... 9 6 11.....