



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2026

by **C Butcher BSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6007661

1 Oakmount Avenue, Chandler's Ford, Hampshire, SO53 3AB

- 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 C Roath against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is H/25/100449.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension and roof amendment to approved plans F/13/72696.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are: (i) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) the effect of the proposed development on protected species.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. A previous proposal to extend the existing dwelling on the site was allowed at appeal some thirteen years ago¹ (hereafter referred to as the 2013 permission). It is unclear from the evidence before me whether or not that permission was ever commenced and I therefore cannot be certain that it remains extant. Nevertheless, the appeal before me, which is for full planning permission, refers to amendments to those approved plans. Furthermore, as part of their officer report for the case before me, I note that the Council has assessed the proposed development against the plans that formed the 2013 permission. It therefore seems appropriate for me to take the same approach while also assessing the proposal on its individual merits.
4. The plans for the 2013 permission show a much enlarged dwelling compared to the existing home on the site. However, the roofline is shown as being of variable height, while the southern extent of the building would have been set back from the principal elevation to a reasonable degree. In combination, these design features would have softened the visual impact of the enlarged dwelling thereby ensuring that it would not have appeared as being overly dominant within the street scene.

¹ Appeal ref: APP/W1715/D/13/2205511

5. In contrast, the scheme before me proposes a ridge height which would be noticeably higher than the 2013 permission. Moreover, the roofline would be largely continuous rather than being visually broken up with different levels. The proposal is therefore quite different to the 2013 scheme. In essence, even taking account of the varied design of other dwellings in the vicinity, and the fact that the dwelling is set back from the road, the proposed development would appear as an unattractive block like edifice which would seem overly large, dominant and incongruous.
6. As such, it would clearly detract from the appearance of the surroundings. The fact that the appeal site is a prominent corner plot, which is easily visible from the street, would only increase the level of identified harm. Moreover, the relatively pleasing character of the existing dwelling would be largely lost within the sheer bulk of the additional built form.
7. As a result, whether one is comparing the appeal scheme with the 2013 permission, or on its own merits, it is inevitable that it would harm the character and appearance of the area. As a result, it would conflict with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 (the LP), which in part, seeks to ensure that new developments are well designed and that they preserve existing character. It would also conflict with the relevant aspects of the Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document which have similar aims.

Protected Species

8. As part of their response to the original planning application, the Council's ecology officer set out that the site has some potential for bat roosts. The appellant has not provided a Preliminary Roost Appraisal to demonstrate whether any roosts are present, and therefore whether there is any potential for bats to be harmed as a result of the proposed works. On that basis, as the decision maker in this appeal, I do not have sufficient certainty that the proposal would not result in harm to a protected species. The lack of certainty also means that it would not be appropriate to seek to remedy this issue via a suitably worded condition.
9. The scheme would therefore conflict with LP Policy DM11, which in part, seeks to protect such species.

Other Matters

10. I note that a further planning permission was granted in 2016 for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the construction of a new five bedroom dwelling². However, as I do not have the plans from that application before me, it is not possible for me to make any comparisons with this appeal scheme. Furthermore, the permission was granted ten years ago, and the Council has confirmed that it was never implemented and has therefore expired. The appellant has not sought to dispute that position. On that basis, the 2016 permission carries very little weight and is not a determinative feature of this appeal.

Conclusion

11. The proposed development would result in harm to character and appearance and also has the potential to harm protected species. It would therefore conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. The scheme would not result in a

² Council ref: F/15/76637

net increase in the number of dwellings in the area, while the increase in living space for future occupiers is a matter that attracts very little weight.

12. Accordingly, there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C Butcher

INSPECTOR