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

Application Ref: Date Inspected:	3/2021/0384 23.06.21	Ribble Valley Borough Council
Officer:	RB	www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
DELEGATED ITEM FIL	E REPORT:	REFUSAL

Development Description:	Removal of hedge around exterior to erect 1.8m fence.
Site Address/Location:	1 Coniston Close, Longridge, PE3 3AU

Longridge Town Council object to the application as the deeds of the estate state that no permanent structure over 18 inch can be erected.

Removal of the hedfe will alter streetscene and impact on the potential wildife in the area.

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies	
LCC Highways:	No objection subject to conditions.	
CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.	

One letter of representation has been received with the following objections:

- Deeds of the properties in this estate do not allow for boundary walls/fences
- Fence would cause visibility issues.

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:

None relevant

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application property is a semi-detached dormer bungalow located in Longridge. The application site occupies a corner plot of the junction of Coniston Close and Langdale Road.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Consent is sought for the removal of the existing boundary fence and erection of 1.8m high fence in its place. The fence will be constructed using arch close boarded panels measuring 1.5m in height with concrete posts measuring 1.8m in height. The fence will extend along the boundary between the side and neighbour to the east measuring 13.2m and will then extend along the roadside boundary by 10m continuiting round the front corner by 1m and the across the front road side boundary by 4.9m

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 the plot being located on the corner of the junction the application site in afforded a high level of visual prominence on approach from Coniston Close and Langdale Road. The location of the fencing would be sited on the most prominent northern and western boundaries.

In the wider area the majority of properties along Langdale Road and Coniston Close do not benefit from any defined boundary treatment however on occasion low hedges are used to determine garden boundaries. At the application property the defining boundary is a hedge that provides a natural boundary but also determines the properties garden area and also acts as a privacy screen from the road.

The proposed fence would have a maximum height of 1.8m and would extend a total of 29.96m around the properties garden area. As the proposed fence is of a solid construction the fence would be 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, would result in the introduction of an incongruous feature within the streetscene that will be visually dominant and harmful to the character and appearance wider area.

Highways:

The proposed fence wraps around the corner of the property and ends adjacent to the driveway associated with the property. As such highways require that the fence be limited to 1m within the visibility splay of this driveway.

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.

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.