

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2016

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/D/16/3154415
12 Hillside Avenue, Southampton, SO18 1JY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Q Hussain against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00855/FUL/4059, dated 4 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and rear extension and part single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Note

2. Much of the two-storey extension and the single-storey rear extension have already been built apart from the roof link between the two-storey element and the roof of the original house. I also noted on my site visit that the single-storey extension, as constructed, differs from that shown on the submitted plan in terms of its window and door detail. I have, however, determined this appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling, which is situated in a primarily residential area. Although it sits at a lower level than the road, the dwelling is prominent in the streetscene because of its open position towards the end of Hillside Avenue. The houses along Hillside Avenue differ in terms of their size and appearance. In particular, I noted during my site visit that the roof designs and pitches are varied.
 5. The appeal property has previously been granted planning permission (reference: 11/00961/FUL) for a two-storey side extension and single-storey rear extension. It was approved on 11 August 2011. That proposal showed a hipped roof construction with a central link between the two-storey side
-

extension and the original roof of the dwelling. However, the side extension has not been built in accordance with the approved plans, which show a shallower roof pitch than has been built. Consequently, the overall roof height of the two-storey extension is higher than originally approved and the angle of the slope does not match that of the original roof. The appeal proposal is essentially for the same development as was approved in 2011 but it seeks to retain the angle of the roof structure as built on the two-storey extension.

6. The Council considers that the proposal would detract from the appearance of the dwelling and the streetscene. Accordingly, the Council states that the proposal would conflict with Policies SDP1, SDP7 and SDP9 of the adopted City of Southampton Local Plan Review 2006 (LP), and with Policy CS 13 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2010 (CS). These policies generally seek (amongst other things) to ensure that new development is of high quality design; respects the existing character and appearance of buildings; and integrates with its surroundings. In my opinion, the policies are consistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which requires new development to be of high quality design and to add to the overall quality of the area in which it is located (paragraphs 17 and 58)
7. In addition, further guidance on design is contained in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Design Guide 2006 (SPD). I note that paragraph 2.5.2 of the SPD states that roof form and pitch must relate to the original design of the building.
8. I acknowledge the appellant does not want to rebuild the existing roof of the two-storey extension. However, I consider the proposal to be visually incongruous and at odds with the character and appearance of the original dwelling because of the design and angle of the roof. The two-storey extension would be a prominent feature in the streetscene when viewed from both the front and side of the property and it would fail to make a positive contribution to the appearance of Hillside Avenue. Accordingly, I consider that it would conflict with the Development Plan and with the Framework, as referred to above.
9. In my opinion, the single-storey rear extension is acceptable in terms of its scale and appearance. However, this does not alter my findings on the proposal as a whole.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR