



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 13 September 2021

by James Blackwell LLB (Hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/21/3277885

12 Telegraph Road, West End, Southampton SO30 3EJ

- 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 James Rands against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/21/90193, dated 25 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with a side facing dormer and raising of roof by 1200mm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since determination of the planning application, the 2019 iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) has been superseded by the July 2021 version. Both parties have had the opportunity to comment on the changes. I have therefore determined this appeal with regard to the current version.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of nos. 10 and 14 Telegraph Road.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a detached 2-storey dwelling, situated on the western side of Telegraph Road. The road is predominantly residential in nature, and comprises a mixture of house types which are varied in terms of size, width and architectural style.
5. If approaching from the south, Telegraph Road follows a downward slope. Given the properties closest to the appeal dwelling are broadly consistent in height, this means they generally achieve a coherent roof topography which

follows the downwards gradient of the road. This consistent roof topography contributes positively to the street scene.

6. The proposed development would raise the roof height of the appeal dwelling by approximately 1200mm, in order to accommodate an additional storey. The additional height would mean the ridge height of the appeal dwelling would be comparable to no. 14, if not taller, which would significantly disrupt the stepped roof topography between the dwellings along this side of the road. As a result, the loft conversion would appear very prominent in the street scene, jarring with the coherent roof line shared between its closest neighbouring properties.
7. Similarly, the additional height means that the appeal property would sit substantially taller than no. 10 to the north. Given the appeal dwelling is already positioned higher than no. 10 (on account of the gradient of the road), the additional height would create a noticeable disparity in height between the two properties. As a result, no. 10 would appear dwarfed by the appeal dwelling, which would again be harmful to the street scene.
8. For these reasons, the development would harm the character and appearance of the area, and would conflict with Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001 – 2011) (adopted 2006) and Policy DM1 of the emerging Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016 – 2036). These policies require new development to take proper account of the site context, including the character and appearance of the locality, and to be appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout and siting, both in themselves and in relation to adjoining buildings.

Living Conditions

9. Given the sloping gradient of Telegraph Road, the appeal dwelling already sits higher than no. 10 to the north, which means there is already a degree of overshadowing between the sides of the two properties. On the basis that no. 10 is also stepped back from the appeal dwelling, the additional height arising from the proposed extension is unlikely to make any noticeable difference to the levels of overshadowing already experienced.
10. In terms of no. 14, the few windows on the flank wall which do face out on to the appeal property are very narrow. Given the proximity of these windows to the appeal dwelling, they are already overshadowed. Whilst it's possible that the increased height of the proposed extension could lead to some minor impact on the daylight experienced at these windows, given their existing limitations, I do not consider that this impact would be meaningful. Similarly, on the basis that there are very few windows along this flank wall of no. 14, there are unlikely to be any particular issues regarding overlooking or loss of privacy.
11. As a result, I am satisfied that the development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of nos. 10 and 14. In this respect, the development would be consistent with Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001 – 2011) (adopted 2006) and Policy DM1 of the emerging Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016 – 2036), which seek to ensure new development does not unduly interfere with neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking, loss of outlook or loss of daylight.

Other Matters

12. Given the varied character of house types along Telegraph Road, I do not consider that the addition of a side dormer would appear incongruous with neighbouring properties, as there is no particular consistency in roof type or design. Similarly, given the relatively modest changes to the design of the appeal property, I do not consider that the proposed development would harm the appearance of the appeal dwelling itself. Nonetheless, these are neutral factors and would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area as identified above.

Conclusion

13. Whilst I have sided with the appellant with regard to the second main issue, this would not outweigh the harm that the development would cause to the character and appearance of the wider area. For the reasons given above, and having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal should be dismissed.

James Blackwell

INSPECTOR