



Application Reference:	P0847.18
Location:	20 Brookdale Close, Upminster
Ward:	Upminster
Description:	New boundary wall
Case Officer:	Aidan Hughes
Reason for Report to Committee:	A Councillor call-in has been received which accords with the Committee consideration criteria.

1. SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 The visual impact of the boundary wall is acceptable and not out of keeping with the locality. Furthermore, the scale and siting of the wall is not judged to result in material harm to neighbouring amenity. No material amenity issues or parking and highway issues are considered to result. .

2 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions to secure the following matters:

Conditions

1. SC04 – Time Limit of 3 years to implement.
2. SC10 – Materials used for wall to match bricks of dwelling.
3. SC32 – Accordance with plans
4. NSC1 – Chamfered wall to be retained to front and rear of site.

Informatives

1. INF28 Approval without Amendment

3 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

- 3.1 Planning permission is sought for a new 2m high boundary wall adjacent to the footpath on the east side of the dwelling.

Site and Surroundings

- 3.2 The application site is located within Brookdale Close. The site contains a detached chalet bungalow finished in a mixture of face brick and painted render.
- 3.3 There is parking in the garage and on the drive to the front of the property. The surrounding area is characterised by single and two storey semi-detached dwellings with Upminster Park to the east.

Planning History

- 3.4 The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:

P2089.17- Single storey side and rear extensions and part single and part two storey side extensions and enlarged rear dormer on existing house - Approved (currently being implemented).

P1471.17 - Single storey side and rear extensions and part single and part two storey side extensions to include 4 No. dormers at rear and 4 No. roof lights in front elevation – Refused.

4 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

- 4.1 The views of the Planning Service are expressed in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section below.
- 4.2 The following were consulted regarding the application:
- 4.3 Highways: No objection to the proposal.
- 4.4 Environmental Health: No objection or comments in respect to contaminated land or air quality.

5 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

- 5.1 9 neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment.
- 5.2 The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 11, which all objected.

- 5.3 The following Councillor made representations:

Councillor Ron Ower wishes to call the application in based on the concerns over the sight line for the resident leaving number 19 and the loss of the openness in this cul-de-sac.

Representations

- 5.4 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application, and they are addressed in substance in the next section of this report:

Objections

- Proposal will block sight lines.
- The 60 degree angled section will not improve sight lines.
- Proposal will impact on general streetscape as out of character.
- Proposal will replace trees and shrubs.
- 1m high wall at front of the dwelling is out of character.
- Position of new wall close to the bend.
- Highway, cycling and pedestrian safety issues.
- Estate was designed with wall set back to provide a sense of space.

Non-material representations

- 5.5 The following issues were raised in representations, but they are not material to the determination of the application:

- Parking on double yellow lines (Officer comment: this is not a material planning consideration but Parking Enforcement issue).
- Covenants on the land/estate. (Officer comment: this is not material planning consideration but a civil matter).
- Comments regarding consent given for approved extensions. (Officer comment: this is not material consideration for this application as they are two different forms of development. The previous application was assessed and granted further to the changes made).
- Allowing proposal will be a precedent for the whole estate. (Officer comment: each application is determined on their individual merit).

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the committee must consider are:

- The visual impact and impact on amenity arising from the design and appearance of the wall on the area.
- Highways and parking issues

6.2 Physical impacts of the proposed boundary wall

The existing boundary wall would be moved closer to the footpath on the east side of the site. The existing wall is set back approximately 2.4m from the back edge of the footpath. Staff are satisfied that the principle of the proposed boundary wall in this location would be acceptable and the existence of other boundary treatment is characteristic of the locality.

It is noted that a similar design of boundary wall has been utilised close to the boundary with a chamfered wall used at Nos. 8 and 12 Brookdale Close.

Both of these properties are in close proximity to the application site and it is judged therefore that the character of this part of the cul-de-sac is less open than elsewhere within the Close and, as such, the boundary treatment would not appear materially out of character or harmful to openness. Staff are also mindful that, prior to the implementation of the extensions to the dwelling house at No.20 Brookdale Close, large privet hedge extended around the corner in which part of the new wall is proposed and that the property already has a brick boundary wall. The application effectively moves this closer to the back edge of the footway. The new 2m high wall only runs alongside the side boundary of the site, and reduces to 1m high at the site frontage, which is judged to further maintain openness.

It is considered the proposal would not adversely impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

6.3 Parking and Highway Implications

No highway or parking issues would arise as a result of the proposal. The application includes a chamfered wall adjacent to no.19, which would provide adequate sightlines. The Highways Department have not objected to the proposed boundary wall.

7 Conclusions

All other relevant policies and considerations have been taken into account. Planning permission should be approved for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.