



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2026

by R Cahalane BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 January 2026

Appeal Ref: 6001834

5 Tower Place, West End, Hampshire SO30 3DL

- 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 & Mrs Cole against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is H/25/99653.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side extension at 5 Tower Place, West End, Hampshire SO30 3DL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref H/25/99653, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: 03932 Rev A; 03935 Rev A; 03936 Rev A; 03937 Rev A; 03938 Rev A; 03939 Rev A.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 6 Tower Place, with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal site (No 5) comprises a two-storey detached dwelling within the small residential cul-de-sac of Tower Place. No 6 is on significantly lower land level, and has ground and first floor windows at close proximity to the proposed extension.
4. No 6's ground floor windows nearest to No 5 are already impacted by the fencing and shrubbery on higher land level along the side boundary with No 5. No 6's ground and first floor rooms served by its side bay projection are each also served by front windows facing its front garden and the cul-de-sac. Whilst some first-floor views from this side bay are possible past No 5's side wall, these are at an angle, and I am therefore not persuaded that this provides a primary source of outlook.
5. The proposed low sloping monopitch roof towards No 6, and the angled siting of No 6 to the southeast, would also assist in reducing the light and outlook impacts

on its affected windows. Impacts on No 6's garden would be limited to the gated passageway along the side boundary, and the primary garden areas would not be materially affected. I envisage that the above factors would avoid a visually overbearing impact on No 6 and would also avoid a harmful degree of light loss.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not adversely harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 6 in terms of light and outlook. The scheme thus complies with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 (adopted 2022), insofar as it requires development to not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenities of residents. I have also found no conflict with the relevant guidance of the Council's Quality Spaces Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2011), which advises that new development should be designed to respect the residential amenity of occupiers.

Conditions

7. A condition specifying a time limit for the development (No 1) is necessary in the interests of planning certainty. Condition 2 is necessary to clarify the approved plan details. Condition 3 is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of No 5 and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed.

R Cahalane

INSPECTOR