
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2019

by Roy Curnow MA BSC(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/W/19/3228389

Flat 3, 12 Barnfield Way, Southampton SO19 9GU

- 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 Jason Domingo against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00355/FUL, dated 26 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of pitched roof to flat roof to top floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - (i) the character of development in the locality; and
 - (ii) the living conditions of the occupants of 11 Barnfield Way, having particular regard to outlook and daylight.

Reasons

Character of the locality

3. 12 Barnfield Way lies at the end of a cul-de-sac on a residential estate, occupying a corner position on its turning head. Although all the dwellings have two-storey forms, there are differences in their designs. For its most part, the estate consists of semi-detached dwellings with shallow pitched roofs and a mixture of painted render and tile hanging on their facades. There are also short terraces of four brick-built dwellings. These have steeper pitched roofs and their brickwork is painted at first floor level.
4. Both forms of development are found around the turning head. No 12 belongs to the latter, of which there appeared to be a greater concentration on Barnfield Way than elsewhere. It differs from any other property that I saw on the estate, in as much as it accommodated three flats set over three floors. An external staircase gives access to a flat at first floor level. The upper floor flat is, save for its kitchen and bathroom at first floor level, set into the property's roof space. Its rooms at first floor level are served by windows looking onto the turning head, with those above being served by rooflights.

5. Notwithstanding these variations, there is a strong overall character to the area and the host property reflects this.
6. It is proposed to raise the side walls at the rear of the property and replace its pitched roof with a flat roof. This would result in a large three-storey high, flat-roofed element at the rear of the building.
7. The Council's Residential Design Guide, 2006, (RDG), states that the reconfiguring of roofs to create additional accommodation in the roof space will not be acceptable if the changes adversely impact on the local character of the area.
8. Although it would have the same height as the existing roof, the result would be a building of considerably greater mass than others in the area. Whilst there would be no ill-effect on the street scene, as the extension would be little seen from public vantage points, this would not mitigate the harm that would result to the overall character of the estate.
9. For the above reasons, my finding on this main issue is that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character of the locality. As such, it would be contrary to 'saved' Policies SDP7 and SDP9 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review, Adopted Version 2nd Revision 2015 (Local Plan). Amongst other things, these require development proposals not to cause material harm to the character of their areas and to respect their surroundings, respectively. It would also be contrary to the terms of Policy CS13 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document, March 2015, (Core Strategy) that require developments to respond positively to their local surroundings. These are also amongst the terms of the RDG, with which the proposal also conflicts.
10. I do not find that Local Plan Policy SDP1 was relevant to this issue, as it refers to matters of residents' amenity and a complementary mix of uses in an area.

Living Conditions

11. The proposal would result in a three-storey element projecting from the rear of No12 along the boundary with 11 Barnfield Way. However, there is an extension to the rear of No 11, which appeared to be in some form of storage use, that runs along the length of this proposed element. This would mitigate the effect of the extension when viewed from the garden, as people would be set away from the full height of the flank wall. Furthermore, the extension would break up its apparent bulk.
12. Due to its extension, there is no ground floor window to No 11 adjacent to the flank wall of No 12. There is a first-floor window that is set fairly close to this flank wall. However, the additional floor of accommodation at No 12 would not have a significantly harmful effect on the outlook from this window.
13. As the rear of the terrace faces just west of north, the proposed extension would not result in the loss of direct sunlight to the No 11. Similarly, from what I saw, I do not find that the proposed extension would result in the loss of daylight reaching the rear of No 11.
14. My finding on this main issue is that the proposed development would not unacceptably affect the living conditions of the occupants of No 11. It would, therefore, accord with the terms of Policy SDP1 of the Local Plan, and those

terms of Core Strategy Policy CS13 that reflect this. My attention was not drawn to any specific part of section 2 of the RDG, with regards to this issue. Notwithstanding this, for the reasons given above, I find that the scheme would accord with the overall aim of its Section 2.2. This seeks, amongst other things, to maintain access to natural light and outlook for the occupants of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

15. I recognise that the design would meet the Building Regulations. However, neither this nor the lack of objections to the planning application outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

16. Although I have not found that the proposed extension would harm the living conditions of the occupants of 11 Barnfield Way, neither this nor any other matter raised, outweighs the harm that I have identified to the character of the area.
17. For the reasons set out above, and having taken all matters into account, I dismiss the appeal.

Roy Curnow

INSPECTOR