
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2020

by Martin Small, BA (Hons), BPI, DipCM, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/D/20/3251853

14 Redmoor Close, Southampton, SO19 4DH

- 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 Simon Dackham against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref: 20/00071/FUL dated 16 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as '2.5 storey side extension, not exceeding the roof height of highest pitch roof at 12 Redmoor Close. Extension is within 1 meter from the boundary. With single storey front bay protrusion, with flat roof extending across to provide a canopy for the porch, in keeping with the art deco design style for our property'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and on the street scene of Redmoor Close.

Reasons

Background

3. Planning permission was granted in 2014 for an 'extension to porch and two storey side extension' at the appeal property. However, this has not been implemented. The proposal before me differs from the approved scheme in that it would be higher, incorporating an internal mezzanine floor.

Character and appearance

4. Redmoor Close is a cul-de-sac that rises from the entrance to a 'bulb' at the end. The road accommodates a variety of detached and semi-detached 2-storey dwellings and detached bungalows. The appeal property is one of six semi-detached dwellings at the head of the cul-de-sac originally constructed in a 'moderne' style. However, the original designs of some of these dwellings have been changed by the addition of pitched roofs in place of the original flat roofs and other alterations, although the appeal property retains its original flat roof and moderne style.
5. The proposed extension would be to the side of the property and set back from the front elevation, close to the side boundary but designed to retain a gap

between the side elevation of the extension and that boundary. It would have the same footprint as the approved extension but would project above the existing roof of the appeal property. The proposals also include the addition of a shallow bay and the provision of a flat canopy over this window and front door to the front elevation at ground floor level.

6. The increased height of the proposed extension, although no higher than the ridge line of the partner dwelling to the appeal property, No. 12 Redmoor Close, would result in its being more dominant than the approved scheme and not subservient to the host property. Whilst I appreciate that the proposed extension is intended to be in keeping with the architectural style of the appeal property, it would not reflect the simple plain form of the host dwelling.
7. Moreover, the proposed extension would be more prominent than the approved extension from Redmoor Close where the top of the extension would be visible whereas the approved extension would be obscured by the existing dwelling. Although it would be seen against a background of vegetation and a dwelling at a higher level than the appeal property, the top of the proposed extension would still be a noticeable feature, at odds with the roof forms of other properties in the Close.
8. Furthermore, although the architectural composition of the six moderne dwellings has been altered by the changes to some of the properties, the group does retain sufficient coherence for the proposed extension to be at odds with this group. The existing extension to No. 13 Redmoor Close does not project above the roof of the main dwelling and so is materially different to the proposal before me. These alterations to the other properties do not, therefore, justify the proposed development.
9. I therefore conclude that although the proposed bay and canopy would be acceptable, the increased height of the proposed side extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property and to the street scene of Redmoor Close. The proposal therefore conflicts with saved Policies SDP7 and SDP9 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (as amended 2015) which, in combination, seek to protect the character and appearance of an area and require proposals to respect their surroundings in scale, massing and visual impact.
10. The proposal would not fully accord with Policy CS13 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (as amended 2015) as although it would respond to the architectural vernacular, it would not respond positively and integrate with its local surroundings and character. The proposed development would also not fully accord with the guidance set out in the Council's Residential Design Guide that extensions should be subordinate to and not dominate the appearance of the original dwelling. Nor would it fully accord with paragraph 127 c) of the National Planning Policy Framework which sets out that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

11. Whilst I sympathise with the appellant's desire to provide additional accommodation for his family, I have borne in mind that the development would remain long after the personal circumstances have ceased to be material. Therefore, this consideration does not outweigh the harm to the

character and appearance of the host dwelling and to the street scene that I have identified.

12. The appellant has provided examples of other dwellings of similar style in Southampton, which I observed during my site visit, and elsewhere which incorporate a 'tower' as part of an asymmetrical design. However, whilst these demonstrate that a tower feature is not necessarily incongruous with the moderne style, these examples appear to be primarily more substantial, individual, detached dwellings rather than part of a group of properties originally of the same design, and thus differ from the appeal property and its context. Accordingly, I do not consider that they justify the proposal before me which, in any event, I have to determine on its own merits.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to the other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Small

INSPECTOR