

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2017

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/17/3173974

2 Emmons Close, Hamble-Le-Rice, Southampton SO31 4QF

- 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 Tim Gabriel against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application, Ref. F/17/80052, dated 15 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is to replace the existing rear conservatory with a single storey rear extension. Replace single storey side extension with a 2 storey side extension. Convert roof space for storage. Minor modifications to the existing windows and re-clad the front elevations gable.
-

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 existing house and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the appeal dwelling is one of a group of properties in a cul-de-sac that despite their individuality in terms of detail have a visually pleasing coherence as regards their design and external materials.
 4. I consider this consistency is important to the character and appearance of the area and whilst it does not preclude the principle of further additions and alterations, it does act as a constraint on their appearance and the ability to comply with the Council's adopted policies and Government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 ('the Framework').
 5. In this case the appeal scheme includes the replacement of the existing single storey side extension on the western flank of the dwelling with a 2 storey addition to provide a pool / exercise room / utility room on the ground floor with a master bedroom / en suite / bathroom on the first floor.
 6. This extension would be of a more contemporary design than both the original dwelling and an approval for extensions in 2012, with the inclusion of a flat roof for the ground floor accommodation that would extend forward of the existing front elevation. There would also be a flat roof for the first floor bedroom at a height above the eaves line of the adjoining gable. The first floor element
-

would be set back from the sides of the ground floor extension, particularly on the north elevation.

7. I have carefully read the Design and Access Statement submitted as part of the application but whilst I acknowledge the flat roofs of the side extension would tie in with the ground floor rear extension to replace the conservatory and also reduce any effect on the outlook for the occupiers of No. 3, I consider that they (and particularly the first floor roof) would not sit comfortably with the main building. Indeed the opposite would be the case, and although there are occasions where a contemporary design for an extension to a largely 'traditional' design can be successful I do not regard this proposal as being a case in point.
8. Overall, I consider that whilst some aspects of the scheme are acceptable, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of a building that has a coherence with its context to which I have already alluded. For the same reason I also share the Council's concern in respect of the change in the external materials of the front gable to horizontal cladding (or 'slatted rainscreen') so as to match the side extension. This would replace the mock Tudor frontage also evident on a couple of nearby properties and introduce a feature not already apparent in the Close.
9. For the appellant it is argued that the visual impact of the side extension would not be significant. However, whilst I accept that the appeal dwelling is to some extent tucked into the corner of the Close, the contrasting style and design of the utility room proposed forward of the existing front elevation and the first floor flat roof to the master bedroom would be sufficient to draw the eye from the public realm.
10. Overall, I conclude that the appeal proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing house and the surrounding area. This would be contrary to Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan review 2001-2011 and conflict with Section 7: 'Requiring Good Design' of the Framework.
11. The grounds of appeal refer to alterations to other properties in the area. However, I have considered this proposal as a whole and on its individual merits and I am not persuaded that my attention has been drawn to any other development that would form a precedent in this case or otherwise justify the acceptability of the appeal scheme.
12. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR