

Supporting Statement for Appeal of Planning Application Ref 3/2016/0114

Project: Erection of Garage to house caravan & Boundary Fence

Location: Blue Trees, Copster Green, Blackburn, BB1 9EP

Client: Mr J Rowley

Job Ref: 16007

Date: 10th May 2016

1.0 The Proposal

1.01 This proposal arose due to the appellants desire to provide a secure storage place for their caravan / motorhome. The garage building to house this, therefore, needs to be significantly larger than a standard car garage in order to adequately accommodate this vehicle. The single storey garage building is 6.9m wide, 8.5m long and 5.9m high (4.2m high eaves).

1.02 In addition, following the recent approval of a large extension at the front of the neighbouring dwelling Oaksmead (application ref 3/2015/0771/P), which did not take into account any impact that this would have on the appellants other property Hill Top Bungalow, they decided to include within the same application the erection of a fence to block out this eyesore extension from their view and to shield the Lounge window from the proposed neighbouring drive (which would be oriented head on to the window). The proposed fence is 3.2m high, which would still be more than 700mm lower than the eaves height of the proposed neighbouring extension. The fence was also designed to be stepped down in height as it gets nearer to the highway to reduce its visual impact from the green.

1.03 The fence is intended to replace the existing lower level fence which is deteriorating in condition. The fence line is directly next to a row of conifers which are currently higher than the proposed fence height.



1.04 Photographs of existing conifers along the boundary line (the chimney of the neighbouring dwelling Oaksmead can just be seen above the trees).



2.0 Local Authority Reason for Refusal - Point 1

Incongruous features resulting in detriment to visual amenity.

2.01 The neighbouring development Oaksmead also contains incongruous features, but that did not constitute a reason for refusal of that application.

2.02 The proposed Oaksmead extension is larger in scale, height and massing than the proposed garage, and is also higher than the proposed fence. The garage design, appearance and form is in keeping with other similar buildings in the area, whilst the fences appearance is timber to match other nearby fences.

2.03 The proposed garage is also located well away from the highway, being 36m from the front boundary, which means this will not be very visible at all from the green.

2.04 It is also worth noting that the parish council objected to this application giving 5 reasons against it, yet they failed provide any comments at all against the neighbouring Oaksmead application, a proposal that significantly changes the local character and vernacular of the location being very prominently located at the front of the dwelling. In contrast the appellants proposals are predominantly behind the established building line with the garage building being located 36m from the highway and approx 19m behind the building line.



The Intelligent Design Centre
Creative thinking in architecture, engineering and the built environment

The Intelligent Design Centre
5-11 Eagle Street, Accrington, Lancashire, BB5 1LN
T_01254 232 007
F_01254 392 193
E_info@email-idc.co.uk
W_www.intelligentdesigncentre.co.uk

3.0 Local Authority Reason for Refusal - Point 2

Overbearing impact.

3.01 The proposed fence is 3.2m high, the blank wall of the proposed neighbouring extension is 3.8m high to the eaves level and 7.1m to the ridge. We do not consider the fence to be overbearing in this situation, in fact quite the opposite.

3.02 The proposed garage building is 4.2m high to the eaves level, next to the existing conifers which are around the same height. In addition the proposed garage building is set 9m beyond the rear wall of the neighbouring Oaksmead. We do not consider this to be overbearing.

Over shadowing.

3.03 The proposed fence and garage are located to the North side of the neighbouring building Oaksmead. It is therefore difficult to understand how this development can cause any over shadowing to Oaksmead when the sun shines from the Oaksmead side towards the appellants property.

3.04 In addition, there is also currently a row of conifers along the majority of the proposed fence line, which are higher than the proposed fence and around the same height as the proposed garage eaves. Therefore if there are any issues relating to light they must currently exist and would not be made any worse by the this proposal.

Loss of outlook.

3.05 Any loss of outlook that could be caused to the windows on the front and rear elevation of Oaksmead, will not be any worse than the present situation due to the existing fence and conifers. The new fence will be painted green to blend in with the conifers.

3.06 With regards to the windows in the front elevation of Oaksmead, the case officer appears to have only considered this application against the existing situation rather than against their approved extension. If this extension is built then the proposed fence will not affect any of the windows at the front of the enlarged property.

3.07 We therefore do not consider this development to cause any loss of outlook to the neighbours.



4.0 Conclusions

4.01 Whilst the proposed garage and fence have a slightly different arrangement than the recently approved neighbouring extension, they are no larger in scale, massing and overall height than the Oaksmead extension. The building element of this proposal (the garage) is located well behind the building line, unlike the Oaksmead extension which protrudes 7m from the front of the building completely disregarding the established building line for newly constructed buildings on this side of the road.

4.02 Therefore, based on the existing features on the site and the precedent set by the neighbouring extension, we do not believe the appellants proposals will be any worse.

4.03 We appreciate that each development should be evaluated on it's own merits, however, it is very difficult to comprehend why one development is deemed acceptable and the other is not, particularly when assessed against the same criteria.

