
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2021

by S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/D/20/3260413

3 Hinkler Road, Southampton SO19 6FR

- 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 Miss Frankie Lanham against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00879/FUL, dated 7 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 Hinkler Road and 5 Hinkler Road, with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property comprises a semi-detached two-storey dwelling of a traditional design with brick walls under a slate hipped roof. There is a single storey hipped roof addition which wraps around the side and rear of the building.
4. The site lies within an established suburban residential area. There are a variety of building types within the site vicinity, including detached, semi-detached and terraced properties, and houses, bungalows and flats. However, the northern part of the road within which the appeal site is located is characterised by pairs of semi-detached houses, resulting in a regularity of development type within this part of the street. Whilst not all buildings are identical in their design detailing, a strong rhythm of development is clearly perceived from the public realm, due to the prevailing open/low nature of site frontages. A positive feature of the townscape is the retention of a sense of

symmetry between the pairs of houses in terms of their roof form and frontage fenestration, which includes feature bay windows and arched front door surrounds. Retention of space to the side ensures that the semi-detached character of the original buildings is still evident.

5. The appeal property is typical of the original form of period semi-detached property in this part of the street, and together with its neighbour at No.1, makes a positive contribution to the street scene and the character and appearance of the area.
6. A 2-storey extension has been added to the side of No.1. However, due to a combination of its hipped roof form, incorporating the same eaves and ridge heights as those of the host property, its use of matching materials and front elevation fenestration design, and the retention of space to its side due to its position adjacent to the rear gardens of neighbouring properties, this addition has not significantly altered the original character of the semi-detached building as a whole.
7. The proposed two-storey side extension to No.3 would significantly disrupt the existing symmetrical appearance and balance of the building. Notwithstanding the proposed matching materials and front elevation window design and the lower ridge height, the extension, due to its combined height, depth, massing and wrap-around nature, would not respect, or appear subservient to, the existing dwelling. The large expanse of unrelieved brick on the side wall, only broken up by two small first floor windows, would further serve to emphasise the visual dominance of the extension in relation to the host property. This impact would be apparent in views from Hinkler Road and the neighbouring property.
8. When viewed from the street, the proposed gable-ended roof would appear discordant in relation to the hipped roof form of the original pair of houses, and would result in the property having an unbalanced appearance within the street scene. The roof form would also draw attention to the large scale of the extension in relation to the host property and, having regard to the proximity of the proposal to the side boundary, would significantly erode the space between the building and the pair of houses at Nos. 5 and 7.
9. The rear gable-ended projection would also relate poorly to the existing hipped roof form of the building as a whole, and the combined height, width and depth of the rear gable-ended projection would also unbalance the rear of the building, assuming an undue visual prominence in comparison to the rear two-storey projection at No.1, which is shallower in depth and has a more subsidiary hipped roof design.
10. As such, the proposal would detract from the appearance of the host property and No.1 when viewed within the context of the pair of properties, and it would have a detrimental impact on the established pattern of housing which characterises the immediate locality.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to several residential developments within the locality of the appeal site. I have not been provided with the precise details or the planning history of those developments, which on the basis of the evidence before me are not directly comparable with the current appeal scheme. In any event, I must determine the appeal having regard to the appeal site circumstances and the merits of the scheme before me.

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies SDP1, SDP7 and SDP9 of the *City of Southampton Local Plan Review (2006) as amended 2015 (Local Plan)*, Policy CS13 of the *Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2010) as amended 2015 (Core Strategy)*, and sections 2.3 and 2.5 of the *Residential Design Guide SPD (2006) (RDG)*. These policies and guidance, amongst other aims, require new development to be of a high-quality design, respect the scale and proportion of existing buildings, take account of the existing character of the surrounding area, and, in the case of residential extensions, be subordinate to the original building and have a roof form and pitch which relates to the original design of the building and existing roof.
13. For similar reasons, the proposal would also be contrary to Policies of the *National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework)* which seek to secure high quality design as set out in Chapter 12.

Living conditions

14. Although the current occupants of 5 Hinkler Road have raised no objection to the appeal scheme, I must consider the impact of the proposal on the living conditions of any future occupants of that property. Due to the combined height, length, front and gable-ended roof form of the proposed two-storey extension, together with its position immediately adjacent to the side boundary of No.5, I find that the proposal would have an unduly oppressive and overbearing impact on the outlook from the neighbouring property and would result in an undue sense of enclosure to the side of that property. In this respect, I note that there are side elevation windows and a rear conservatory at No.5 which have views towards the proposal.
15. I acknowledge that the appellant has amended the proposal from that which was the subject of a previously refused planning application, by positioning the extension further away from the side boundary with No.1. Notwithstanding this, the combined depth, height and massing of the rear projecting element of the proposal, having regard to its position in relation to the side boundary with No.1, is such that it would have an unduly over-dominant impact on the outlook from the rear patio doors of that property and the part of the garden just beyond the rear wall of the house, which given its proximity to the dining room doors could reasonably be considered likely to be a well-used part of the garden.
16. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would result in demonstrable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 and 5 Hinkler Road, with particular reference to outlook. As such, the proposal would not accord with Local Plan Policies SDP1, SDP7 and SDP9, Core Strategy Policy CS13, and section 2.2 of the RDG, in so far as these policies and guidance seek to ensure that new development does not unacceptably affect the amenity of the city and its citizens, and that extensions maintain outlook for neighbours in their homes and private gardens.
17. This is generally consistent with paragraph 127 of the Framework, which seeks to ensure that developments will function well and promote a high standard of amenity, health and well-being for existing and future users.

Other Matter

18. Whilst not referred to in the Council's second reason for refusal, the Delegated Report refers to loss of light to the neighbouring properties at 1 and 5 Hinkler Road. There is no compelling evidence before me to enable me to reach a conclusion on this matter. However, given my findings on the first two main issues, there is no need for me to consider this point further, since it will not alter the appeal decision.

Conclusion

19. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Leonard

INSPECTOR