



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 May 2008

by **G M Hollington MA, BPhil, MRTPI**

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
10 June 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/A/08/2062527

4 Canada Road, Woolston, Southampton, Hampshire, SO19 9DR

- 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 HGS Developments Ltd against the decision of Southampton City Council.
- The application Ref. 07/00535/FUL, dated 13 April 2007, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2007.
- The development proposed is extension and conversion of 3-bedroom house to form 4 1-bedroom flats (resubmission following withdrawal of previous application Ref. 07/00263).

Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for extension and conversion of 3-bedroom house to form 4 1-bedroom flats (resubmission following withdrawal of previous application Ref. 07/00263) at 4 Canada Road, Woolston, Southampton, Hampshire, SO19 9DR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 07/00535/FUL, dated 13 April 2007, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) Bin storage shall be laid out with a level approach prior to the first occupation of the flats hereby permitted and shall be kept available at all times. The facilities shall include accommodation for the separation of waste to enable recycling.
 - 4) No development shall take place until details of the external appearance of the bike shed have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 5) Cycle storage shall be laid out with a level approach and Sheffield-style stands prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted. The cycle storage shall be kept available for this purpose at all times.
 - 6) The garden area shown on the approved plan and the pedestrian access to it shall be made available as a communal area prior to the first

occupation of the flats hereby permitted and shall be kept available as a communal area at all times.

- 7) In connection with the implementation of this permission, no demolition, conversion and construction works, including the delivery of materials to the site, shall take place outside the following hours: 0800-1800, Mondays-Fridays; 0900-1300, Saturdays; and not at all on Sundays or Public Holidays. Any works outside the permitted hours shall be confined to the internal preparation of the building without audible noise from outside the building.
- 8) The car parking area hereby permitted shall be laid out and surfaced prior to the first occupation of the flats hereby permitted and shall be kept available for the parking of cars at all times.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue in this appeal to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is in a predominantly residential area comprising a mix of mostly semi-detached and detached houses of varying ages and designs. 2/4 and 6/8 Canada Road have relatively large gaps to either side and both nos. 2 and 4 have been extended to the rear, including a lean-to single storey building at no. 2 and, formerly, a car port at no. 4.
4. The proposed development would extend rearwards from no. 4, stepping down slightly in height. Its footprint and plot coverage would be similar to those of the previous buildings but its bulk would be greater, with 2 floors of accommodation under pitched roofs.
5. Nevertheless, the scale of the building, its juxtaposition with the rear extension at no. 2 and the remaining gap to the boundary with no. 6 would not result in the development being seen as overdevelopment or out of keeping with its surroundings. Some other dwellings, notably no. 14, have also been extended substantially to the rear.
6. Furthermore, the Council has subsequently permitted a very similar scheme (Ref. 07/01059/FUL) for 3 flats, the main external differences being the stepping down of the rear part of the extension to give only a single storey of accommodation at the rear, and the use of hipped rather than gable ended roofs. The differences between the 2 schemes are not sufficient, in my view, to have any materially different effects on the wider area.
7. The Council is concerned that a building akin to a residential mews terrace would not respect the character of the street, and I acknowledge there is no similar form of development nearby. In addition, the space between nos. 4 and 6 would allow views to the extension and appreciation of its size and depth. However, the permitted scheme would also have the appearance of a mews terrace, with the same number of entrance doors, and I consider the effect of the appeal proposal on the character of the street would be little different; neither scheme would impinge directly on the street scene itself.

8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would not conflict with the aims of policies SDP 1, SDP 7, and SDP 9 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review or of the Residential Design Guide.
9. I have also taken into account all the other matters raised in the written representations, including local residents' concerns about car parking and traffic, but the number of parking spaces would accord with the Council's standards and I note the highway authority has no objection (subject to imposing certain conditions). None of the other matters is of such significance as to outweigh the considerations which have led to my conclusion on the main issue.
10. I have considered the need for conditions in the light of the advice in Circular 11/95: *The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions*. Because of the similarity with the permitted scheme, I consider it appropriate to apply the conditions attached to permission Ref. 07/1059/FUL but with some minor re-wording for clarification and to reflect Circular advice, while not altering their aims, and with 2 other changes.
11. I consider it unnecessary to impose a condition referring specifically to the application drawings. On the other hand, no details of the appearance of the bike shed have been provided and, in the interests of the area's character and appearance, it is necessary to obtain these.

G M Hollington

INSPECTOR