Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/0761/15**

Recommendation – Approve

Site: 43 Downside

Proposal: Installation of trellis atop existing fence along driveway (east boundary) and closeboarded fence panels atop existing wall (west boundary). Total height to both boundaries 2.3 metres

Date of site visit: 8-6-15
Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a two-storey detached dwelling in a residential street in an outer suburb of Shoreham.

The neighbouring buildings either side are bungalows. The neighbouring building to the west has been extended by way of a flat roof rear extension, which has a side window in it facing onto the application site.

Permission is sought for trellis atop an existing fence (east boundary) and a close boarded fence atop an existing wall (west boundary). The total height to both boundaries would be 2.3 metres.

Relevant site history
None relevant

Consultations (summarised)
Southern Water: *Location of any gate/fence posts and foundations should be kept clear of public sewers, rising mains and water mains.*

Representations (summarised)
Objections received from occupiers of 45 Downside and David Sessions (no address given):-
Your letter appeared to be almost identical but you failed to point out that is now 2.3 m compared to 2.225m. Apart from being eyesore and completely out of character with area it will exclude most of light through our window it will completely darken our front door and hall making it necessary to use lights for fear of bumping with my electric chair. 41 had similar problems when he installed his fence in front of their kitchen window. As I said previously, call around and see for yourself. Vehemently object to fencing above the normal 2 meter height on the West wall as it is not necessary, will interfere with our light and take away our view affecting the value of our property. History is that when occupant of 43 moved in garden was denuded, all shrubs and trees destroyed. Completely exposing the garden and ourselves. A large decking was built on the back and whole of ground rear knocked out. Exposed us

further. Occupant realised our little kitchen window now overlooked his decking he went to planning and ask for out plans out of archives. It was found that window should have been frosted and objected. Your Claire Pink came out to see and ruled that the same window had been there prior to 1999. In addition, occupant of 42 has all his fences facing inwards (unlike normal persons). I personally (from an electric wheelchair taking me 3 months) constructed with the aid of my, a trellis and climbing plants (roses, clematis, jasmine). This on the advice of Claire Pink was no higher than 2 metres. His wall could possibly be dangerous. You never mention my kitchen window yet you did in your letter to No. 41? Totally bemused by my neighbours audacity. My neighbour has caused a lot of problems since moving in 2011.

Relevant Planning Policies
National Planning Policy Framework
Saved Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle. No new fence posts are proposed, so Southern Water comments are not relevant in relation to this proposal.

Residential amenity

By way of its design, the trellis would allow neighbours to continue to benefit from sufficient light and outlook whilst providing some additional mutual privacy.

The fence would be solid and remove some light and outlook from the side window. However this is a secondary light source (and was originally meant to be obscure glazed) so would not impinge materially on the living conditions of the neighbours. It would provide mutual privacy.

No residential harm would arise.

Visual amenity

The trellis and fence are of designs typical of a suburban garden, and would not be conspicuously visible from public vantage point. Both are entirely in character with its domestic setting.

No visual harm would arise.

Recommendation

Approve

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit

2. Approved Plans

Informative:

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? y

Case Officer:	Matthew Porter	Date: 13-7-2015
Authorised by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 13 July 2015