

Report of	Meeting	Date
Head of Development & Regeneration	Development Control Committee	20.06.2006

**ENFORCEMENT ITEM
ERECTION OF BRICK WALL 2 METRES IN HEIGHT ADJACENT TO HIGHWAY
USED BY MOTOR VEHICLES – 89 HIGHWAYS AVENUE EUXTON**

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To consider whether it is expedient to take enforcement action in respect of the above case.

CORPORATE PRIORITIES

2. This report does not affect the corporate priorities.

RISK ISSUES

3. The report contains no risk issues for consideration by Members.

BACKGROUND

4. A retrospective planning application for the erection of a 2 metre high boundary wall to property 89 Highways Avenue, Euxton (application reference 06/00385/FUL), appears on this agenda. My recommendation is for planning permission to be refused. If members agree with the recommendation, given that the application is submitted in retrospect, then it would be expedient to take enforcement action for the reasons set out in the main report.

COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

5. No comments.

COMMENTS OF THE HEAD OF HUMAN RESOURCES

6. No comments.

RECOMMENDATION

7. That it is expedient to issue an Enforcement Notice under Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in respect of the following breach of planning control - without planning permission the erection of a brick wall adjacent to a highway used by vehicular traffic, which is over 1 metre in height.

- (a) Remedy for Breach



i. Reduce the heights of the brick pillars and the close boarded timber fence panels between points A and B, as shown on the attached plan, to a height of 1 metre when measured from ground level, thereby benefiting as permitted development granted by virtue of, Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A, The Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.

ii. Remove all material resultant from the works carried out under 9 (ai) from the land.

(b) Period for Compliance

56 days

(c) Reason

The height of the brick pillars 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 reflect a more open and sylvan character with softer boundary treatments. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies GN1 & GN5 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

JANE E MEEK
HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT & REGENERATION

Report Author	Ext	Date	Doc ID
Lyndsey Cookson	5230	5 June 2006	
Background Papers			
Document	Date	File	Place of Inspection
Planning Application		06/00385/FUL	Union Street Offices