
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2020

by James Taylor BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/D/19/3236010
122 Radstock Road, Southampton SO19 2HU

- 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 Horsham against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00852/FUL, dated 7 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'new gabled roof with rear facing dormer'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. Upon my site visit I saw that the front boundary wall had been removed and the front amenity space had been paved with a drainage channel across the frontage.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are i) the effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area; and ii) whether the proposal provides adequate vehicular parking, and if not, the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with a modest, shallow pitched and hipped roof form. To the front it has a small projecting gable over the two-storey bay window. From immediately outside the property this is the dominant roof feature. From the opposite side of the street however, the whole of the roof can be appreciated and seen in the context of the surrounding built form. Except for some gabled roof forms to the eastern end of Radstock Road the dwellings within the street scene have roofs consistent with the host building in terms of form and height. There is some subtle variation in heights. However, the street is relatively flat and there is a strong sense of consistency in the roof form, pitch and heights.
5. The proposal would introduce a more steeply pitched and gabled roof form into the street scene. It would have an appreciably greater ridge height than the flanking properties, which includes a semi-detached dwelling. These are

normally greater in height than the detached properties. From views opposite and a short distance in either direction, this would appear prominent and incongruous, especially for one of the detached houses. It would appear out of keeping with the context of modest, shallow pitched and hipped roofs. Furthermore, the introduction of rooflights within the front roof slope would draw attention to the additional scale and height of the development.

6. Additionally, although not prominent within the street scene due to its siting to the rear and the close proximity of the flanking buildings, the dormer window would be sited flush with the proposed gabled wall. This lack of any set back between the dormer and the side elevation would not reflect good design. Furthermore, although not prominent from the front, the full width, flat roofed box dormer would appear as a significant mass and bulk poorly related to the surrounding roof forms when viewed from the gardens at the rear of neighbouring property.
7. Whilst I acknowledge that the impact of the proposal would be limited to the immediate environs of the appeal site, this does not mitigate its effect on the host building, nor fully mitigate its effect on the surrounding area. Upon my site visit I did observe similar examples of this type of development, however none were identical to the proposal before me. Furthermore, they were some distance from the appeal site and not characteristic of the street scene.
8. Therefore, on the first main issue, the proposed development would appear incongruous and harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policy CS13 of the Council's Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document - Amended Version incorporating the Core Strategy Partial Review March 2015 (CS), 'saved' Policies SDP1, SDP7 and SDP9 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review – Adopted Version 2nd Revision (2015) (LP), and the Residential Design Guide Final approved version – September 2006. The aims of which include the provision of positive design reflective of local distinctiveness and the area's character and appearance.

Vehicular parking

9. The proposed development would provide two additional bedrooms to the appeal property, extending it to be a four-bedroom home. The evidence details that the property currently has no vehicular parking. I have noted the recent provision of hard standing to the front garden, but no dropped kerb was evident on my site visit. Furthermore, I have no plans to indicate if this new hardstanding is suitable for the provision of vehicular parking. I am also mindful that the provision of a dropped kerb, as highlighted by the appellant would commensurately reduce the availability of on-street parking. As such I conclude that no additional parking provision has been identified.
10. The Council's parking standards¹ refer to maximum provision at new residential development, using the number of bedrooms to determine the level of parking required. Based on this the existing dwelling currently provides two spaces less than the maximum. The plans show a proposal that would increase the shortfall to three spaces. Whilst the Parking SPD sets out that the provision of less than the maximum is permissible, a caveat to this is that developers should

¹ Table 1 at 4.2.1 of the Southampton City Council Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (Parking SPD)

demonstrate the provision of less than the maximum would be sufficient. The appellant has provided no evidence to support vehicular parking levels below the maximum standard.

11. However, the meaning of 'new residential development' is not defined within the Parking SPD. I am mindful of the difficulty of imposing modern parking standards to householder extensions within existing residential areas where internal alterations or permitted development can result in similar impacts. For example, I note that the submitted plans show three reception rooms at ground floor, two of which could be readily turned into bedrooms without the need for planning approval. This presents a potential fall-back position resulting in the provision of the same number of bedrooms without planning control. Whilst I find technical conflict with the 2011 guidance, I note that this is not part of the development plan, and a reasonable fall-back is a material consideration.
12. Furthermore, the Council has not provided any consultation response from their highway colleagues to substantiate their concerns over levels of parking. Additionally, no neighbour objections have been received raising concerns over the potential effect of the proposal on their living conditions.
13. Therefore, on the second main issue, whilst I find that the proposal would not provide adequate vehicular parking when assessed against the Parking SPD, I find no harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. As such the proposal would not conflict with Policy CS19 of the CS; and 'saved' Policies SDP1 and SDP5 of the LP. The aims of which include securing adequate parking provision and the protection of local residents' living conditions.

Conclusions

14. In conclusion, whilst I have found no harm in relation to vehicular parking and the living conditions of neighbouring residents, this does not mitigate the harm I have identified in relation to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Therefore, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

James Taylor

INSPECTOR