

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/25/99973

Site Address: 79 ASHDOWN ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 5QX

Case Officer: Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh

Description: Retrospective boundary wall

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Within the Urban Edge • Within Established Residential Area • Within Built-up Area Boundary • Tree Preservation Orders		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Z/12588/002/00 - Erection of 1.8 metre boundary fence - Permit - 15/07/1981 • PN/19/85433 - Prior Notification: Single storey rear extension. Depth 6 metres, maximum height 3 metres, eaves height 2.9 metres. - Prior Approval Not Required - 15/05/2019 • H/19/85967 - Front Extension - Permit - 11/09/2019 • H/23/95063 - Retention of front porch - Permit - 04/08/2023		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	One comment was received in relation to the original proposal, raising concerns that the wall may have inadequate foundations and could potentially become unstable. Concerns were also raised that the wall had been built forward of the original fence line and closer to the pavement edge, and that the timber infill panels and subsequent reinforcement work appear visually untidy.		
Parish Council:	No comments received.		
Tree Consultant:	Initially raised a holding objection due to concerns regarding the proximity of the wall foundations to protected trees and the potential impact on root systems. Following the submission of amended plans and additional arboricultural information, no objection was raised to the retention of the wall.		
Highways:	No objection.		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 15 th September 2025.		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance

Development Plan:

The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 The most relevant policies are Strategic policies S1 and S2; and Development Management policies DM1, DM2, DM11 and DM14.

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals.

Assessment:**Site context and surroundings**

The application site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on a corner plot at the junction of Ashdown Road and Charnwood Crescent. The dwelling fronts Ashdown Road, with its side boundary running along Charnwood Crescent. A detached garage is located to the north/rear of the dwelling. The site contains protected trees which are subject to a Tree Preservation Order. The application site has no substantial boundary treatment to the front, whilst the eastern and northern boundaries were previously enclosed by fencing and are now partly enclosed by the brick wall subject of this application. The surrounding area is residential in character, comprising mainly two-storey dwellings and chalet bungalows.

Proposal

The application seeks retrospective planning permission for the retention of a boundary wall along the eastern and northern boundaries of the site.

As originally submitted, the proposal sought retention of a brick wall with brick piers and timber infill panels along the side and rear boundaries. During the course of the application, concerns were raised regarding the forward projection and visual prominence of the wall along Charnwood Crescent, particularly where it extended towards the front of the site.

Following discussions with the agent, amended plans were submitted. The revised scheme shows the forward section of the eastern boundary wall reduced to approximately 1 metre in height, with the upper brick piers and timber infill removed. The remaining section of wall further to the rear would retain the higher brick wall, brick piers, and timber panel arrangement.

Boundary treatments adjacent to a highway which do not exceed 1 metre in height may benefit from permitted development rights. However, the application has been assessed on the basis of the amended plans as a whole.

Policy and Principle

The application seeks retrospective consent for the retention of a boundary wall within an established residential area. Boundary treatments of this nature are acceptable in principle, subject to consideration of their impact on the character and appearance of the area, residential amenity, highway safety and protected trees. Although the development has already been carried out, retrospective applications are required to be assessed on their planning merits in the same manner as any other planning application.

Layout, design, and impact upon the character of the area

- Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that all new development should respect the character and appearance of urban areas, take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbourhood, and be compatible in terms of mass, scale, layout density, design, and siting.

- The application site occupies a prominent corner position, where boundary treatments are visible from both Ashdown Road and Charnwood Crescent. The originally submitted scheme, which showed the wall and piers extending further forward than the previous fence line, would have created a harder and more enclosed appearance than the previous boundary treatment and would have appeared visually prominent within the street scene.
- The area generally has a relatively open character, particularly around corner plots, where front and side boundaries contribute to the visual spaciousness of the area. It is acknowledged that other boundary walls exist within the wider area. However, these are generally set further back from the highway or softened by landscaping. By contrast, the originally submitted wall, which extended closer towards the front of the site, appeared more visually dominant.
- The amended scheme reduces the forward section of the wall to approximately 1 metre in height. This significantly reduces its visual prominence and restores a greater degree of openness at the corner of the plot. It is also noted that boundary treatments adjacent to a highway not exceeding 1 metre in height may benefit from permitted development rights.
- The remaining higher section of wall is positioned further back along the side and rear garden boundary, where it would appear more closely associated with the private garden enclosure. In this context, the boundary wall is not considered to appear unduly prominent or result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area to a degree that would warrant refusal. The revised proposal is therefore considered acceptable in design and visual terms.

Impact on residential amenity

- Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) amongst other matters, stipulate that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities of both new and existing residents.
- Given its boundary height, location, and separation from neighbouring dwellings, the wall would not result in unacceptable overlooking, loss of privacy, loss of light, or overbearing impact.
- The neighbour's concerns regarding the wall's construction and potential collapse are noted. However, structural stability and construction standards are not planning matters in this case and would fall outside the scope of the planning assessment. On the basis of its height, position, and relationship with neighbouring occupiers, the wall would not result in unacceptable harm to residential amenity.

Trees and landscaping

- Following a thorough review of the proposal, no arboricultural objections were raised. However, approval is subject to condition.
- The site contains protected trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order. During the application, the Tree Consultant initially raised a holding objection due to the proximity of the wall to protected trees and the potential for the wall foundations to have affected root systems. Further information was requested regarding the foundations and the arboricultural impact of the development.
- An arboricultural report was subsequently submitted. The report includes an addendum stating that the wall constructed in the rear garden is within the root protection area of the sweet chestnut and that some root damage was likely. However, the vitality of the canopy appeared largely unaffected.

- Following review of this information, the Tree Consultant confirmed that, for the purposes of this retrospective planning application, they are satisfied that the wall has not resulted in harm sufficient to justify an objection to its retention. Therefore, the Tree Consultant raises no objection to the retention of the wall.
- It is important to note that the submitted arboricultural report recommends the felling of the sweet chestnut. The Tree Consultant has expressly confirmed that their comments relate only to the retrospective planning application for the wall and do not endorse any proposed tree works. Any works to protected trees, including felling or pruning recommended in the arboricultural report, would require separate consent under the Tree Preservation Order process.

Highways and parking

- Highways raised no objection to the proposal and noted that the wall and fence replace an existing fence of similar height and stop short of the Ashdown Road/Charnwood Crescent junction by an adequate distance, such that visibility splays would not be affected.
- Whilst the splay to the side of the rear parking area has been reduced, visibility remains available from a central point, and vehicle speeds when exiting the driveway would be low due to its length. The layout was therefore considered acceptable in this specific case. On this basis, the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to highway safety.

Climate Change:

In July 2019, the Council declared a Climate Change and Environmental Emergency. In doing so it agreed, among other things, to: (a) put in place measures to ensure the Council's own operations and functions achieve carbon neutrality by 2025; (b) work with partners to aim for all projects and services delivered in the Borough to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030; (c) ensure that the Council's procurement policy recognises carbon neutrality as one of its primary considerations; and (d) recognise the urgency of action to mitigate and adapt to climate change in every decision taken by the Council. This is underpinned by the Climate and Environment Emergency Strategy 2020–2030 and the supporting Climate and Environmental Emergency Action Plan – Update June 2020.

The declaration of the Climate Change and Environmental Emergency demonstrates a strong commitment from the Council to achieve net zero. The NPPF, development plan and adopted local plan policy do not set this as a specific target, but it is a material consideration to be considered alongside all other material considerations. In any case addressing climate change is a core part of the NPPF and local plan policy. The need to support the economy is part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the adopted local plan, as is an assessment of climate impacts.

The NPPF, Policies S1, DM2 and DM3 of the Local Plan and energy and water elements of the adopted Environmentally Sustainable Development SPD require development to be sustainable in terms of resource use, climate change and energy use. When considering the impact of climate change, the proposed development is expected to be resilient to the potential effects of climate change.

Equalities Implications:

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states:

- A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - a. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;

- b. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- c. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

When making policy decisions, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups. It is considered that this application does not raise any equality implications

Conclusion:

Permit subject to conditions.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐