



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 April 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/25/3360740

14 Thorold Road, Chandler's Ford, Hampshire SO53 5BT

- 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 M Hendrick against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
- The application Ref. is H/24/98362.
- The development proposed is for a side extension and raising of ridge to form habitable accommodation with dormers within roof space.

This decision is issued in accordance with section 56 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended and supersedes that issued on 22 April 2025.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. It is acknowledged that the Council changed the description of development that was included within the planning application forms which the appellants consider does not accurately describe the proposal. It falls to me to determine the appeal based on the original submission and whilst the term "Resubmit of" does not constitute development for which planning permission is required in its own right, I have nonetheless utilised the description of proposed works as set out within the application form thereafter.
3. Since the planning application, the subject of this appeal was determined, a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') has been published (12 December 2024) and consequently amended on 7 February 2025. There has been no material change to national planning policy in respect of householder appeals and therefore I considered that it was not necessary to refer back to the parties. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area; and upon the living conditions of the occupants of 12 Thorold Road, with specific reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is located within a leafy, residential street and the subject dwelling comprises a modest hipped roof bungalow within a section of Thorold Road where such building forms tend to predominate. It is highly visible within the street scene by virtue of its elevated position relative to the road and is also on slightly higher ground than no12 to the south, albeit that the rear garden of the latter also rises up in an easterly direction.
6. Overall, the proposal would significantly increase the scale of the host dwelling and combined with a lack of detail does not convince me that it would give rise to a high quality design as required by the Framework, as the original form of the bungalow would essentially be subsumed into the proposal.
7. I acknowledge that there is a mix of residential properties ranging from bungalows, extended chalet style and two storey houses within the wider area, but nonetheless the appeal site and no12 are generally read in isolation when viewing up the road due north of its junction with Grosvenor Road; and ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits.
8. I note that the Council raise no objection to the principle of extending the bungalow, it is the nature of the scheme that is at issue. I have no reason to doubt that a more sensitive scheme could be designed for the site that pays respect to the character of the original bungalow.
9. The proliferation of dormer windows, combined with the various flat roof forms would give the host dwelling an incongruous appearance in the street scene and would run counter to the simple and modest roofscapes found within the immediate vicinity. I acknowledge that the adopted Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Character Area Appraisal (CAA) was adopted nearly 20 years ago, although that in itself does not necessarily render the general spirit of the document as out of date, however changes to National and local planning policy have occurred and no doubt there has been developmental change to the built environment within the Kingsway area. Nonetheless, the CAA does require that the design of new building work, including extensions, is compatible with the character of adjacent properties and fits well into the overall street scene. I note that the appellants acknowledge that this principle is still relevant and one with which I find conflict between it and the proposal as described above.
10. I therefore find on this issue that the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016- 2036) (EBLP) which requires development proposals to, amongst other things, take full and proper account of the context of the site, including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality and neighbourhood, and be compatible with adjoining uses and be well integrated with these in terms of mass, scale, layout, design and siting both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views.

Living Conditions

11. As highlighted above, no12 is located on lower ground than the appeal site although its rear garden also slopes up in an easterly direction away from its rear elevation, upon which a conservatory has been added. By virtue of the staggered nature of the appeal dwelling's footprint in relation to its immediate neighbour, the outlook from the conservatory would be affected to some degree and, furthermore, the overall increase in scale and bulk of the appeal dwelling would be overbearing upon the rear garden of no12, especially by virtue of its close proximity to the shared boundary.
12. Consequently I consider that the scheme would give rise to a demonstrable loss of outlook to the occupants of no12 and again the scheme is contrary to EBLP Policy DM1 in that the development would have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of existing residents.

Conclusion

13. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR