

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2023

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/D/23/3315109
9 Mead Crescent, Southampton, SO18 2JN

- 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 Balbir Bassi against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01270/FUL, dated 12 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as set back link existing rear and side dormer.
-

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 property and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached brick-built dwelling set in a typically suburban residential street. The dominant features on the front elevation of the pair are prominent twin gables, which add visual interest to their external appearance. The appeal property shows signs of some past modifications – in the form of a ground floor side extension and a side dormer structure. A rear dormer has also been inserted.
4. The appellant proposes to link the existing side and rear dormers. In effect, it would comprise a wrap-around roof extension providing more internal accommodation at a high level. I understand that an additional front dormer has been permitted, but that this is yet to be built.
5. The appellant says that the '*front view of the house remains unchanged*'. That may be so in two dimensions, but the existing side dormer is clearly visible when approaching along the street from the south-east, as would the proposed wrap-around link. To my mind the wrap-around structure, when added to the dormers, would make the enlarged structure appear conspicuously bulky and ugly when viewed from the street, accentuating the already imbalanced appearance of the property in relation to its adjoining partner.
6. I share the appellant's view that judgments of this nature are essentially subjective in nature but, to my mind, the proposal, were it built, by reason of its poor design would prove harmful to local visual amenity. The Government attaches considerable importance to design, and the *National Planning Policy*

Framework advises that '*development that is not well designed should be refused*'. I propose to follow that guidance here.

7. In conclusion, I find that the design of the proposal to be unacceptable, and that the development, if built, would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. Accordingly, a clear conflict arises with those provisions of policies SDP7 & SDP9 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review, and CS13 of the Southampton City Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy directed to achieving high quality design and preventing development which would cause material harm.

Other matters

8. All other matters referred to in the representations have been taken into account, but no other matter is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR