



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2019

by S Thomas BSc (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/D/19/3238170 3 Evesham Close, Southampton SO16 3PG

- 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 L Walford against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01321/FUL, dated 31 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension and roof alterations including front and rear dormer to provide additional first floor accommodation and external raised deck to rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (i) the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the area and (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 6 Grendon Close (No 6) in respect of privacy.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modest two storey property with a pitched roof and a single storey extension to its side elevation. There exists dormer windows on the side elevations of the property at first floor level. The property is located in the corner of a quiet cul de sac in a row of properties of a similar design, with properties of a different design on the opposite side of the cul de sac.
4. The Residential Design Guide (2006) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that all extensions should be smaller than the main part of the house and not dominate its appearance. Extensions that are too big can make the house look lopsided or unbalanced but can also break the visual continuity of the street of which it is a part. It further states that dormer windows should be in keeping with the house and the roof form and the addition of dormers should not visually dominate the existing roof.
5. The proposed roof alterations above the single storey side extension would create a considerable first floor addition to the property. This would extend beyond the side elevation of the single storey side extension to the property and would extend development across the width of the house at first floor level. The proposed roof form would appear at odds with the pitched roof character of the dwelling, and thus would not be a sympathetic addition to the

dwelling and would be uncharacteristic of the roof form in this row of properties.

6. Whilst the proposed roof extension is set down slightly, the scale and massing of the roof extension would create a dominant feature out of character with the host dwelling. The proposed front and rear dormers are set down from the roof in line with the SPD and I acknowledge that the rear dormer does not project further forward than the existing rear elevation of the property. However, whilst the rear facing dormer has more of a prominent impact given its increased bulk, both the front and rear facing dormers are too large and their excessive width and bulk are considerable additions to the property and would together with the roof extensions visually dominate the existing roof.
7. I have considered the fact there is an existing side dormer of a similar scale to that proposed in the rear dormer. However, this is located on the side elevation of the property and screened from view. Notwithstanding this, the proposed dormers will be part of a substantial increase to the roof and thus will be more visually prominent from the front and rear of the property. Further, the proposed rear dormer has an increased level of glazing which increases its prominence, creating a dominant feature compared to the existing rear elevation at first floor level.
8. Whilst the property is in the corner of the cul de sac the proposal will be visible from the street scene and would thus create an incongruent and visually imposing feature detracting from the character of the original dwelling and thus of the similar properties in this row. Consequently, it would fail to integrate successfully into the street scene and would be out of character with the local area.
9. For the reasons outlined above, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and area and thus would be in conflict with saved Policy SDP 1 (i) and SDP 7 (iv) of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (2015) (LPR) and the SPD. Amongst other things, these policies seek that development which would cause material harm to the character and /or appearance of an area will not be permitted and proposals should respect the scale and proportion of existing buildings and should not unacceptably affect the amenity of the city. I do not find conflict with Policy SDP 7 (iii) of the LPR as this relates to layout of buildings in the streetscape. I turn now to living conditions.
10. The neighbouring property No 6 is located at a lower level to the appeal property with the rear gardens of the appeal property and No 6 backing onto each other. The Council identify that the rear separation distances between the properties is less than the minimum standard of 21 metres at around 19.20 metres. Whilst this may be the case, the rear of the appeal property already has a bedroom window at first floor level and the proposed rear facing windows at first floor level would project no further forward than what currently exists. Therefore, whilst the proposed extension would increase the bulk of the property and introduce increased rear facing windows, given the existing situation I do not find this would cause overlooking to the rear habitable windows of No 6 to a degree that would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 6. Consequently, with regard to the effect on living conditions, the proposal would not conflict with Policies SDP 1 and SDP 7 of the LPR and the SPD.

11. Whilst I have not found harm to living conditions this does not outweigh the harm I find to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Stephen Thomas

INSPECTOR