



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/23/3320111

13 Satchell Lane, Hamble, Southampton SO31 4HF

- 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 Steve Simpson against the decision of the Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/22/94226, dated 18 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part 2-storey front and rear extensions, removal of existing roof and erection of new loft floor along with internal remodelling and improved parking area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on: -
 - i) the character and appearance of the area, including the setting of the Hamble Conservation Area; and
 - ii) the residential amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties, Nos. 11 and 15, with regard to overbearing impact.

Reasons

3. No.13 is a detached two-storey 1930/40s property located within a row to the west of Satchell Lane. These properties occupy an elevated position, orientated towards the River Hamble with landscaped frontages. The appeal property is sited between two properties of a similar form, although bungalows and the cubic form of those within the Crowsport Estate also form part of the street scene. Due to the curve to the road, the existing property has a relatively prominent position in views along Satchell Lane in both directions and from Marina Drive.
4. The proposals would significantly alter the appearance of the property to a three-storey, white-rendered building in an art deco style. Projecting further forward the horizontal emphasis of the flat roofed structure with various levels would dramatically contrast with the two-storey gabled projections of the interwar properties and the general appearance of the area which primarily comprises red-bricked properties with pitched roofs.

5. The proposal is a high-quality design, and it is evident that it has been progressed and refined in consultation with the case officer. Nonetheless, the form and height of the development together with the materials and ornate features such as the curved copper roof will be notably unique. Together the increased scale, which extends across the full width of the plot, and the individual form would result in a visually dominant building which would draw attention.
6. I acknowledge, as referenced by the appellant, that there are other properties within the row (Nos.3 and 9) which have been reconfigured to have a more contemporary appearance and have successfully assimilated within the street scene. However, they retain a pitched roof form and are very different in design. While I understand the 1930s connection to the design, visually there is a lack of contextual reference. The flat-roofed, white-rendered properties of the Crowsport development which, whilst visible from the appeal site, are part of a planned estate and have a simplicity and limited height compared to the appeal proposal.
7. Overall, I agree with the Council that the extent of the contrasting form and materials together with its scale and forward projection would be an imposing and incongruous development in the street scene. It would be unsympathetic to its context and harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Thus, it would conflict with policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 (EBLP) and Quality Places SPD which together require development to not have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area and take full and proper account of the context, and integrate well in terms of mass, scale, materials, design and siting.

Conservation Area

8. The boundary to the Hamble Conservation Area (HCA) runs along the other side of Satchell Lane and extends to cover several areas of differing architecture and settings, including the quay, the Crowsport Estate and the central area around the High Street and the Square. This stretch of Satchell Lane does link the various parts of the HCA, nevertheless, the distinct areas of the HCA are separated from the appeal site by intervening properties and/or a change in levels.
9. With reference to the Hamble Conservation Area Appraisal the area has accommodated various changes and newer developments, which whilst omitted from the HCA, sit alongside the tight-knit settlement. The Council raise concerns that the development would be seen from the river, although the HCA Appraisal specifically demarks the view from Satchell Lane towards the river as important. Therefore, whilst the proposal will result in an individual and prominent building within its street scene, I am not persuaded that the change would affect the significance of the HCA as a whole and would be harmful to its setting. It would therefore accord with the EBLP Policy DM12 which seeks to ensure that development does not harm or detract from the significance or special interest of the heritage asset.

Neighbours

10. The existing property has a number of single-storey extensions to the rear and the overall depth of the proposal would more or less align with the existing conservatory. The significant part of the rear element would be single-storey

and due to the boundary fencing, landscaping and modest height, it would not be overly imposing. The copper cladding would primarily be to the side elevation sitting adjacent to the side elevation of No.15, which is in part rendered. Therefore, whilst the development would be visible from the neighbours' gardens, I do not find the relationship or materials would result in the development being overbearing.

11. The Council found that the development would not unduly affect light and privacy, and I concur with that assessment. Therefore, while the outlook from the neighbouring properties would change there would be no significant harm to the occupiers' living conditions. As such the proposal would accord with the requirements of EBLP policy DM1 criterion a (i) and the Quality Places SPD in terms of not having an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of new and existing residents.

Other Matters

12. I understand the appellant's frustration that they proactively worked with the pre-application process to establish the design and that new issues were subsequently introduced. Nonetheless, the procedural approach and any inconsistencies are separate matters for the Council. The instruction of ecologists to undertake a bat survey at the appropriate time and the initial assessment suggests that this aspect could be addressed, however, having found against the proposal on the main issue this would not alter my decision.
13. Reference has also been made to permitted development rights, and while I accept that the property could be extended there are no specific details before me and thereby is a matter to which I have given limited weight.

Conclusion

14. I have found that the development would not be harmful to the amenities of the neighbours and would preserve the setting of the HCA, however the scale and design of the proposal would be visually intrusive in the street scene and harmful to the character of the area. I have considered the proposal on its own merits and there are no identified matters which outweigh the harm I have found and the conflict with the Development Plan.
15. For reasons set out the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR