



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 29 June 2021

by Mr James Blackwell LLB (Hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/21/3271252

47 Park Road, Chandler's Ford, Southampton SO53 2ET

- 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 L Mielczarek against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/21/89622, dated 13 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion and raising of rear eaves and ridge. Dormers to front and rear.
-

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 appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with a flat roofed extension at the rear. It sits within a substantial plot which is set back from the road, and benefits from a driveway and large garden to its front. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature.
4. Whilst the surrounding area does include a variety of house types, on the eastern side of Park Road between the junctions to Parkway Gardens and Kings Road (where the appeal property is situated), the dwellings are all single storey bungalows. Due to the flat topography of the road, this means they share a consistent roof line. These dwellings also each incorporate a hipped roof, which means their roofs are very similar in terms of style and design. These shared features create a strong degree of uniformity between these dwellings, which contributes very positively to this particular section of the street scene.
5. The proposed development would reconfigure the existing roof to incorporate a second storey, which would raise the roof height by approximately 1m. The additional height would be prominent, as it would sit higher than the roofs of the neighbouring properties on either side of the appeal property. This would interrupt the uniform roof line which is currently shared between these dwellings, which would be harmful to the street scene.
6. The development would also change the style of the roof from a hipped roof to a gable ended roof which incorporates a half hip (on the part of dwelling which projects forward). The design incorporates two flat roofed dormer windows at

the front, which would also be a unique feature along this section of Park Road. These changes in design would jar with the pattern of unaltered hipped roofs which characterise this side of the road, which in turn would detract from the symmetry between properties. Once again, this loss of symmetry would harm this aspect of the street scene.

7. As the appellant has highlighted, the proposal is comparable to loft conversions at several nearby properties, including conversions at Nos 30 and 51 Park Road and 28 Parkway Gardens. However, these properties are sited in locations where there is much less uniformity between the neighbouring properties, and most notably, they sit next to or very near to taller properties which have 2 storeys. This means the loft conversions could be accommodated in these instances without harming any established roof line. Unlike the examples provided, due to the siting of the appeal property on the eastern side of Park Road where there is such strong uniformity between the dwellings, the changes to its height and design would jar with the appearance of its neighbouring properties, and would therefore fail to integrate properly with the street scene.
8. Notwithstanding the above, when considered in isolation I agree with the appellant that the loft conversion would not harm the appearance of the appeal dwelling itself. The changes would be a proportionate addition to the existing property, which have been sympathetically designed to ensure the bulk of the new space sits within the pitch of the roof. The addition of the barn hips at either end of the roof helps reduce the visual impact of the additional height. The dormers at the front are modest in size and generally complement the roof design. Similarly, the larger rear dormer sits sufficiently below the ridge of the roof and far enough away from its edges, to ensure it does not appear overly bulky or dominant. However, this is not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have found in respect of the effect on the street scene.
9. For these reasons, the development would harm the character and appearance of the area, and would therefore conflict with Policy 59.BE of the Council's Local Plan¹ and Policy DM1 of the emerging Eastleigh Local Plan², both of which require new development to take full and proper account of the context of its site, to ensure it integrates well with its surroundings in terms of mass, scale, materials and siting. The proposed development would also conflict with the design guidelines set out in the Council's Quality Places SPD³ (SPD) which are explicit that in streets with a uniform roof design, significant alterations should be avoided. The SPD is also clear that rooflines should complement surrounding development. Finally, the development would conflict with the overarching design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to ensure new development integrates properly with its surroundings.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

James Blackwell

INSPECTOR

¹ Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review, 2001 – 2011 (2006)

² Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016 – 2036 (2018)

³ Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document (2011)