

**GFA/19425/2 – Mr I Fletcher**  
**Proposed erection of a replacement set of gates and boundary treatment**  
**26 Coxwell Road, Faringdon, SN7 7EZ**

**1.0 The Proposal**

- 1.1 This planning application seeks permission for the erection of electronically controlled steel gates at the entrance to a private residential development of 10 houses and apartments.
- 1.2 Extracts from the application plans are at **Appendix 1**
- 1.3 The application comes to Committee at the request of one of the local Members, Councillor Roger Cox, who is concerned that the proposal will create a “gated community”.

**2.0 Planning History**

- 2.1 The development currently under construction was permitted in December 2006 under permission GFA/19425/1. Condition 5 of that planning permission states that:

“..no gates, fences, walls or other means of enclosure shall be erected in advance of the dwellings on Plots 1, 2 and 3.....without the grant of planning permission”.

- 2.2 The reason for the condition is:

“To protect the TPO’d trees in front of plots 1-3, and in the interests of the visual amenity of Elm Road (Policies DC6 and DC1 of the adopted Local Plan).”

**3.0 Planning Policies**

- 3.1 Policy DC1 of the adopted Local Plan relates to design and impact on the character of the locality.
- 3.2 Policy DC5 relates to safe access for vehicles, to and from the highway.
- 3.3 Policy DC6 relates to the hard and soft landscaping and protection of existing trees during and after site works.
- 3.4 Policy DC9 relates to the amenities of neighbouring properties and the wider environment.
- 3.5 PPS1 in part relates to social cohesion and creating inclusive communities.

**4.0 Consultations**

- 4.1 The County Engineer has raised no objections to the proposal.
- 4.2 The County Arboricultural Officer has raised no objections to the proposal, but would like to ensure he is present during hand excavation of the roots of the adjacent protected tree.

4.3 Faringdon Town Council has not objected to the proposal but makes the following comments:

“...the members wished the District Council to note that the Town Council is not in favour generally of gated properties especially where gates have not originally been in place. They also expressed their concern regarding the possibility of highway problems being created and, therefore, would ask that such applications be resisted in the future.”

4.4 One neighbour comment was received which states:

“The new gate and boundary treatment needs to take into account the conservation order on the trees at the front of the property.

4.5 In addition it is not clear whether electric gates are being installed. If so they need to be set back far enough from the road so that cars waiting to enter the development do not cause obstruction to the traffic on the main road.”

#### 5.0 **Officer Comments**

5.1 The design of the gates and boundary treatment is considered to be in-keeping with the development and not visually harmful to the character of the locality. There are other properties within the vicinity of the site which have gated driveways, and one which has similar electronic gates.

5.2 The County Engineer has assessed the proposal from a highway safety aspect, and is satisfied that the gates are positioned at sufficient distance from the highway to allow safe access and egress from the site. The vision splay at the access is unchanged from that previously permitted. As such, it is considered that the proposal does not create any highway safety problems.

5.3 The proposal includes measures to avoid any disturbance of the protected tree which is alongside the proposed fencing and gates. These include an undertaking to excavate by hand for the pier foundations and fence posts.

5.4 It is considered that this will be sufficient to protect the tree and will be conditioned such that the Arboricultural Officer is able to be present during excavation.

5.5 The proposed development may be seen to create an “exclusive community” within this part of Faringdon. However, the new development is not a thoroughfare to any other part of the community and as such the gates do not prevent access to any public areas. The development includes only 10 dwellings, which is not considered to represent a separate community itself. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed gates justify a refusal on the grounds of failing to create socially inclusive communities.

#### 6.0 **Recommendation**

6.1 *It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:*

1. *TL1 – Time Limit*

*2. LS5 – Hand Excavation of Roots on notified date*