

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/26/101346

Site Address: 21 RUSKIN ROAD, EASTLEIGH, SO50 4JR

Case Officer: Alexandra Stone

Description: Single Storey Rear Extension

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

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Z/30211/001/00 – Permit – 28/07/1989 Two storey front extension Z/30211/002/00 – Permit – 08/03/1991 Single storey rear extension		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None		
Parish Council:	No Comments 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, DM11 and DM14. Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places (June 2026); Parking Standards (September 2025); Character Area Appraisals.

Proposal:
The application is for the addition of a single storey rear extension. This will measure approximately 5m in depth by 3.2m in width, attaching to an existing extension. This will include roof alterations, from pitch to flat roof.

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 detached dwelling is located with Ruskin Road, to the north of Shakespear Road. The properties within the road vary in style, having differing roofs and materials. Some properties are detached whilst others are semi-detached, with properties predominately having front driveways with good spacing between neighbours.

The proposed extension would sit to the rear of the property, replacing the conservatory and in line with the existing extension. The existing extension currently has a pitch roof, the proposals include altering this to a flat roof adjoining to the new extension. The new extension is set back from the neighbouring property so unlikely to be seen or intrusive within the streetscene therefore inkeeping 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.

It is noted that there is internal re-configurations which would see a W.C to the ground floor. There is already a window in situ which is likely to be obscured. The extension would be of single storey and stepped away from the neighbouring property to the southern boundary. The properties also benefit from good boundary treatment, therefore unlikely to cause overshadowing or overlooking.

- 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.
- 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 ...