

SUPPORTING STATEMENT AND PHOTOGRAPH

ALTHOUGH THE DETERMINING OFFICER CONSIDERED THAT OUR FENCE INTERRUPTED THE OPEN ASPECT OF OUR PROPERTY WITHIN THE STREET ANY PERCEIVED INTERRUPTION IS MINOR IN COMPARISON TO MY IMMEDIATE NEIGHBOURS HUGE EXTENSION IN THEIR FRONT GARDEN WHICH WAS GIVEN FULL PLANNING PERMISSION IN JANUARY 2005.

WE BELIEVE THAT IF MEMBERS HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO VISIT THE SITE THEY WOULD AGREE THAT A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED EXTENSION HAS MUCH MORE OF AN EFFECT ON THE STREET SCENE THAN OUR FENCE WHICH PROTRUDES JUST 3.8 METRES BEYOND OUR PRINCIPAL ELEVATION THEN REDUCES TO 1.0M FOR 2.35M UP TO THE EDGE OF OUR SITE.

IT IS ALSO WORTH NOTING THAT THE COUNCIL'S TRANSPORTATION SECTION HAD NO ISSUES WITH THE FENCE IN RELATION TO ROAD SAFETY BECAUSE IF IT HAD WE WOULD HAVE HAPPILY REMOVED OR REDUCED THE FENCE.

WE FEEL AS THOUGH WE ARE CAUGHT BETWEEN THE OFFICER WHO DETERMINED OUR FENCE AND THE MUCH MORE LENIENT APPROACH TAKEN BY ONE OF HIS FELLOW PLANNING OFFICER COLLEAGUES IN 2005 WHO SOUGHT IT FIT TO APPROVE A HUGE EXTENSION AT THE FRONT OF OUR NEIGHBOURS PROPERTY.

BEARING THE ABOVE IN MIND WE WOULD ASK FOR A SYMPATHETIC ASSESSMENT OF OUR APPEAL TO THIS PLANNING DECISION.

