Item B. 2	06/00385/FUL	Refuse Full Planning Permission
Case Officer	Miss Lyndsey Cookson	
Ward	Euxton South	
Proposal	Retrospective application for a 2m high boundary wall,	
Location	89 Highways Avenue Euxton Chorley PR7 6QD	
Applicant	Mr D McDonnell	
Proposal:	This retrospective application is for the erection of a 2 metre high wall along a section of the southern boundary, adjacent to the highway.	
	an 'L' shape. The section of 8.8 metres in length, and t to the highway, coming wi The 2 metre high wall will of brick pillars 1.1 metres in h	is 13.3 metres, which is constructed in of the wall which bounds the highway is the remaining section is at right angles thin 1.2 metres of the dwelling house. omprise of a 0.8 metre dwarf brick wall, neight, 0.3 metres in width and finished and timber fence panels in between the
Background:	detached garage, both co	ises of a detached dwelling house and onstructed out of brick. The site is a Avenue, which is on a housing estate
Policy:	GN1: Settlement Policy – M GN5: Building Design	lain Settlements
Planning History:	There have been two planning applications at the site: 87/00288/FUL – Two storey side extension. Permitted. 90/00046/FUL – Single storey rear extension. Permitted.	
Consultations:	CBC's Highways Department have no comments to make.	
	Head of Environmental Ser	vices have no comments to make.
Representations:	None	
Assessment:	The application site lies within a main settlement, in which there is a presumption in favour of appropriate development, subject to normal planning considerations and the other policies and proposals of the plan, as stated by policy GN1.	
	will be expected to be w	treet scene e design of the proposed development well related to its surroundings. The area reflects an open and sylvan

will be expected to be well related to its surroundings. The immediate surrounding area reflects an open and sylvan character, evident by minimum boundary treatments at neighbouring properties, which include dwarf walls 0.5 metres high, and softer vegetation.

Neighbouring property no. 59 Highways Avenue to the west of the

site, which is also a corner plot, has 3-metre high hedgerow as its boundary treatment. Neighbouring properties to the south and east of the wall incorporate dwarf walls and vegetation boundaries adjacent to the highway. These boundary treatments are softer and less prominent.

Approximately 35 metres away, property no. 40 Hawkshead Avenue has incorporated a 2.1 metre high wall, which has been constructed without planning permission. A retrospective application was refused (ref:9/05/00992/FUL) and enforcement action was approved in December 2005. An appeal against the enforcement notice has been made, which is currently ongoing. This unlawful development is also not in keeping with the area, and should not justify a similar proposal within the vicinity.

Prominent boundary treatments providing high levels of screening, enclosure and privacy, such as this proposal, are not reflected in this part of the street. The height and bulk of the wall would be visually obtrusive and detrimental to both the appearance and character of the street and the amenity of the area. The development is inappropriate, as it does not relate well to the immediate surroundings, which reflect a more open and sylvan character with softer boundary treatments.

Impact on neighbour amenity

Due to the scale and siting of the proposal, it has no undue impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Impact on highway safety

The proposal has no detrimental impact on highway safety.

Conclusion: The proposal will be a prominent feature in the street scene, and will have a significantly adverse impact on the character of the street scene when taking into account the absence of screening at other properties in the immediate area, and the prominent corner location occupied by the property.

I recommend the proposal for refusal, as it is out of keeping with the character of the immediate surrounding area, and overly prominent within the street scene, contrary to policies GN1 and GN5 of the Local Plan.

Recommendation: Refuse Full Planning Permission

Reasons

1. The proposal, by reason of the height and siting of the boundary wall, would be visually obtrusive and detrimental to both the appearance and character of the street and the amenity of the area. This development is inappropriate as it does not relate well to the immediate surroundings which reflects a more open and sylvan character with softer boundary treatments. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy GN1 and GN5 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.