



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/25/3371208

6 Roman Close, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh SO53 2AW

- 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 Mr Charles Gardiner against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is H/25/99146.
 - The development proposed, and as amended, is a two-storey side extension; part two storey and part single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The application was amended during the course of the application to remove the car port and reduce the size of the extension.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed side and rear extensions on the living conditions for the occupiers of No. 5 Roman Close as regards outlook and light.

Reasons

4. The appeal application as amended has been refused by the Council because it considers that the existing relationship between the host dwelling and No. 5 on its north-eastern flank would be unacceptably altered as regards the outlook and light currently enjoyed by this neighbour.
5. There is a gap between the boundary with No. 5 and a garage, the nearest element of built form at that property. The two-storey dwelling of No. 5 is on the north side of the garage and therefore further away from the proposed single-storey and two-storey extensions at No. 6. And insofar as the outlook from the windows of habitable rooms of No. 5 is concerned, this degree of separation clearly weighs in favour of the appeal scheme.
6. The outlook from the garden of No. 5 is also relevant, but with the two-storey extension limited to 3m or thereabouts in its projection beyond the existing dwelling, combined with the generously sized gardens and mature boundary planting, this is unlikely to be significantly affected.
7. As regards light, the distance between Nos. 5 and 6 means that it is mainly the effect on sunlight that needs to be considered, as opposed to both daylight and

sunlight. The Officer's Report does not separate the effect on outlook from the effect on light and whilst I acknowledge that they are closely related, the grounds of appeal include a more informative and detailed analysis, essentially following the technical advice in the Building Research Establishment 2022 publication '*Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight - a Guide for Good Practice*'.

8. This analysis supports the appellant's view that any increase in shadowing because of the appeal scheme would not have a significantly adverse effect. Accordingly, in respect of both outlook and light I see no harmful conflict with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036); the Council's 'Quality Places' SPD 2011 and paragraph 135f) of Government policy in the National planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024.
9. Having regard to the above and having also carefully considered the concerns of the occupiers of No. 5 on the amended scheme, I would ordinarily be minded, on balance, to allow the appeal subject to conditions. However, the Officer's Report refers to discrepancies on the submitted plans as regards the depth of the extension from the rear wall of the main dwelling and also to errors on the elevation plan in relation to the north side elevation and the rear roof form. Ostensibly at least, these comments appear to be valid, and I note that the Report observes that '*These discrepancies were queried with the planning agent, but no clarification or corrected plans were provided*'.
10. In allowing an appeal it is essential for the purposes of accuracy, and thereby in the interests of proper planning, for a condition to be imposed requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. However, in this case the doubt as to their accuracy precludes the imposition of such a condition.
11. For these reasons the appeal fails. In the event of a further application the Council's decision will need to have regard to my putative findings in this appeal as a material consideration but is not lawfully required to agree with them.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR