

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/26/101549

Site Address: 6 ROMAN CLOSE, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 2AW

Case Officer: Rebecca Altman

Description: Two storey side extension and part two storey / part single storey rear extension, following the demolition of the conservatory and garage (resubmission of application ref. H/25/99146).

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- Urban Edge - Scantabout and Peverells Wood Character Area - Surface water flood risk (front of site)		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
H/25/99146 – Two storey side extension; part two storey and part single storey rear extension – refused 14 July 2025 for the following reason: <i>The proposed extension, due to its excessive height and depth adjacent to the northern boundary, would be visually overbearing and result in an unacceptable impact in terms of loss of outlook and light to the neighbouring residents to the north. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).</i> An appeal against the refusal was dismissed on 20 October 2025. However, the reason for dismissal was due to the inaccuracy of the plans only. The Inspector did not agree with the concerns of the Local Planning Authority in respect of loss of outlook and light to the neighbouring property.		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	Two representations received (one in response to amended plans), objecting to the proposal on the following grounds: - Concern about inaccuracies on the plans; - Significant overall size of extension represents overdevelopment of the site; - Loss of light to neighbouring property due to scale and height of extensions; - Impact on quality of life for neighbours due to loss of light; - Loss of boundary shrubs and trees due to construction impacts; - Increased risk of flooding to gardens; - Concerns which led to previous refusal have not been addressed; - Amended plans show front part of side extension at full height, resulting in a significant scale, out of keeping with the character of the street; - The proposals are disproportionate to the size of the plot; - Measurements shown on plans are confusing; - Concern about side wall not being sufficient to support the extension above; - Concerns about increased fire risk between buildings.		
Parish Council:	No comments received.		
Southern Water:	No objection. Advice provided for the applicants attention regarding new connections to public sewers.		

Ecology Officer:	No objection. Recommend a precautionary working method to prevent harm to wildlife during construction.
------------------	---

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
8 July 2026 – photographs on file		

Policy:

National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance

Development Plan:

The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 The most relevant policies are S1 (Sustainable development), DM1 (General development criteria), DM14 (car parking) and DM23 (Residential development in urban areas).

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Scantabout and Peverells Wood Character Area Appraisal.

The Character Area document sets out the following guidance for development in the area:

- The style and design of any new building work, including extensions, is compatible with the character of good quality adjacent properties;
- Sufficient garden depth and area is retained by existing or replacement dwellings, commensurate with their size and character, which can accommodate appropriate tree planting in keeping with the character of existing plots.

Assessment:

Site and proposal

The application relates to a two-storey detached dwelling located on the east side of Roman Close, at the southern end of the cul-de-sac. The property has a single-storey garage on its northern side, and a conservatory to the rear, and to the front there is a long driveway and garden.

Roman Close is characterised by detached dwellings which would originally have been of a similar design to No.6, but some of them have had side extensions which have altered their appearance within the streetscene (e.g. Nos. 1, 3 and 4 Roman Close). No.5 Roman Close to the north of the site has not been extended and is of a similar style to No.6 with a garage on its southern side.

This application is a resubmission of an application submitted in 2025, for a two-storey side extension and a part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension. The measurements of the proposed extensions are set out below. These have been measured from the plans and checked with the architect to ensure accuracy.

Single storey rear extension:

- Width: 10.95m (wall to wall)
- Depth: 6m
- Height: 2.3m to eaves; 3.88m to ridge

Two-storey side / rear extension (northern side of property):

- Width: 4.05m
- Depth: 10.25 overall; 3m from rear wall of existing house
- Height: 5.6m to eaves; 7.08m to ridge (rear), 7.8m to ridge (front)

Design and appearance

The previous appeal was dismissed due to inaccuracies in the submitted drawings. There were discrepancies between the elevation and floor plan in terms of the depth of the rear extensions. The plans have now been corrected and it has been confirmed that when measured from the rear wall of the existing dwelling, the single-storey extension would measure 6m in depth and the two-storey element would measure 3m in depth.

The previous scheme was not refused on design grounds. The side extension would be constructed flush with the front wall of the main house and the front section would have the same roof pitch as the existing house. It would therefore quite substantially increase the bulk of the dwelling when viewed from the front and side of the site. It is noted that the side extensions to Nos. 3 and 4 Roman Close are set back from the front wall of the original dwellings, creating a more subservient appearance, but that No.1 Roman Close has been extended in a similar way to that proposed at No.6 with no set back. Given that the property is positioned well back from the road and that there are other examples of similar side extensions in the vicinity, the visual impact of the proposed front elevation is not considered to be harmful to the character of the area.

At the rear, the extension would be similar to other rear extensions in the area and brickwork is proposed to be used to match the main dwelling, ensuring a complimentary appearance. Therefore, in terms of design, the extensions are considered appropriate to their context, and in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Local Plan and the relevant character area guidance.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

NDMP P3 of the NPPF (2026) and Policy DM1 of the Local Plan requires new development to not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents.

To the south of the site, there would be a distance of approximately 11m from the south side elevation of the single-storey element of the extension to the rear elevation of the nearest property. Whilst this is a relatively short distance, given the single-storey height of the extension, the intervening boundary treatment and the lack of any new windows on the southern side, it is not considered that these neighbouring residents would be adversely affected by the development in terms of loss of outlook, light or privacy.

To the north of the site is No.5 Roman Close. This property roughly mirrors the layout of No.6 with a single-storey garage on its southern side, separated from the garage at No.6 by a narrow walkway. The side garage on No.6 currently forms part of the boundary with No.5, with the rest of the garden boundary made up of fencing and hedges/shrubs on both sides.

The previous scheme was refused on the grounds that it would result in a harmful impact on the amenities of the neighbours at No.5 Roman Close by way of loss of outlook and light, due to the combined depth and mass of the extensions. However, these matters were further assessed by the appeal Inspector who did not share the Council's concerns in these respects. Regarding outlook, the Inspector commented as follows in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the appeal decision:

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.

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.

In terms of impacts on light, the Inspector noted that due to the distances between buildings, it was mainly the effects of loss of sunlight that needed to be considered (rather than daylight and sunlight). Based on additional shadowing information provided by the appellant at the appeal stage, the Inspector concluded in paragraph 8 that increased shadowing as a result of the appeal scheme would not have a significantly adverse effect.

To conclude, based on the additional information provided by the applicant at the appeal stage regarding shadowing impacts, and having regard to the conclusions of the planning Inspector, it is determined that the impacts of the proposed extensions on the amenities of No.5 Roman Close would not be so significant as to warrant the previous reason for refusal being upheld. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with Policy DM1 of the Local Plan in terms of impacts on neighbouring properties.

Parking

The proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms in the dwelling, which would remain as 3. The Council's Parking Standards require a 3-bedroom dwelling to have 2 on-site parking spaces and, even with the loss of the existing side garage, there would remain ample space for the parking of at least 2 vehicles on the front driveway. The parking provision for the property is therefore acceptable in accordance with Policy DM14 of the Local Plan.

Ecology

The proposals have been reviewed by the Council's Ecologist to consider any potential impacts on protected species. No objection has been raised, but a precautionary working method has been recommended, which can be included as an informative on the decision notice.

Other matters

Some further matters raised in the representations include concerns about loss of boundary vegetation during construction, and increased flood and fire risk.

In respect of boundary matters, including potential damage to neighbouring vegetation, these would be private matters to be addressed between the relevant parties.

In terms of flood risk, the Council's mapping system indicates there is some risk of surface water flooding on the site, predominantly to the site frontage. Southern Water has been consulted and has provided advice to the applicant regarding surface water disposal which would need to be taken into account. This, and matters relating to fire prevention between buildings, would also be considered under Building Regulations.

A further concern has been raised in relation to the potential for guttering to overhang the neighbouring boundary. The submitted plans indicate that the development would be constructed within the boundary of the application site and the applicant has confirmed that they would also ensure that guttering remained within the boundary line. An informative note is to be added to the decision to confirm that the granting of planning permission does not give approval for any encroachment over the neighbouring boundary.

Climate Change:

In July 2019, the Council declared a Climate Change and Environmental Emergency. In doing so it agreed, among other things, to: (a) put in place measures to ensure the Council's own operations and functions achieve carbon neutrality by 2025; (b) work with partners to aim for all projects and services delivered in the Borough to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030; (c) ensure that the Council's procurement policy recognises carbon neutrality as one of its primary considerations; and (d) recognise the urgency of action to

mitigate and adapt to climate change in every decision taken by the Council. This is underpinned by the Climate and Environment Emergency Strategy 2020–2030 and the supporting Climate and Environmental Emergency Action Plan – Update June 2020.

The NPPF, Policies S1, DM2 and DM3 of the Local Plan and energy and water elements of the adopted Environmentally Sustainable Development SPD require development to be sustainable in terms of resource use, climate change and energy use. When considering the impact of climate change, the proposed development is expected to be resilient to the potential effects of climate change and is expected to reduce/limit impacts on climate emissions as a result of the development or its use.

Equalities Implications:

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states:

- A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - a. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - b. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - c. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

When making policy decisions, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups. It is considered that this application does not raise any equality implications.

Conclusion: Having regard to the previous appeal decision and following review of the proposed plans and details, the development is considered to be acceptable in terms of design and would not result in harmful impacts on the amenities of the neighbouring residents. The proposal is considered to accord with the relevant policies of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan.

Recommendation:	PERMIT ☒	REFUSE ☐
-----------------	---	--