

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/23/96589

Site Address: 36 STOKE PARK ROAD, BISHOPSTOKE, EASTLEIGH, SO50 6BZ

Case Officer: Rachael Morris

Description: Retrospective extension of a timber fence.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Within the urban edge		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- H/18/82264 - Single storey side and rear extension and integral garage – Permit – Mar 2018 - H/18/82767 - Single storey rear extension and garage – Permit – Jun 2018 - H/23/95153 - Retrospective extension of a timber fence – Refuse – Nov 2023		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	1 Underwood Road. Objection. Part of the extension appears to be affixed to a fence belonging to us which needs to be reviewed/agreed upon. The chosen extension is not in keeping with the general aesthetics, it is very imposing from our property at the current height, and I am unsure what purpose it is serving. 3 Underwood Road. Objection. Eyesore that has doubled the height. It doesn't blend-in, and trees already offer privacy. It should not be over 2 metres.		
Parish Council:	No Comment		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 27/10/2023		

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; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals (Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath - BIFOHH 9).

Assessment:
The development is considered acceptable and complies with policies DM1, DM11 and DM14 from the 2016-2036 local plan, in that: <u>Proposal</u> - The application seeks the retention of slated fencing which extends the height of an existing close-boarded fence to the rear garden of a residential property. - The property sits to a corner plot on Stoke Park Road, to the corner of Sedgwick Road, with residential neighbours also on Underwood Road to the South. The property is bounded by numerous residential gardens to the South, East and West with public open space to the North-West.

- The existing close-boarded fence measured approx. 1.54m in height with the extension boards measuring 0.46m on top across the Southern boundary.

Principle

- The development is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable.
- 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 neighbouring, and be compatible in terms of mass, scale, layout density, design and siting.
- In addition, policy DM1 requires all new development should not have an unacceptable impact on, and where possible should enhance residential amenities of both new and existing residents; the character and appearance of urban areas, the countryside and the coast.

Design and layout

- The proposed fencing slats on top of the existing closed-board fencing would result in a fence totalling 2m in height. The proposed addition of 0.46m has been reduced from a previous refusal of between 0.94-1.17m (H/23/95153) and this re-submission which was originally submitted at 0.72m.
- The proposed total height of 2m for the fencing is an acceptable height and commonly seen within a residential setting. Moreover, a height of 2m could be achieved through permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A.

Residential amenity

- 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.
- As this is a retrospective application, a condition will be placed to require the taller fencing currently in situ to be removed within 1 month of the date of the decision.

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.

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 ...