| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Site Address: | 338 Purbrook Way, Havant, PO9 3SQ | | |
| Proposal: | Retention of fence. | | |
| Application No: | APP/17/00881 | Expiry Date: | 06/11/2017 |
| Applicant: | Mr & Mrs Mansbridge | | |
| Agent: | | Case Officer: | Harriet Pitney |
| Ward: | Barncroft | | |

Recommendation: **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION IN RETROSPECT**

## 1 Site Description

The application site forms the end of a terrace of 4 residential, two storey dwellinghouses, located on the corner plot between Linkenholt Way and Purbrook Way, comprising elevations of brick construction with a tiled pitched roof.

The property is set back from Purbrook Way by approximately 10 metres and is separated from the main highway by an area of green amenity space which appears to be a common characteristic within Purbrook Way.

The area is residential in nature with a medium to high density of dwellings adjacent to the site and to all boundaries all of a similar age, style and design.

## 2 Planning History

None relevant.

## 3 Proposal

This application has been submitted on a retrospective basis and seeks to retain the fence erected to the south and west boundaries of 338 Purbrook Way.

## 4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

| | |
|---|---|
| CS16 | (High Quality Design) |
| CS20 | (Transport and Access Strategy) |
| DM13 | (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development) |

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

| | |
|---|---|
| AL1 | (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development) |

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

## 5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

**Highways Engineer, Development Engineer**
The dropped kerb does not require planning permission but it does require the permission of the Highway Authority. Look on https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/parking/droppedkerbs
Panels 6 and 7 on average over 1 m but on balance I would not recommend refusal

**Landscape Team HBC**
Having looked at the retrospective application we agree that the erection of the fence has a detrimental impact on the streetscape vernacular. As such we would recommend a mitigation plating strategy to soften the views.

We would recommend the planting a minimum of two climbers that will create a screen of foliage, these could include:

- Virginia creeper *Parthenocissus quinquefolia;* a self clinging deciduous climber
- Armand Clematis *Clematis armandii*; an evergreen climber with fragrant white flowers
- Ivy 'Glacier' *Hedera helix 'Glacier'*; a self clinging evergreen climber

Due to the hard surfacing abutting to the fence on the southern aspect we would recommend that either planters and/or pots be used. It is not clear from the images but if there is a planting bed on the western edge this should be used to plant at least one of the climbers.

## 6 Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 6

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

| Comment | Officer Comment |
|---|---|
| Safety of pedestrians when entering and exiting the driveway.<br><br>Poor visibility as a result of the fence. To the right of the fence, incoming traffic from a main busy road comes around the corner. This is very different to the property opposite, in which there is clear visibility and the traffic is travelling towards the main road. | Please see section 7 of the Officer Report. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Since the construction of the drive, there have been incidents of bumping and down the kerb to enter and exit the driveway.<br><br>As the driveway comes out onto the road in a precarious position (near a junction), it would cause an accident, especially if cars reverse out onto the road.<br><br>Concerns regarding the height of the fence. | |

## 7 Planning Considerations

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

(i) Principle of development
(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
(iv) Highway Safety

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered to be acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria. The dropped kerb element of the proposed development does not require the benefit of formal planning permission as neither Purbrook Way or Linkenholt Way are a classified road. On this basis, the creation of a new access could be undertaken via Permitted Development, however consent would still be required from Hampshire Highways. An informative has been placed within the decision on this basis.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

7.3 The streetscene of Purbrook Way is varied, with little consistency in terms of the type, height and level of boundary treatment within the streetscene. Whilst it is acknowledged that the fencing would be readily visible from the public realm, it was noted at the time of the officer site visit that are many other examples within the immediate vicinity of the application site where properties have removed the original boundary treatment and replaced with timber close boarded fencing, brick boundary walls or alternatively sought to provide some form of vegetation. However, it is acknowledged that many of these examples are set at a lower height (in accordance with Permitted Development) when compared to the fencing subject of this application. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that a precedent has already been set in terms of a varied boundary treatment within the immediate streetscene, whereby the boundaries of many properties within Purbrook Way are no longer uniform in their appearance as they were when they were first constructed.

7.4 It is important to acknowledge that the applicant could have removed the original

boundary treatment and replaced this with a fence which does not exceed 1 metre in height utilising the property's permitted development rights and without the need for formal planning permission. Whilst it is acknowledged that the fence subject of this application exceeds those tolerances and as such does result in an impact which is add odds with the streetscene vernacular, the additional height is considered to be marginal with the highest point not exceeding 1.52 metres and as such the additional 0.5 metres (at its highest point) is not considered to result in such an additional impact which would justify a reason for refusal.

7.5 Whilst it is acknowledged that the applicant has sought to stagger the height of the boundary fence, it is considered that when the site is viewed from Linkenholt Way, the fencing together with the hardstanding, (which was carried out utilising the property's Permitted Development rights), has the appearance of being particularly stark and as the land rises towards the property there is clear visibility of the rear part of the fencing which is considered to be result in an impact which is harmful to the existing streetscene. On this basis and in order to mitigate this impact, a condition has been recommended which requires some landscaping to be provided internally that creates a screen of foliage- this will require the submission of a landscaping scheme by the applicant for approval by the Local Planning Authority.

7.6 Furthermore, it must be acknowledged that the application site is set back from the main highway (Purbrook Way) by approximately 10 metres and is separated by an area of amenity land which further reduces the visual prominence of this addition on the immediate streetscene.

7.7 Overall and taking into account the context of the immediate streetscene, it is considered that whilst the design and appearance of the proposal in its current form is not considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the area, it is considered that subject to the implementation of the landscaping to be provided internally, the impact of the fence will be more acceptable in terms of integrating with the existing streetscene, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

7.8 The proposal is set a sufficient distance away from the residential properties to the south and east and runs parallel with the adjacent neighbours boundary treatment (comprising a hedgerow). It is therefore considered unlikely the proposal would appear overbearing or visually intrusive to neighbouring properties.

7.9 It is acknowledged that a representation has been received in relation to the application, however the concerns raised relate primarily to Highway Safety. This would be addressed by Hampshire Highways as part of the dropped kerb application and has also been assessed as part of this application below.

(iv) Highway Safety

7.10 As specified above, the creation of a new access or the addition of a dropped kerb does not require the benefit of formal planning permission in this instance, however, separate consent will be required from the Highways Authority. The Highway Authority in this instance would therefore assess the impact of the dropped kerb on Highway Safety.

7.11 Notwithstanding the above, the Council's Development Engineer has been formally consulted in respect of this application and has confirmed that whilst Panels 6 and 7 marginally exceed the 1 metre which is recommended, on balance it is not considered to be justified to recommend a refusal of planning permission on this basis. As discussed, the applicant could erect a fence around the curtilage of the property at a height of 1 metre without the need for formal planning permission and on this basis the additional 0.2 metres proposed (approximate) across panels 6 and 7 is considered to be marginal and unlikely to worsen the impact to a significant extent which would warrant a refusal of planning permission.

## 8 Conclusion

8.1 The application is considered to be acceptable subject to the relevant conditions and is therefore recommended for approval.

---

## 9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION IN RETROSPECT** for application APP/17/00881 subject to the following conditions;

1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Site location plan- received 6th September 2017
Block plan- received 6th September 2017
Photograph 1 (elevations & height dimensions)- received 6th September 2017
Photograph 2 (elevations & height dimensions)- received 6th September 2017
Photograph 3 (elevations & height dimensions)- received 6th September 2017
Fence measurements- received 6th September 2017

**Reason:** - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

2 Within one month of the date of the decision, a soft landscaping scheme shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval which specifies the distribution and species to be planted and retained on the internal side of the fencing hereby permitted and the timing provisions for completion of the implementation of all such landscaping.
The implementation of all such approved landscaping shall be completed in full accordance with such approved timing provisions. Any tree or shrub planted or retained as part of the approved landscaping scheme which dies or is otherwise removed within the first 5 years shall be replaced with another of the same species and size in the same position during the first available planting season.

**Reason:** To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.