Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1293/13 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: **Galleons Reach, The Street, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex, BN43 5NJ**

Proposal: **1.8 metre high close boarded fence and 1.5 metre high metal gates on front and part side boundary (part retrospective).**

Date of site visit: 5 November 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a detached house in The Street, on the edge of Shoreham, close to Mill Hill. It is a semi-rural location with hedgerow and trees to the north on the opposite side of the road and paddocks beyond. The Street has an open character with low walls and hedges forming front boundaries.

This application seeks retrospective permission to retain a 1.8 metre high close boarded fence along the front and west side boundary. Also proposed, but not yet installed, are 1.5m high metal gates at the front.

Relevant site history

SU/235/01 – carport at front – Refused October 2001

Consultations

West Sussex County Council: The Transport Planning Officer has no objection. From inspection of the plans and information provided, the gates open inwards to the site preventing any obstruction to the public footway. Ideally gates should be situated 5 metres back from the carriageway edge to ensure the highway is not obstructed when the gates are closed and a vehicle is waiting to pull in. However, judging the application on its own merits, limited traffic movements occur down The Street and neighbouring properties also operate similar driveways nearby without any apparent concerns. Therefore on this basis, no concerns would be raised to this application from a highway safety perspective.

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
Assessment of Saved Policies (ADC 2013)
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

In this case, DC Standard No. 3 states that the addition of boundary fences can have a significant effect on the character of an area.

Visual amenity

The fence has been erected and it forms a stark and harsh feature in the street scene which is otherwise characterised by low walls and vegetation. The fence is 1.8m high and is far taller than other walls and fences in the street. While there are taller hedges, these are softer features which complement the semi-rural character of the street, which is on the edge of the countryside. The addition of metal gates will further enclose the frontage and result in another 'hard' feature. There is a '5-bar' gate further to the east but this is not considered to be intrusive or out of character, particularly as the remainder of that frontage comprises a low wall with hedge behind, and it is considered to be more appropriate than metal gates and close boarded fencing.

It is acknowledged that the applicant could erect a 1m high fence and gate at this location without requiring planning permission. However, the reduced height of such a feature, compared with what has been erected on site, would be less intrusive and would be a visual improvement.

Residential amenity

The fencing runs along the frontage and the western boundary of Galleons Reach. It does not have a harmful impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Recommendation

REFUSE and proceed with enforcement action to seek the removal of the fence for the reason:-

The fence and proposed gates, by reason of their stark appearance and prominent position, detract from the semi-rural and open character of the street to the detriment of the visual amenities of the locality. The proposal is

therefore contrary to saved policies AG1 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan and the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 10 December 2013

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 11 December 2013