

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/26/101905

Site Address: 150 PARK ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 1HS

Case Officer: Gina Aftanas

Description: Retention of boundary fence (retrospective)

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Within the urban edge 1,000 year extent surface water just outside of boundary line Southern Water foul and surface water pipes		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
<u>Reference</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Decision</u>
H/19/86651	Single storey side extension.	Permit – 06/12/2019

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	<u>6 Objections</u> - The new fence is intrusive, and out of keeping with the neighbourhood. Additionally it acts as a barrier to local wildlife. It would be preferable to grow a new hedge. - The new fence is a highly inappropriate replacement, not only from an aesthetic point of view, but also because it has resulted in a the loss of vegetation in a suburban area which battles with runoff. Given changing climatic conditions (most obviously this summer), the fence should not have been allowed. Beyond the issue of vegetation loss, both the design of the fence and the materials used in its construction do not appear to be particularly robust, likely creating future problems with deterioration and longevity. Note that as a close neighbour to the property I observed the day-to-day progress on the fence as it was built, leading to my concerns about the quality of the building work and about the timber used. - I feel that fence is not very nice to look at from my property. - Nearly every property in Pine Road has either a hedge or a low boundary wall/hedge to the front, giving pleasantly varying texture and interest, in addition to providing living organisms helping reduce pollution and allowing nesting structures and wildlife transition areas. In this case a perfectly good and suitable hedge was removed (which fitted in with the surrounding area) and replaced with something so out of character it beggars belief. I strongly object and believe it should be replaced, if not with full hedge, then a low fence/wall and pleached hedging. - The wooden fence which has been erected around 150 Park Road makes it very difficult to see traffic travelling along Pine Road when you are exiting Park Road. It is even more difficult to see traffic when large cars are parked in Pine Road during school pick up and drop off times. You have to pull a long way across Pine Road before being able to see traffic. - The height, scale and solid form of the fence have an unacceptable visual impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. The fence forms a visually dominant feature when viewed from the public highway and creates a considerably harder and more enclosed appearance than the previously established hedge. A shame to see the hedge disappear. <u>1 Support</u> - I often walk past your property and consider you have improved that corner between Park and Pine Road. <u>Officer Response</u> The comments raised above are discussed within the report below.		

Parish Council:	No Comment Received
Ecology:	There are records of hedgehogs in this area. Photos of the site available on Google maps show that previously there were hedges rather than a boundary fence at this corner. Removal of the hedges represents a loss of biodiversity. The site layout plan and elevations shows native species landscaping inside the fence, however this is not visible on the site photos or on the aerial photos of the site. I don't see any gaps in the closed board fence that could be used by hedgehogs, but had this been a non-retrospective application, we would have required gaps at the baseboard of the fence for hedgehogs to move through the garden. At this point, the only option is to require biodiversity enhancements in accord with Local Plan policy DM 11 to offset the loss of biodiversity.
Hampshire Highways:	From an initial review it is noted that the installed fence-line is likely to sit within the required visibility splay at the junction of Park Road and Pine Road when looking left on the exit from Park Road. Conversely however, it would appear from historic GoogleMap images that the previous landscaping was of similar height to the fence and obscured visibility in the same way, potentially worse with outwards growth that also has the potential to obstruct the footway if not cut back. Given this, unless there are historical conditions available to keep landscaping at 1.0m or less, there is no detrimental impact on the highway from the fence being in place, when directly compared to the previous landscaping impact.
Southern Water:	Southern Water has no objections to this proposal. Please note, surface water should not be disposed of into a public foul sewer and must comply with the Hierarchy of H3 of the Building Regulations. Any new connections to the public sewerage system will require a New Sewer Connection application (also known as a Section 106) to be submitted and approved by Southern Water.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Site visit carried out 07/09/2026 – photographs on file.		

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).

Proposal:
This application seeks approval for the retention of a boundary fence. The boundary treatment originally comprised of a tall hedge with wall base which separates the site from

Park and Pine Road but now has been changed to a new boundary treatment, which is the subject of this planning application. The application is retrospective and seeks to retain a replacement boundary treatment to the northern and eastern sides of the site. The new boundary treatment comprises natural timber horizontal close boarded fencing, with a mix of hedgerow and planting behind.

Assessment:

Principle

The development is located within the urban edge, where the principle of development is considered acceptable, subject to the detailed matters according with the relevant planning policies.

Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises a single storey detached property located on the corner of Park and Pine Road in Chandlers Ford, Eastleigh. The property is set back from the road by way of front garden area

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.

Whilst a large, dense hedgerow which provided visual amenity has been removed along the western boundary of the application site, it is considered that the introduction of timber fencing with hedgerow behind, will not appear as an alien feature in views along Park and Pine Road as it is quite commonplace within close proximity of the application site. With the maturing of the hedgerow within the front garden and weathering of the timber over time, it expected to soon be assimilated into the street scene and respect the character of the locality.

The development would not be an overdevelopment of the site, would retain sufficient amenity space and meet parking standards. As a result, the development respects the established character of the locality and complies with the requirements of Policy DM1.

Residential Amenity

NDMP P3 of the NPPF (2026) and Policy DM1 of the Local Plan requires all development to preserve the amenity of neighbouring residents and where possible enhance it to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers.

A total of six objections were received in response to this application noting a number of concerns.

- Aesthetics
- Intrusive
- Barrier to wildlife
- Loss of vegetation in a suburban area which battles with runoff
- Out of character
- Difficult to see traffic
- Unacceptable visual impact

Although a hedgerow would represent a more attractive and traditionally softer form of boundary treatment in this location, it is not considered that the replacement timber fencing gives rise to a level of harm that would justify either refusal of the application or the seeking of amendments at this completed stage.

The fencing has been left untreated, allowing the timber to weather naturally over time and adopt a more muted appearance. As a result, its visual prominence is expected to lessen, enabling it to assimilate more effectively into the surrounding street scene. Furthermore, timber fencing is a common feature within the area, including along Pine Road, and the proposal would therefore not appear unduly incongruous or result in an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the locality. As the planting behind the fence continues to establish and mature, the boundary treatment is expected to integrate further with its surroundings, reducing its visual impact still further.

Owing to the nature and siting of the proposal, together with the separation distances maintained between the application site and neighbouring properties, the proposed boundary treatment is not considered to result in a significant adverse impact on residential amenity. In particular, it would not give rise to an unacceptable loss of light, loss of privacy, or an overbearing effect on any adjoining occupiers. As such, the proposal is considered to maintain an acceptable level of amenity for neighbouring residents.

Although hedgehogs have been recorded within the local area, it is noted that the previous boundary treatment incorporated a brick base which would similarly have prevented their passage through the site boundary. As highlighted by the Council's Ecologist, whilst the provision of hedgehog access gaps within the gravel board would ordinarily have been sought had this been a prospective application, the circumstances of this retrospective proposal do not justify the imposition of a planning condition requiring such measures. Consequently, the development is not considered to result in a materially greater barrier to hedgehog movement than the boundary treatment it has replaced.

As a result, 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.

Ecology

Due to bats and hedgehogs recorded in the area, the Council's Ecologist was consulted as part of this application. They responded with no objection to the application, with the following comments.

"Photos of the site available on Google maps show that previously there were hedges rather than a boundary fence at this corner. Removal of the hedges represents a loss of biodiversity. The site layout plan and elevations shows native species landscaping inside the fence, however this is not visible on the site photos or on the aerial photos of the site. I don't see any gaps in the closed board fence that could be used by hedgehogs, but had this been a non-retrospective application, we would have required gaps at the baseboard of the fence for hedgehogs to move through the garden."

The landscaping within the front garden, as shown on the approved plans, will be secured by condition to ensure its implementation and long-term establishment. Whilst the removal of the existing hedgerow has resulted in a degree of biodiversity loss within the site, the proposed planting within the front garden is considered to provide some mitigation for this.

In relation to hedgehog movement, it is noted that the previous boundary treatment incorporated a brick base which would also have prevented passage beneath the boundary. As such, the current arrangement does not represent a materially different situation in this respect. Given that this is a retrospective application and the previous boundary treatment similarly restricted access, it is not considered reasonable or necessary to impose a condition requiring hedgehog access gaps within the fencing. Consequently, the ecological impacts of the proposal are considered acceptable in the circumstances of this case.

Hampshire Highways

Hampshire Highways were consulted as part of this application to ascertain their view in terms of highway safety and responded with no objection to the fencing and the below comments.

"The installed fence-line is likely to sit within the required visibility splay at the junction of Park Road and Pine Road when looking left on the exit from Park Road. Conversely however, it would appear from historic googlemap images that the previous landscaping was of similar height to the fence and obscured visibility in the same way, potentially worse with outwards growth that also has the potential to obstruct the footway if not cut back.

Given this, unless there are historical conditions available to keep landscaping at 1.0m or less, there is no detrimental impact on the highway from the fence being in place, when directly compared to the previous landscaping impact."

It is acknowledged that the fencing is located within the visibility splay of the junction. However, the previously established hedging was also of a comparable height and had the potential to create greater visibility restrictions over time through outward growth if not regularly maintained. The replacement fencing provides a more fixed and predictable boundary treatment and is of a similar height to the former hedge, while remaining lower than the adjacent boundary treatment on the neighbouring property.

In these circumstances, it is not considered that the proposed fencing would result in a materially greater impact on highway visibility or safety than the boundary treatment it has replaced. As such, the development is considered acceptable in highway safety terms.

Other Material Considerations

- 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 by 2030; (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: This application is recommended for approval.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐