



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2025

by Juliet Rogers BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/W/24/3355788

17 O'Connell Road, Eastleigh, Hampshire SO50 9GN

- 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 S Michael against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is F/24/97118.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing outbuilding and the erection of a detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Comprising the existing dwelling and garden area of 17 O'Connell Road (No.17), the appeal site is located within an established residential area of predominantly semi-detached and short rows of terraced properties. Along O'Connell Road, properties are orientated towards the street, sited back from the pavement behind front gardens of a similar depth. This creates a sense of space to the street scene which is heightened by the angular relationship of the pairs of semi-detached dwellings, including No.17, that front onto small areas of grass and/or adjacent to a road junction.
4. The proposal would introduce a new detached dwelling into part of the existing garden area of No.17 positioned close to the side boundary with 19 O'Connell Road (No.19), replacing the dilapidated workshop structure. Although sited in line with the façade of No.19, the proposal would occupy an existing gap between the built form which contributes to the spacious character of the street. Due to its proposed position and scale, it would be a more imposing feature than other structures, such as single storey garages, within similar gaps between properties along the road. As such, it would result in a cramped layout which would be detrimental to the established pattern and rhythm of development along the street.
5. Other detached dwellings have been constructed within similar gaps between existing dwellings nearby, including at 1a, 2a and 20a Spencer Road. However, the width of the resultant plots is marginally wider than is the case between No.17 and No.19. In addition, the massing of these particular infill dwellings differs from that of the appeal scheme, with a single storey garage closest to the angled part of

semi-detached dwellings providing a degree of separation to its neighbour. The gable end and roof pitch of these newer dwellings respond to the elevational design of their neighbours which assists in maintaining the local character. In any event, the spacious characteristics of Spencer Road relate more to the façade-to-façade distances formed by the deeper front gardens and the symmetrical relationship of the staggered building lines to the carriageway. Therefore, whilst with similar characteristics to O'Connell Road, Spencer Road is appreciated differently, even if they formed part of the same initial development.

6. Although the purpose of Policy DM1 of the Local Plan¹ is, in part, to make an efficient use of land and maximise opportunities to increase density, as also promoted by the Framework², this is supported in circumstances where the context, character and appearance of the surrounding area is taken into account. This approach is advocated by the Framework and is the case irrespective of whether a site is located within a Conservation Area, the presence of modern interventions nearby or the degree to which its surroundings have been altered.
7. Notwithstanding the simple design and form, with a replication of architectural details and the use of matching materials, together with the reduction in the width and number of bedrooms comprising a recently dismissed appeal³, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would, therefore, not represent a circumstance where an increase in density is supported by Policy DM1 of the Local Plan.

Other Matters

8. The proposal would provide social and economic benefits resulting from the construction and occupation of an additional dwelling in a location with convenient access to a range of shops, services and facilities. In so doing, it would support the Framework's objective of significantly boosting the number of homes and add to the variety of dwelling sizes within the housing stock. Environmental benefits would be derived from the proposal through the densification of the site, the provision of photovoltaic solar panels, measures to minimise water and energy use and its siting to maximise solar gain. Whilst contributing positively in this way, nonetheless, as similarly concluded by the Inspector on the recent dismissed appeal, the scale of the proposal and the benefits which would follow would be small.
9. The appeal site is located within the catchment zones of several European designated sites. These are afforded protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2007, as amended. If the circumstances leading to the grant of planning permission had been present, I would have considered the impact of the development on these sites, with reference to the Unilateral Undertaking submitted with the appeal. However, as I am dismissing the appeal on the main issue above, it is not necessary to consider this matter further.
10. Any support from the Town Council to the proposal or the absence of objections from the local community are not reasons to permit development which is harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

¹ Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 (the Local Plan)

² National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)

³ APP/W1715/W/24/3339114

Conclusion

11. The proposed development is contrary to the development plan as a whole and material considerations do not indicate that the proposed development should be determined other than in accordance with it. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all relevant matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Juliet Rogers

INSPECTOR