Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0365/20 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 1 Valentine Close, Steyning Road, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Proposed 2m high close boarded fence to West boundary

Date of site visit: 13 March 2020

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is in a prominent location at the gateway to Shoreham and within the Old Shoreham Conservation Area, on the edge of the Built Up Area boundary. The garden of the property is triangular and narrow to a point at its southern end. There is currently a low picket fence along the roadside, slightly elevated above the pavement level.

It is proposed to replace the fence with a new 2m high closeboard fence for a length of about 25m along the southernmost part of the garden boundary with Steyning Road.

Relevant Planning History

None

Consultations

West Sussex County Council: The **Highways Authority** has no objection. The proposed close boarded fence will be positioned circa 3.2m from the nearside edge of the carriageway and does not appear to encroach on the public highway. The proposed height of the fence, as demonstrated on the proposed plan, is 2m. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) does not anticipate that the erected fence will cause a highway safety concern in this location as it is not expected to obstruct visibility along the publically maintained highway.

Adur District Conservation Advisory Group: On the one hand the members can sympathise with the applicant's need for the fencing to be erected particularly in an area which is heavily trafficked resulting in excessive pollution, plus the site not allowing much privacy. However, we are aware that the 6' close boarded fence will have an adverse effect on the heritage church of St. Nicholas located nearby.

Members are in the main, supportive of such a fence but would ask that applicant selects a close boarded fence where the its effect a softened with a form of trellis type pattern on the highest 12/14 inches on each panel. This, it is felt would be acceptable & members would then recommend APPROVE

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15, 17
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle, subject to consideration of the visual impact, particularly on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Visual amenity and impact on Conservation Area

The street scene along this part of Steyning Road is open in character with only a low picket fence along the frontage of 1-3 Valentine Close. Opposite there is a mixture of low wall, picket fence and hedge. It is considered that the introduction of a 2m high closeboard fence, located in an elevated position along part of the roadside boundary at No.1 would be visually harmful and out of character with the street scene. It would therefore fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

While the desire of the applicant for some privacy and protection from traffic noise in their garden is understood, it is not considered that this is sufficient justification in this case for development that would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area. The suggestion of ADCAG to amend the fence design to include a section of trellis is noted but this is not considered to be sufficient to mitigate the impact of the fence in this location.

Recommendation

REFUSE

The proposed fence by reason of its height, length and design would be an intrusive feature out of character with the street scene and harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 15 and 17 of the Adur Local Plan and the NPPF.

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

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 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: 7 April 2020

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 7 April 2020