|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | | **Officer:** | **EP** | | | | **Date:** | | **05/01/2023** | | **Manager:** | | **SK** | **Date:** | **08.01.23** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | | 2023/0927 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | | 13/12/2023 | | | **Site Notice:** | | N/A | |
| **Officer:** | | | | | EP | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | **REFUSAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | | Regularisation of boundary fence to front and side. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | | 2 Sunnyside Avenue, Wilpshire BB1 9LW | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| Wilpshire Parish Council raise no objection to the current application but wouldn’t want the fence to extend any further along Whalley Road. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | | No objection. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | | |
| Two letters of objection have been received raising the following concerns.   * Loss of outlook. * Fence is out of keeping with the area. * Fence is overbearing and domineers the property. * If approved will set a precedent for other similar fences. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy  Key Statement DS2: Sustainable Development  Policy DMG1: General Considerations  Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  No recent planning history. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application relates to a semi-detached property in Wilpshire, accessed from Sunnyside Avenue. The site location is within the settlement boundary of Wilpshire, with immediate surroundings mostly comprised of detached and semi-detached residential development, with the dwelling itself faced in a combination of pebble render and red brick. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  This application seeks retrospective planning consent for the erection of a timber boundary fence measuring a maximum height of 1.9m from ground level. The proposed fence has been constructed with concrete posts, concrete base boarding and timber close boarded fence panels. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  The application dwelling hosts a corner position and consequently only has one directly adjoining neighbour, No.4 Sunnyside Avenue. The fence sited to the southern extents of the site and is therefore a sufficient distance from the neighbouring dwelling to mitigate any potential overbearing impact. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that development must   * *be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style, features and building materials.* * *Consider the density, layout and relationship between buildings, which is of major importance. Particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character, as well as the effects of development on existing amenities.*   Boundary treatments contribute a great deal to the streetscape and character of an area. Poorly designed boundary treatments can undermine the quality of the built environment. The application property hosts a corner position with the application fence facing both Whalley Road and Sunnyside Avenue and is therefore visually prominent in the general street scene. The overall street scene as existing comprises a range of boundary treatment primarily being low stone boundary walls and hedgerows. The wooden panels forming the fence appear stark and incongruous in the local surroundings and their overall effect is exacerbated by the slope of the Sunnyside Avenue which, from some aspects, exaggerates the apparent height of the structure. The fence extends the entire length of the dwellings front garden and continues past the rear of the property. A solid built structure of this extent significantly effects the openness of the area, particularly when considering the previous low boundary treatment that was in place. The fence, when read in conjunction with the existing boundary treatments within the street scene, appears anomalous and in stark contrast with the existing open plan character and soft landscaping of the street scene.  It is therefore considered that, by virtue of the application fences visual prominence, height and overall design, the development is in direct conflict with policy DMG1 in as much that it fails to respond positively the existing character of the streetscape. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways and Parking:**  LCC Highways were consulted in relation to the proposal and are of the opinion that there is no adverse impact on highway safety or amenity as a result of the application fence and subsequently raise no objection. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  No ecological constraints identified. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  As such, for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that the application is recommended for refusal. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| That planning consent be refused for the following reason(s). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **01:** | The proposed development by virtue of its height, extents, appearance and visual prominence would result in the introduction of an incongruous, unsympathetic and discordant feature that would be of detriment to the character and visual amenities of the area and contrary to the aims and objectives of Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |