Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.						
Signed:	Officer:	Date:	Manager:		Date:	

Application Ref:	3/2021/0130	Ribble Valley
Date Inspected:	15/02/21	Borough Council
Officer:	RB	www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
DELEGATED ITEM FIL	E REPORT:	REFUSAL

Development Description:	Application for regularisation of the erection of a 1.8m high garden fence to the boundary and new parking area to the rear of the dwelling.
Site Address/Location:	67 Hillcrest, Langho, BB6 8EN

# CONSULTATIONS: Parish/Town Council

The parish council have objected to the development as the fencing in this location is out of character with the surrounding properties. The estate has no or very low fencing resulting in an open aspect to all houses. Concerns were also raised with regards to a covenant on the property restricting placement/height of the fencing.

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies	
LCC Highways:	Have objected to the development as the applicant has not provided sufficent details of the off street parking area to the rear of the property in terms of dimensions of the spaces, proposed surfacing materials and sufficient visibility splays being shown.	
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

## **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.

## 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. 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. No details of the proposed parking area to be retained have been provided in terms of proposed surfacing materials, dimensions of the spaces and the visibility splay to be achieved.

### **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 properties 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 trellis fencing above. The exact height of the fence and hedge is underdetermined 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, with the trellis above.

The retrospective application has removed a section of hedging at the site that will be re planted and the remainder of the hedge has been retained. Behind the hedge a 1.8m tall timber boarded fence has been erected. As built, the fence does appear to be taller than the fence that was previously situated on site. As the fence is of a solid construction despite being partially screened by the hedging the fence is visually dominant and is considered to be out of character with the wider area when compared with the existing boundary treatments in the immediate locality as mentioned above.

As such it considered that the fence, by virtue of its size, scale and visual prominence, has resulted in the introduction of an incongruous feature within the streetscene that is be visually dominant and harmful to the character and appearance wider area.

### **Highways:**

The development proposes to create a new off street parking area to the rear of the property. No details of the proposed materials, dimensions of each parking space or visibility splay to be provided have been submitted with the application. Therefore LCC highways have objected to the application on the grounds of the development having an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

### **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**

In conclusion, the development would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area and does not comply with Policy DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. Furthermore the development has an unacceptable impact on highway safety contrary to Policy DMG1 and DMG3.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

That planning consent be refused for the following reason(s):

- 1. The proposed development, due to its scale, size and visual prominence, would result in an incongruous form of development that would be of detriment to the visual amenity of the area in direct conflict with Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Core Strategy.
- 2. The applicant has failed to adequately demonstrate that the proposed new vehicular access off Hillcrest Road will not result in detriment to the safe operation of the immediate highway by virtue of vehicle-to-vehicle conflict nor has the applicant demonstrated that adequate visibility splays can be provided and maintained as such that would allow vehicles to safely leave and enter the site. As such the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy