



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2026

by **J Evans BA(Hons) AssocRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2026

Appeal Ref: 6007162

34 Stockholm Drive, Hedge End, Southampton SO30 0LJ

- 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 Mrs Wendy Ward against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is H/25/100649.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey front extension with alterations to front porch, altering from flat roof to pitch roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension with alterations to front porch, altering from flat roof to pitch roof, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: H/25/100649, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing and Proposed Plans (KC 01); Existing and Proposed Plans (KC 02 Rev A); and Proposed Block Plan (KC 03).
 - 3) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of the appeal proposal from the decision notice as I consider this better reflects the proposed development before me.
3. The decision notice does not specifically mention the policies from the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (April 2022) that the Council considers there is a conflict with. However, I have been provided with a copy of Policy DM1 (General criteria for new development) and its supporting text through the appeal paperwork by the Council and this policy is also referred to in the Officer's Report. I have therefore determined the proposal on the basis that it is Policy DM1 that is considered of relevance to this case.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effects of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the wider area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property (No.34) is a C20 two storey dwelling located part way along Stockholm Drive, which consists of a mix of single storey and two storey properties. No.34 itself is located at a transitional point from single storey to two storey properties, it has also been extended to its side in a two-storey form.
6. There is some consistency in the style of the house types along Stockholm Drive near to No.34, but nonetheless various householder adaptations have taken place over time, including extensions to the front elevations such as at No.14 to the north-west, whereby some of the original consistency of the properties has been reduced.
7. Whilst I appreciate the proposal would result in a variation to the appearance of the similarly styled two storey properties in the immediate vicinity to No. 34, I am not of a view that the differentiation that would take place would result in poor design or harm to the character and appearance of No.34 or the wider area. To my mind the proposed alterations are relatively modest and would assimilate well into the site context.
8. Therefore, I find that the appeal proposal would align with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (April 2022) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024), which amongst other matters, seek well-designed development that respects the site and its surroundings through its scale, massing, materials, design, density, layout, character and visual appearance.

Conditions

9. The standard time limit is required together with a condition listing the plans in the interests of certainty. I have also included a condition requiring that the materials to be used match those of No. 34.

Conclusions

10. For all of the above reasons, having regard to all matters raised, and subject to the specified conditions, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Evans

INSPECTOR