

| Code No. and Date Received | Name and Address of Applicant | Description and Location of Proposed Development |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| 12/0635/RET 07.09.2012 | Mr G Davies 77 Ridgeway Graig-Y-Rhacca Caerphilly CF83 8RD | Retain boundary fence 77 Ridgeway Graig-Y-Rhacca Caerphilly CF83 8RD |

APPLICATION TYPE: Retain Development Already Carried Out

SITE AND DEVELOPMENT

Location: At the north-eastern end of the Ridgeway Estate.

House type: The host dwelling is a semi-detached, corner property, with highway to the front and side.

Development: The retention of a boundary fence.

Dimensions: At the rear of the property, the fencing runs for a length of 17.6 metres and is approximately 1.6 metres in height. The fencing at the rear side of the property runs for a length of 15.1 metres, at approximately 2 metres in height and it returns for a length of 4.8 metres from the side boundary to the dwelling, separating the front and rear of the side garden, measuring approximately 1.8 metres high in this location.

Materials: Red cedar close boarded timber fence.

Ancillary development, e.g. parking: None.

PLANNING HISTORY

5/5/90/0081 - Erect side two-storey extension - Granted 15.03.90.

POLICY

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN:

Site Allocation: The land is within the settlement boundary.

Policies: CW2 (Amenity), CW3 (Design Considerations - Highways) and Guidance Note 5 of Supplementary Planning Guidance LDP7 – Householder Development.

NATIONAL POLICY:

Planning Policy Wales (2011).
Technical Advice Note 12: Design (2009).

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Did the application have to be screened for an EIA? No.

Was an EIA required? Not applicable.

CONSULTATION

Bedwas, Trethomas & Machen Community Council - strongly objects to the height of the fence. It is claimed that the fence is 9ft high (2.77m) and totally out of character with the area.

Transportation Engineering Manager - raises no objection.

ADVERTISEMENT

Extent of advertisement: Seven neighbours consulted.

Response: None.

SECTION 17 CRIME AND DISORDER ACT

What is the likely effect of the determination of this application on the need for the Local Planning Authority to do all it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area? There are no specific crime and disorder issues in this instance.

EU HABITATS DIRECTIVE

Does the development affect any protected wildlife species? No.

ANALYSIS

Policies: Guidance Note 5 of Supplementary Planning Guidance LDP7 states that boundary treatments should match the height and type of properties on either side and should not obstruct views of the house from the street or the street from the house.

With regards to the latter point, the enclosure has been erected along the rear side boundary returning to meet the dwelling. The front and front side remain fairly open plan with a dwarf wall and landscaping and therefore the development is considered to accord with this criterion.

The application includes the retention of an enclosure along the rear boundary of the property; this separates the host dwelling from the side of the neighbouring property, 75 Ridgeway. It is common for properties to be separated by close-boarded fences and therefore as no objection has been raised by the Transportation Engineering Manager, at a height of approximately 1.6 metres, this is considered acceptable.

The main issue to consider is the scale of the side boundary treatment and whether it matches the height and type of properties on either side. It is recognised that the fence has been erected to replace a previous enclosure, which was lower in height, to improve security. Given that the surrounding boundary treatments vary in type, design and height and recognising that there is a need for security at this corner location, it is considered that the fence as erected is acceptable.

Comments from consultees: Transportation Engineering Manager has raised no objection.

Bedwas, Trethomas and Machen Community Council has raised objection on the basis that the fence measures 9ft high (2.77m) and is out of character with the area. However, at its highest point along the side boundary, the fence measures 2 metres in height, which is 6 ft 6 inches, as indicated on the submitted plan. In respect of the character of the area, this has been considered above and particularly as the front and front side remain open plan, the development is regarded acceptable.

Comments from public: None.

Other material considerations: The development is considered acceptable in all other aspects.

RECOMMENDATION that Permission be GRANTED
