



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 September 2023

by K Reeves BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/D/23/3323695

59 Shanklin Road, Southampton, City of Southampton SO15 7RG

- 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 Harry Lovejoy against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00194/FUL, dated 14 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension with hip to gable roof alterations, installation of skylights and a flat roof dormer on rear elevation.
-

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 building and the area.

Reasons

3. 59 Shanklin Road is a detached two storey dwelling set within a residential street in Southampton. The residential properties either side of the site are semi-detached dwellings, although there are examples of other detached dwellings along the street. A prevailing feature of the built form on Shanklin Road is hipped roofs with characterful brick chimneys.
4. The removal of the two chimneys from the dwelling and the alteration of that side of the roof from a hip to gable would result in the dwelling having an asymmetric roof form that would be incongruent with the character of the dwelling and overtly out of keeping and jarring amongst the consistent character of buildings on this part of the street.
5. Regarding the proposed dormer, I could not see other examples of this type of roof structure on the rear roofs of the nearest neighbouring dwellings on this side of Shanklin Road. The large new flat roof dormer would be a dominant and bulky addition to the rear roof slope, out of keeping with the dwelling and its surroundings.
6. The side extension would be subservient in form to the host building. Moreover, it would retain the characteristic hip on that side of the roof and given that the gaps between dwellings on this side of the road are variable, the push out of the new side wall towards the boundary line would not cause a cramped appearance or a terracing effect.

7. Having regard to the above, although I have found the side extension acceptable, the new gable end and the rear dormer would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the building and the area. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policies SDP1, SDP7 and SDP9 of the City of Southampton Local Plan (Revised 2015) and Policy CS13 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document Amended Version incorporating the Core Strategy Partial Review March 2015, which collectively seek, in part, to avoid harm to the visual amenity, character and appearance of an area through the use of appropriate scale, massing, design and materials.
8. Additionally, the proposal would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which seeks, amongst other things, for development to be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

9. I note that the appellant has referred to an extant planning permission (reference 22/00920/PLDC), which they state was for a single storey side extension, two side facing dormers and a hip-to-gable roof extension to the rear to facilitate a loft conversion. However, I have been furnished with minimal information on this permission and it is therefore afforded limited weight in the determination of this appeal.
10. Reference has also been made by the appellant to other house extensions that have taken place in the surrounding area, including hip-to-gable alterations. However, they are in other locational contexts. Moreover, such examples are not common, and they do not define the character and appearance of the area around the appeal site. I therefore give the other developments referred to limited weight and, in any event, I need to consider the case on its own merits.
11. I am aware that a Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) has been granted that established that certain alterations to the property, including to the roof, would be permitted development. However, I do not have the plans of that scheme and so I cannot make any meaningful comparisons between the LDC and the appeal schemes. As such, I give the potential fallback position little weight.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having regard to other matters raised, the proposal conflicts with the adopted development plan, when taken as a whole, and the Framework. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Reeves

INSPECTOR