



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2026

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2026

Appeal Ref: 6001759

37 Park Road, Chandlers Ford, Hampshire, SO53 2ET

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Himat Lakhpuri against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is H/25/99901.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of garage. Alterations and extension to bungalow to form chalet bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of garage. Alterations and extension to bungalow to form chalet bungalow at 37 Park Road, Chandlers Ford, Hampshire, SO53 2ET in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref H/25/99901, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No.37 forms part of a row of bungalows on the eastern side of Park Road. Within the road and surrounding area, there is, however, a mix of house types, and it was evident from my site visit that a number of the properties were being altered, including roof alterations to existing bungalows.
4. Occupying the corner plot wrapping around onto Kings Road, the appeal property is more open and spacious than the adjacent bungalows, which extend across the width of the plot. The proposal would bring the building close to the northern boundary, although this section would be single-storey with a hipped roof, the projection to the front and rear would be limited, and the spacing to the boundary would reflect the existing pattern of development.
5. The various other additions are infilling to create a relatively square building, and the overall increase in height would be just under 1m, with the massing reduced by the use of a hipped crown roof. The footprint would fit comfortably within the plot, and the resultant size and scale of the building would be in keeping with the neighbouring properties.
6. Whilst there have been no alterations to accommodate a first floor within the row of bungalows (Nos 37-49), No. 20 opposite is similar in design to that proposed, with

pitched-roof dormer windows and is seen together with the appeal property in views along Kings Road. The proposed dormer windows would align with the fenestration below, be proportionate, and create a balanced roofscape.

7. Due to its corner position, No.37 is read within a wider context which includes two-storey properties to the other side of Park Road, and the bungalow to the other corner (No.35) has flat roof dormers, and forms part of a row of bungalows (Nos. 21 to 35) where a variety of roof alterations have been incorporated.
8. There is no policy or guidance before me that indicates the protection of bungalows, and the design, materials, and detailing of the alterations reflect and respond to the host property. As such, I find that the scale and form of the proposed development would integrate with its setting and would not be incongruous in the street scene.
9. Therefore, in conclusion, the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and accords with policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036. Amongst other things, this policy seeks to ensure that development does not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the urban area, and takes account of the site context, including mass, scale, materials, layout, density and siting.
10. Reference is also made to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 2012- 'Quality Places'. I have not been referred to any specific elements, but overall, this similarly promotes good design, including site context and character, which the proposal would be compliant with.

Other Matters

11. The Council have found that the development would not be harmful to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers, and given the scale and form of the development, I have no reason to disagree.
12. The site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and a watercourse runs along the edge of the plot. The completed Environment Agency Householder Form forming the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) confirms that the floor levels of the proposed development will be set no lower than the existing levels, and other features such as raised electrical outlets and non-return valves will be incorporated as part of the build. The proposal is minor development in terms of paragraph 176 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and so is not subject to the flood-related sequential test or exception tests in national policy.
13. A public sewer crosses through the site. Any build-over agreement and investigations would be subject to separate requirements from the water authority.

Conditions

14. The Council has provided a list of suggested conditions which I have had regard to, as well as the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
15. In addition to the standard time limit condition, conditions require the development to be carried out in accordance with the plans and material details provided for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.

16. There are also a number of features on site (watercourse, public sewer and TPO tree) which would need to be protected during construction. I have combined these as part of the construction management condition. Consultation with Southern Water or other bodies is a matter for the Council. I have, however, included the requirements for tree protection. As this information is required prior to the commencement of development, the appellant has been consulted on the proposed pre-commencement conditions and agreed to them.
17. In addition, as the parking arrangements are changing, a condition is required to secure the provision of the parking layout, although, as an existing property, I have altered the trigger to within 1 month, rather than prior to use.
18. A condition has also been suggested in relation to the timing of deliveries or the collection of equipment and materials outside school drop-off and collection times. However, as a small-scale domestic extension, it would not be reasonable or enforceable to restrict the timing of deliveries to the property.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons set out and having regard to the matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall start no later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the following plans numbered: 1810 P 01 and 1810 P 02.
3. The materials to be used must match as closely as possible, in type, colour and texture those listed in the 'Materials' section of the application form.
4. Prior to the commencement of development, including any demolition, a construction environmental management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include measures to protect the public sewer, the on-site watercourse and the retained tree(s). The approved plan shall be adhered to throughout the construction period of the proposed development.
5. The details submitted in accordance with condition 4 above shall include a scaled and referenced tree protection plan, as per British Standard 5837:2012 (Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations). The approved tree protection plan must be adhered to in full, and may only be modified subject to written agreement from the Local Planning Authority.
6. Within 1 month of completion of the extension and alterations hereby permitted, a minimum of 3 no. car parking spaces will be provided within the curtilage of the site and thereafter maintained and kept available.