HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/13/72759

DESCRIPTION	Addition of fencing above existing boundary wall, to a total height of 2m
ADDRESS	3 Ravenscroft Close Bursledon Southampton SO31 8FT

SITE VISIT DATE	15/07/2013 (site photos deleted in error).
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	YES
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	YES

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The proposed fencing would extend above the existing boundary wall and in parts be completely new to an overall height of 2m.
TOPOGRAPHY	Relatively flat although the site does rise in ground level into Ravenscroft Close.
TREES	No protected trees to be affected by the development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	There is an existing low level brick wall, small trees and mature landscaping by way of sections of hedging.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	End of terrace two storey property with a relatively small rear garden. There is a garage and small drive to the rear of the site.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential, characterised by a mix of detached, semi detached and rows of terraces.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None received	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Bursledon Parish Council	***TO OBJECT on the imposing nature of the 2m wall and the adverse effect on the street scene***.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 59.BE
Pre submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 DM1
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area – 56, no specific characteristics

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

N/A

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to the visual impact of the proposals.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below	X	
Other …				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

X	None received		See below		
Other …					

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Not applicable

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:-

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality and be appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, design and siting. It also requires a high standard of landscape design, have a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclist and pedestrians, make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, noise and fumes. The guidance is largely reiterated in Policy DM1.

The size and design of the proposed fencing is considered to detract from the open character of the area and result in a visually intrusive feature within the streetscene.

The application site is a corner plot in a residential estate and as such the side area would be open to both Ravenscroft Close and Reeves Way. Open plan frontages are a feature of the estate and contribute to its open character. The existing boundary treatment on the application site consists of a low level brick wall and two sections of hedging and a small tree. The rear garden area is enclosed by a taller brick wall of at least 2m in height which is set back and attached to the side of the existing house. The existing boundary treatment to the side of the site is in keeping with the open character of the area.

The wider area is predominately characterised by a mix of low level boundary treatment, including open frontages, low fencing, and brick walls or hedging. There are examples of higher boundary treatment such as close boarded fencing or brick walls scattered within the area. Some of the brick walls or fencing may have been added with the original house construction but others visible within the streescene (adjoining no.'s 26 Reeves Way and towards Lewin Walk) serve rear access ways or rear gardens where there is expected to be a degree of security required. The example of fencing at number 28 Reeves Way, approved in 1991, although set adjacent to a large area of open space fronting the site, the relationship with its neighbour and open plan frontages along Pallot Close is not considered to represent good planning. The fencing at number 50 Reeves Ways appears to have been added following works to the property approved in 1997 but no records were found for consent to this fencing. The material and especially height of fencing erected on prominent corner sites within this predominately open area are not considered to contribute positively to the visual amenities of the area. An application in 2006 was refused at number 4 Reeves Way for development of a 1.8m boundary wall. The proposals were considered to detract from the open character of the area.

The proposals would introduce 2m boundary treatment which is not prevalent to the front garden areas of housing within the immediate vicinity. The proposals do not include any green features to aid in softening the development such as the retention or provision of landscaping. Due to the side on position of the site within the streetscene, position of the proposed boundary treatment against the existing open plan frontages and the higher ground level of the site, the proposals would be prominently visible from many viewpoints. On this basis the development conflicts with the requirements of the policies 59.BE and DM1 in that the proposals detract from the open plan character of the area.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029. While not yet adopted it does carry weight by virtue of being intended as the current local plan's replacement. With regards to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSION

The recommendation is to REFUSE.