



8 Danebury Gardens, Chandler's Ford, SO53 4NQ  
Tel. 07770 220788  
e. paul@paulashton.ltd.uk

## **Final Comments**

### **In respect of Planning Appeal reference 6008044**

**By**

**Mr Luis Martinez**

**In respect of**

**Eastleigh Borough Council Planning Application Reference F/25/100361**

**For**

**Construction of 1no. detached two-bedroom bungalow within the side garden of Quob Store Bungalow**

**At**

**QUOB STORE BUNGALOW, ALLINGTON LANE, WEST END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 3HQ**

**June 2026**

#### **1 REASON FOR REFUSAL 1 - PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT.**

|     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1.1 | The appellant accepts that the site location is defined as Countryside but considers the council has discretion to decide the outcome of the application based upon its own specific circumstances. In the opinion of the appellant, the site does form a natural infill with little or no harm being caused to the surrounding area. However, in making the appeal, this is the principal matter that the appellant is asking the inspector to decide upon and considers that adequate representation has been made in this respect. |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

#### **2.0 REASON FOR REFUSAL 2 - ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY**

|     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2.1 | The application was supported with the approved metric. However, it is not necessary to do anything other than inspect the site to see it is completely covered in scalplings with no (notable) vegetation. The metric was based upon that situation and appeared to show no further consideration was required. |
|     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 2.2 | The appellant was not asked to provide any further information in respect of the supplied metric before the application was refused                                                                                                                                                                              |

|     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 2.3 | Should the appeal be upheld, this aspect of the application can be dealt with by condition and clearly, if it cannot be addressed to the satisfaction of the LPA, the development would not be able to proceed. |
|     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

### **3 REASON FOR REFUSAL 3 -HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT**

|     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3.1 | The application was submitted with the mandatory documentation required by the Planning Portal - the system will not allow the application to proceed without such data. In addition, it was registered by the LPA and no request for additional information was made before the application was refused.                                     |
|     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 3.2 | The appellant is confident that this can be satisfactorily addressed, particularly against the backdrop of the council's own development of 2500 units, itself within former Countryside area and within a mile or so of the application for this single unit, which, apparently, can be accommodated in terms of the various impacts listed. |
|     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |