|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** |  | | | | **Date:** |  | **Manager:** | |  | **Date:** |  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | 3/2021/0437 | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | 15/02/21- previous application | | | | | |
| **Officer:** | | | RB | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | **APPROVAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Application for regularisation of the erection of a 1.8m high garden fence to the boundary with hedging to screen fence. Erection of detached garden building to side. Resubmission of application 3/2021/0130 | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | 67 Hillcrest, Langho, BB6 8EN | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | |
| The parish council have objected to the development with the following comments:   * The Hillcrest estate is ‘open plan’, with few, if any fences at the frontages. This , despite the   ‘added hedge’ will be incongruous with every other house on the estate.   * Concerns were raised how many years the laurel hedge would take to conceal the fence   that does look out of place compared to neighbouring properties. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | No objection subject to condition requring that the new driveway be paved with a porous bound material. LCC also request that the access remain ungated and a dropped kerb will be required. Also the hedging needs to be cut back so that it doesn’t overhang the footpath. | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | |
| No comments received in respect of the proposed development | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Policy DMG1 – General Considerations  Policy DMH5 – Residential & curtilage Extensions  **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  3/2020/0769-Three pitched roof dormers to front elevation. Resubmission of application 3/2020/0443- Approved with Conditions  3/2021/0130- Regularisation of erection of 1.8m high garden fence to boundary- refused. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application property is a semi-detached bungalow located on a cul-de-sac off, Hillcrest Road within the defined settlement of Langho. Consent has previously been refused for the erection of a 1.8m fence. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  Retrospective consent is sought for the regularisation of the erection of a 1.8m high boundary fence along the northern boundary of the property and a Native Yew hedge is proposed between the fence and the footpath at the same height.The works also involve the creation of an area for off street parking at the rear of the dwelling and new vehicular access off Hillcrest Road.  Consent is also sought for the erection of a detached garden room to the side of the property. The garden room measures 5m by 4,5m and will have a flat roof measuring 2.5m in maximum height. The garden room is set back from the highwy by approximately 1.7m. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Residential Amenity:**  Due to the orientation of the application site in relation to the street scene and neighbouring dwellings the fence is not considered to result in any significant negative impact on the residential amenity of any neighbouring residential properties within the surrounding area. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity:**  Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1 states that ‘development should be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature’. Furthermore, emphasis is placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings.  By virtue of the orientation of the dwelling, topography of the site and plot location the application site in afforded a high level of visual prominence on approach from Hillcrest Road. The location of the fencing is sited on the most prominent northern boundary of the application property.  In the wider area the majority of propertiers along Hillcrest Road do not benefit from any defined boundary treatment however on occasion low stone walls are used to determine the end of a garden when adjacent to the pavement. At the application property the previous boundary treatment was a hedge with a fence behind with open tressling above. The exact height of the fence and hedge is undetermined but from google street view they appear to have exceeded 1m in height. This hedge provided the required privacy to the rear garden area of the property and it was considered to be a good visual barrier that had an acceptable impact on the visual amenity of the area, as the hedge covered the majority of the fence behind and the area not screened was open tressling so that the fence wasn’t visually prominent. As a result, the most prominent feature was the hedge to the front.  The revised application proposes to replace the existing hedge with a newly planted Native Yew container grown hedge that will be of the same height as the fence. As such similar to the previous situation the most prominent feature will be the hedge to the front. To ensure the hedge screens the fence it will be conditioned that the hedge be planted at its full 1.8m height and that it must be retained in perpeutuity and be replaced if it dies.  The proposed garden room would be visible from Hillcrest Road and would be seen as a prominent addition when viewed from this Road. However as the building could be erected under permitted development it would be unreasonable for the application to be refused for this reason. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways:**  LCC highways have no objection to the development but would like to make the applicant aware of the requirement to get a license for a dropped kerb and also that the proposd hedge be maintained so that it doesn’t overhang the highway. A condition will also be attached requiring the proposed driveway be surfaced in a porous bound material. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Other Matters:**  So that the hedge would encourage biodiversity in the area it was request that the proposed hedge to be planted would be a Native Yew hedge instead of Laurel. This type of hedge provides the required screenage as well as being a good habitat. The hedge will be required to be planted within 2 months of the permission as the boundary fencing is already in place and it must be replanted if it ever dies within the next 5 years and the hedge must be retained there after. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  The proposal has no significant detrimental impact on nearby residential amenity nor would it have an adverse visual impact. I therefore recommend accordingly. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | | | That planning consent be granted | | | | | | | | |