

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

**APPLICATIONS UNDER VARIOUS ACTS / REGULATIONS – SUPPLEMENTARY  
INFORMATION**

**1. Application Number: 16/04497/FUL**

**Address: 14 Mosborough Hall Drive, S20 4UA**

**Additional Representation**

Additional representations have been received from two of the existing objectors to the scheme in response to the published officer report. The points raised are as follows:

- There are no other similar fences on Mosborough Hall Drive or Dunedin Glen
- Staining the fence dark brown will make it appear worse and will increase its prominence
- A 1 metre high structure would be acceptable but this is not 1 metre high
- Just lowering a small number of panels next to the two adjacent drives will still mean that visibility for drivers is impaired as the remainder of the fence will still be at 1.75 metres in height such that safety concerns have been disregarded.
- It is hoped that no pedestrians are injured by allowing the higher fence to remain
- It should be noted that there is no objection to the lower fence on Mosborough Hall Drive
- The application has not been dealt with in a positive and proactive manner – it has been done to appease the applicant
- The neighbour at 2 Dunedin Glen states that there is ‘unambiguous and clear physical evidence on site of a boundary ‘T’ structure that was installed by the developer/builder of the site over 40 years ago’. They claim that this clearly identifies the shared boundary line and as such it can be concluded that part of the fence has been built on their property.

**Officer Response**

It is not considered that any new issues are raised in this representation. The reference in one of the proposed directives to dealing with the application in a ‘positive and proactive manner’ is derived from the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework that Local Planning Authorities should look for solutions rather than problems and should work proactively with applicants to find such solutions. That is what the planning officer has done in this case.

It is recommended that a directive is attached to any subsequent approval to remind the applicant that it is their responsibility to ensure that the fence is built upon land that they control. It is re-iterated that the Council does not have access to private

property records so cannot establish the accuracy of the boundary line or the neighbour's contention that a 'T' structure marks the boundary.

**Proposed Additional Directive**

The applicant is advised that it is their responsibility to establish the exact boundary line of the property where it adjoins 2 Dunedin Glen and to ensure that the fence has been erected on the boundary or within land entirely controlled by the applicant. The Local Planning Authority further advises that this is a civil matter between the two parties.