

Design Statement

25 Rockhall Place, Lossiemouth - Proposed boundary fencing for Mrs Val Cooksley

Proposal: To erect boundary fencing to provide amenity to garden area, see drawing nos 14:39:03, 04, 05, 06.

History: The applicant has had an earlier consultation with the Planning Officer Lisa MacKenzie to explain the lack of amenity and discuss the proposed erection of fencing to provide some privacy to the front of her property. During discussions Mrs Cooksley was advised that the fencing to the back garden was acceptable and would not require a retro-spective planning application, but that the fencing to the front of the house would need permission. It has been highlighted by the Planning Officer that a planning application for fencing to the front of 15 Rockall Place had been refused in 2008, and that there were aesthetic concerns regarding the proposed erection of the fencing.

Justification: Planning policy is applicable in respect of policies HG and IMP1. This requires the alterations to ensure that the appearance of the house and surrounding area is not adversely affected in terms of style, scale, proportions and materials. Policy IMP1 requires development to have scale and character appropriate to the surrounding area.

The front area is bounded on two sides by pedestrian routes and the third side by a low level wall with a neighbour. It is the only part of the garden areas which has sunlight, due to the northerly orientation of the rear garden and the shading from the house and garage. The applicant takes a pride in her garden and has established planting which on several occasions has been both ripped out by youths and damaged by trespassers.

It is intended to erect a timber fence to the two 'public' sides of a scale, proportion and material to match the boundary fencing of numbers 28, 29, 30 Rockhall Place and 24, 25 Forth Place which also border the pedestrian courtyard. For classification the fence would be of the same height, material and construction as the existing fencing within the courtyard. The height of the fence to the south side of the garden could be splayed to the lower level of the timber fencing to number 23 Rockall Place to further match other detailing within the courtyard.

In relation to character of the area, there is precedent both for side fencing throughout the estate, and higher level fencing to the front areas of 1, 3 Bailey Place nearby. The refusal of the planning application to 15 Rockall Place was for 1.8m high fencing to the garden area which fronted the public road "by reason of its height and siting close to the public road". The proposed fencing is not close to or fronting the public road, and would not be detrimental to the character of the area.