

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: F/26/101347

Site Address: 14 HOLMESLAND DRIVE, BOTLEY, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 2SH

Case Officer: Alexandra Stone

Description: Change of use of land to residential curtilage and retention of boundary fence (Retrospective Application)

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- Within Urban Edge		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
F/11/69230 – Permit – 09/08/2011 Rear conservatory, following demolition of existing conservatories H/25/99683 – Permit – 01/09/2025 Proposed single storey front porch extension, alterations to garage roof, demolition of conservatories to rear and side to be replaced with single storey extensions		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None		
Parish Council:	No Comment Received		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 10/07/2026		

Legislation:
Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:- <i>"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."</i>

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance Development Plan: The <u>Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036</u> 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.

Proposal:
The application is for the retention of the extension to the 2m high fencing to the boundary treatment, with change of use of landscaping land to residential.

Assessment:
<u>Principle</u> The site is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable, subject to the detailed matters according with the relevant planning policies.

Character and Appearance

Policy DM1 requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality and be well integrated with these (in terms of mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting), both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views.

The semi-detached dwelling is located to the end of Holmesland Drive, to the north of Downland Close.

The properties within the road have variety of frontages, some have integral garages to the side of the property, other have driveways. The properties have a mix of boundary treatment, some with hedgerow, whilst others have fencing.

Previously to this application, the property had large boundary fencing around the site. The proposals for this application seek to retain the new fencing which has encroached on landscaping land, requiring the change of use of land to residential.

The new fencing is similar to the previous fencing albeit slightly larger. The new fencing would weather and become more silver in colour, similar to the neighbouring properties fencing, therefore unlikely to be intrusive and in keeping with the character of the area.

- The design of the proposals are suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance.
- The development would not be an overdevelopment of the site, would retain sufficient amenity space and meet parking standards.
- The design and layout respects the character and appearance of the locality.

Residential Amenity

Policy DM1 amongst other matters, stipulates that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities of both new and existing residents.

- The development accords with guidance set out in the 'Quality Places' SPD in that there will be no unacceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, light or outlook.

Other material considerations

- There will be no adverse impact upon trees or other natural features worthy of retention.
It is noted that trees were felled prior to the application however, these were not protected trees by way of a Tree Protection Order.
- There are no likely significant impacts on the SPA.

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; (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.

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:

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐

Comments ...