
Site Address:	34 Belmont Grove, Havant, PO9 3PU		
Proposal:	Continuation of 1.8m high fence along front/side boundary.		
Application No:	APP/14/01090	Expiry Date:	10/12/2014
Applicant:	Mr A Cooper	Team:	Team 1
Agent:		Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
Ward:	Bedhampton		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The site relates to a semi-detached dwelling on the north side of Belmont Grove and is located on a tight bend in the road such that it is in effect a corner plot having a large roadside frontage. The pair of semi's have tile hung first floor beneath hipped roofs. They are set back from the road by approximately 7m and due to their corner location are set some distance from the pair to the south, No 30 & 28 and sit somewhat in isolation. However there is a fairly strong 'building line' on both sides of the road with generally low frontage boundary treatments and mature planting. The land slopes down to the south-west such that the application site is higher than the road and houses to the south.

The application site already has a 1.8m high fence, in picket-style with pointed tops, erected just inside the frontage low boundary wall. This fence is positioned such that starts after the site's detached garage and car standing space to the north, runs round the corner to a point in line with the frontage of the dwelling where it turns the corner and returns to the corner of the dwelling. The frontage garden is then open, with a low boundary wall continuing round the bend and some mature hedging on the south side.

2 Planning History

No recent relevant history

3 Proposal

This application proposes extending the existing fence line further round the boundary of the site/corner. Instead of the fence being aligned with the front facade of the dwelling in an east-west alignment, it would be aligned in a north-south direction - so the fence would be extended round the corner by approximately an additional 2m in length.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011
CS16 (High Quality Design)

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

Development Engineer - no adverse comment

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: 10

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Summary: No 34 on inside curve of sharp bend - it is a blind corner with Parkside and allowing fence to continue will result in continued loss of sight across the corner to drivers; evening and weekend parking on both sides of curve means vehicles are on the wrong side of the road; reversing out of our drive is hazardous with limited view; solution would be to put yellow lines or a sign alerting to blind corner

Comment: The highways safety issue points raised will be considered below:

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) Highway safety issues
- (iii) Impact upon the streetscene

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria.

(ii) Highway safety issues

7.3 The extended fence is not adjacent a drive or vehicle access and therefore does not block visibility for emerging vehicles. It is however on the bend of a road but the presence of the fence, set back the width of the pavement, does not in itself alter the visibility available for vehicles traversing the corner. Visibility is limited by virtue of the bend, not the proposed fence - the line of sight round the bend would be the same if the fence were extended or not. The only marginal difference would be night driving, where vehicle lights would currently shine across the front garden area and through the front hedges, to warn other drivers of an approaching vehicle, but with a solid fence this light would be blocked.

7.4 The highway engineer has raised no objection to the proposal in terms of highway safety. In terms of the objectors suggested signage or yellow lines, this would be a

matter for the Traffic and Parking team, but because there is no current highway safety concern then this would not be a priority.

(iii) Impact upon the streetscene

7.5 When viewed from Parkside to the north, the existing fence is already quite dominant in the street scene, being 1.8m high right up to the back edge of the pavement. However, when viewed as approaching from the east, it is currently not visible at all - since it does not encroach forward of the front facade of the dwelling it is not prominent from this direction.

7.6 The proposed extension to the fence would however result in it being visually prominent from the east. It would sit forward of the dwelling in an otherwise open area. The approaching streetscene in Belmont Grove is characterised by low boundary walls only - any boundary treatment higher is generally natural vegetation and hedges which adds to the character of the area. Whilst further to the north in Parkside there are some examples of high fences at the back edge of the highway, they are generally on the corner plots enclosing rear gardens.

7.7 It is considered that the extension of this 1.8m high close boarded fence, forward of the 'building line' in Belmont Grove would be out of character with the current open nature of the street scene, and would be an overly prominent structure detrimental to the visual appearance and amenity of the street scene, which would be contrary to policy CS16.

8 Conclusion

8.1 Whilst the objection received relates to highways safety issues, there is no highway safety objection to the proposed fence extension to warrant a reason for refusal on these grounds. However the visual impact of the fence in street scene terms is considered detrimental to the amenity of the area and should be refused on amenity grounds as contrary to policy CS16.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/14/01090

(A)

(B) for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed fence extension on this prominent corner location, forward of the building line in Belmont Grove, is considered to be out of keeping with the visual character of the street scene and would therefore be detrimental to the visual appearance and amenity of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.