DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: WB/10/045/FULL – 104 Palatine Road

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 02/03/10

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): N

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site is situated off a residential street, with speed humps along its length. It is characterised by detached bungalows of a quite uniform style and design. Throughout the surrounding streets front and side boundaries are predominately demarked by low dwarf walls and hedging, with front gardens left largely open.

The application property is a detached bungalow on a prominent corner site. The boundary treatment along Palatine Road is a very low brick boundary wall. The boundary along Coniston Road is demarked by a run of hedging some 1.8 – 2 metres in height.

PROPOSAL:

The development has been advertised as provision of close boarded fencing above existing side boundary wall and new piers

Planning permission has been applied for:

A side boundary wall (consisting of brick pillars with fencing infill, topped with trellis) to measure some 2 metres in height with a length of some 20 19 metres, and to run along a length of side boundary to Coniston Road.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

None

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

The South East Plan
BE1, CC6, CC1, T4

Worthing Local Plan 2003
BE1, H16, H18, TR9

National Advice
PPS1, PPG13

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

West Sussex County Council consultation response received, content of which is summarised below:

No highway safety concerns

The proposal is for the provision of new fencing at this site, in addition to extension of existing hard standing. The fencing will not impact adversely on vehicular and pedestrian visibility at this location. No anticipated safety concerns regarding creation of additional vehicular parking space and caravan storage by extending existing hard standing utilising existing access point

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

Introduction

The principal planning concerns with this proposal are its impact upon visual amenities of the area, and highway safety.

Visual Impact

Frontage treatments along Palatine Road are generally defined by low walls, low fences, or hedges/shrubs or a combination of these resulting in an attractive but relatively open street scene. There are a few exceptions to this, with particular reference to a high brick wall at No. 117 Palatine Road which is located on the corner plot opposite the application site. Further, the proposed boundary treatment is to a side road (Coniston Road). It will not project beyond the front wall of the house and it is set back from the junction leaving an appropriately open frontage. Furthermore, the use of three different types of boundary treatments does help to break up what could otherwise be a monotonous and bland close boarded fence. It also benefits the amenities of the occupiers by better securing their private garden.

Highway safety

The new boundary treatment would reduce visibility to some extent, but the Highways Authority has not raised objection. Because the increase in height of the boundary treatment is to a stretch of boundary along a quiet side road and terminates before rounding the corner onto Palatine Road itself, the Local Planning Authority concurs with this assessment. As such, no highway safety concern would arise.

Conclusion

Given the above assessment the fencing is acceptable in visual and highway safety terms, and the application should be approved.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard three year
2. Brick pillars to match existing main property
3. Plans as approved

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The proposed development would not detract from the existing local urban environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and without detraction from highway safety. It would consequently not conflict with the relevant 'saved' policies of the Worthing Local Plan (BE1, H16, H18, TR9) and the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1, T4).

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 approved, would have some impact on the neighbouring properties. However, it is considered that on balance, existing residential quality of life would not be significantly adversely affected as a result of the proposal. Accordingly it is considered that it is acceptable with regard to Article 8 and Article 1.

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

N/A

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign..... [redacted] .....Date.....8/4/10.....

Authorising Officer
Sign..... [redacted] .....Date.....8.4.10.....