

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 May 2017

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 08 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/D/17/3171615

44 Shanklin Road, Southampton, SO15 7RF

- 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 & Mrs David and Rachel Reynolds against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01966/FUL, dated 16 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and roof alterations to facilitate loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more descriptively complete than the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached hipped roof dwelling of pleasing appearance in an area of established residential character. The locality is suburban in nature with broadly similar detached and semi-detached homes, usually with hipped roofs, coming together to make a pleasant streetscene. The proposal is as described above and would provide increased ground floor living accommodation, new stair arrangements and a bedroom and shower room at roof level.
 5. The two storey side extension would represent an unusual design and one which would not sit comfortably in aesthetic terms with the existing home, its adjoining home and its wider surrounds. This is because, even with a suitably reduced ridge line and front elevational set-back, rather than reflecting the fully hipped approach and established eaves height the structure includes a partial hip design and a visually awkward and overly high blank frontage wall. This would rise some way above the main eaves and side hip. It would stand out as an unsympathetically designed extension and would be jarring on the
-

eye. Adding a window within the front elevation as suggested by the Appellants would not overcome the visual problem of the vertical wall simply running to too great an overall height.

6. Saved Policies SDP1, SDP7 and SDP9 of the Local Plan Review (2015) and Policy CS13 of the adopted Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2010), have relevance to the case. Taken together, and amongst other matters, they seek to ensure that development is of high quality design, sympathetic to its surroundings and integrating in the streetscene, suitable in form for its context, and protective of visual amenity. This is reflected in the advice and objectives of the Council's adopted Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2006 (SPD) albeit that document cannot be expected to cover every eventuality. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the relevant development plan policies and the pertinent aims of the SPD.

Other matters

7. I sympathise with the wish of the Appellants to increase internal space to help meet family needs. I appreciate that some efforts have been made to seek to achieve a degree of subservience of form and that thought has been given to seek to improve upon what might or might not be the result of applying 'permitted development' rights which may appertain. I can see that there would be no harm to the residential amenity of neighbours and note that no objections have arisen. I would agree that seeking total symmetry of semi-detached pairs is not always necessary and that there could well be scope for some flexibility in relation to the appeal property. I recognise that there are other examples of side extensions erected locally. I would conclude that some work successfully in visual terms, others less so. However for reasons of position, scale or form none are directly comparable to the appeal scheme which, in any event I must assess on its own merits. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellants but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered and the development plan policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR