



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2026

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6008273

Mayfield, Botley Road, Fair Oak, Southampton, SO50 7AP

- 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 Mark Sainsbury against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is F/25/100427.
 - The development proposed is conversion of existing garage into HMO bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's decision notice stated that the development would be contrary to the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) (Local Plan) but made no reference to specific policies. However, the Delegated Officer Report on the application referenced specific policies from the Plan and in respect of highways and parking issues referred to Policies DM13 and DM14 from the Local Plan. These policies have been provided with the appeal documentation, and I have had regard to these policies from the Local Plan.
3. I have corrected the post code from that recorded on the application form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on car parking within the site and on the free flow of traffic on adjoining roads and on highway safety.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached property on the east side of Botley Road (B3354) which is in use as a six bedroom house in multiple occupation (HMO). There is a shared access drive with the adjoining property to the north, West View. There is parking at the front of the property. At the time of my site visit there was a regular flow of traffic in both directions along Botley Road and Botley Road is a bus route.
6. The proposal would convert the existing detached garage to the front of the bedroom to an additional HMO room, with the addition of a window to the front elevation in place of the garage door.

7. The information provided by the Appellant indicates that the site has a physical capacity to park at least 5 vehicles. The submitted proposed plan shows four parking spaces, including two in the covered car port (marked as Parking 2 and 3), one between the existing garage and house (Parking 1) and a fourth in front of the house (Parking 4). However, it is not clear how two of these spaces (Parking 1 and Parking 4) would operate as the use of Parking 4 would prevent access to or egress from Parking 1.
8. There are no specific parking standards in the Council's Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2025 for HMOs. However, Policy DM14 of the Local Plan sets out that new residential development will be required to provide off-highway parking which is adequate in terms of highway safety/ traffic management.
9. The number of rooms would increase from six to seven. However, and for the reasons I have set out above, and on the basis of the submitted plans, there appear to be as existing and would continue to be three usable parking spaces at the site. I have taken into account the Appellant's stated operation and management of the site to encourage occupancy for residents who do not own vehicles and to encourage both residents and visitors to use public transport. However, and on the limited information before me, I cannot be satisfied that such measures are and would be successful and prevent a greater number of cars seeking to park on site.
10. The information provided by the Appellant and the neighbour are conflicting regarding the amount of parking which occurs on site and how the spaces are managed. Furthermore, if all the parking spaces were being used it is not clear how there would be space for manoeuvring within the site to enable safe and convenient access to the highway network.
11. Although the proposal would only increase the size of the HMO from six to seven rooms, I am not satisfied that the increased size of the HMO could be satisfactorily accommodated in terms of both on-site parking and manoeuvring within the site. The lack of parking and manoeuvring space on site would lead to pressures for parking and manoeuvring outside of the site on the highway or within adjoining roads with consequent risks to highway safety.
12. I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable harmful effect on the free flow of traffic and highway safety by reason of inadequate parking provision as well as manoeuvrability within the site. This would conflict with Policies DM13 and DM14 of the adopted Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular paragraph 115, all of which amongst other matters seek safe and convenient access arrangements.
13. I have noted the Appellant's proposals regarding the provision of secure and covered cycle parking on site, but no additional details are provided regarding this provision in terms of its siting and in turn its potential effect on the issues raised above. Whilst the provision of on-site cycle parking would, in principle, be encouraged and accord with the Council's policies, it would not, by itself, overcome the harm I have concluded.
14. The provision of additional housing accommodation would be welcomed, but it would not outweigh the harm I have concluded to parking and highway safety.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR