The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2017

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/D/17/3172177
15 Bridge Close, Bursledon, Southampton, SO31 8AN.

- 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 Chris Bunce against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
- The application Ref F/17/79921 dated 20 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2017.
- The development proposed is for a replacement rear extension and raise roof to form additional accommodation.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area.

Reasons

3. Bridge Close is characterised by detached bungalows from a limited range of designs. Due to the sloping topography and the different widths of the dwellings their ridge heights vary slightly. Notwithstanding this, their fully hipped designs and consistent roof pitches result in a strong sense of uniformity and rhythm within the street scene.

4. The Appeal dwelling is located in a prominent position within the road adjacent to a bend and set further forward on its plot than the adjoining dwelling at 16 Bridge Close. It is also directly opposite an area of open grassland, which facilitates wider views towards the Appeal site.

5. Together and amongst other things policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2001 – 2011 (Local Plan) and policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2029 (Emerging Local Plan) seek to ensure that proposals take full and proper account of the context of the site, including the character and appearance of the locality. Where possible proposals should enhance the character and appearance of urban areas and should make the most efficient use of land. Consistent with this the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that new development should respond to local character and add to the overall quality of an area.

6. With the proposal the roof of the existing dwelling would be raised 0.9 metres. Whilst in itself this is not a significant increase, the resultant dwelling would be materially taller than the dwelling at No.16. The depth of the resultant roof would be materially deeper than the roofs of the adjacent dwellings and the steeper pitch of the roof would be at odds with other roofs within the road. As a result the proposed roof extension would materially change the overall appearance of the host dwelling. More important, it would be inconsistent and out of keeping with the shallow depth roofs and roof pitches of the adjacent dwellings.

7. The harm that would be caused by the proposal would outweigh the benefits for the Appellant and his family that would result from the proposed additional living space. Such harm could not be dealt with by the imposition of conditions.

8. At the same time the scheme would conflict with the guidance set out in Character Area BHH 21 of the Character Area Appraisals Burlesden, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Amongst other things it seeks to maintain the predominant orientation of ridgelines and the uniformity in building heights within the street.

9. It is acknowledged that the dwelling at 8 Bridge Close has been increased in height. However, as its pitch remained unchanged the slight increase in its height has had a negligible impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Similarly the roof extensions further to the southeast along Bridge Close have not involved any changes to roof pitches and so are not directly comparable to the Appeal scheme. These developments serve to highlight the need to assess each proposal on its individual merits and in light of the prevailing planning policies.

10. I conclude that the proposed extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the street scene and the area. It would therefore conflict with policy 59.BE of the Local Plan, policy DM1 of the Emerging Local Plan, the SPD and the NPPF.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR