



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2021

By Andrew Bremford BSc (Hons) MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C1760/D/20/3263997

1 The Green, Romsey SO51 7UA

- 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 Mrs Amy Taylor against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01315/FULLS, dated 17 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon (i) the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) a protected tree.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace two storey dwelling, located at the junction of Short Hill and The Green. It is typical of the development in the surrounding area, the streetscene of which is characterised by predominantly uniformly designed detached, semi-detached and terraced rows of two storey properties. When viewed from the street, as a result of their prevailing scale and overall design, the terraced row of properties, in common with most other buildings in the surrounding area, appear symmetrical and visually balanced. Some properties in the area are set within plots with open grassed frontages whilst others are bounded by hedges and other foliage and there are scattered trees in the area. The appeal property, by virtue of its uniform design and visually balanced appearance, in combination with the low vegetation and grassed area adjacent to its front and side elevations and the mature silver birch tree positioned within its open frontage, positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
4. It is acknowledged that the appeal site is not located within a Conservation Area. However, by virtue of the modest size of the two storey element of the proposed side extension, the development would not integrate well with the host building. The roof ridge height would be set well below that of the existing building and it is this significant step down in height, together with the overall small size of the two storey element of the development, that would result in the proposal appearing as an incongruous addition to the host building. Although the proposed development would be constructed using

matching materials, it would nevertheless visually unbalance the existing symmetrical appearance of the terrace, appearing as an awkward and conspicuous disproportionately small appendage to the end of the terraced row of dwellings. The adverse visual impact of the development would be exacerbated due to the fact that it would be in a prominent location within the streetscene, very readily visible in views from the public domain, especially from the entrance to Short Hill from Hunters Crescent and from Short Hill in the vicinity of the junction with The Green.

5. Overall, for the above reasons, the design of the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy E1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan DPD 2016 (LP) which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure development is of a high quality in terms of design and local distinctiveness by integrating, respecting and complementing the character of the area in which the development is located.

Protected tree

6. The proposed development would be located in the vicinity of the mature silver birch tree which is protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) ref: TVBC.935(2006). The tree appears in good condition and as a result of its location and size has good public amenity value. The appellant points out that she amended the design of the proposal to take account of the position of the tree and to avoid its roots. I note that the appeal statement includes details of the first design which shows the proposed side extension positioned closer to the tree than the final refused scheme. Moreover, the appellant states that the final scheme reflects the advice received in her tree report. However, I have not been presented with a copy of the tree report. Thus, there is no evidence before me to demonstrate that the proposed works would not cause damage to the roots of the tree, which could adversely affect its health, potentially leading to its loss. Furthermore, the tree is significantly taller than the host building. Owing to its size and proximity to the proposal, there would be future pressure to heavily prune, or fell the tree, due to the light that it would block to the windows within the front elevation of the proposed development.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not harm a tree protected by a TPO. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policy E2 of the LP which seeks to protect, conserve and enhance the landscape of the Borough by, amongst other things, ensuring that development does not result in the loss of important local features such as trees.

Other Matters

8. The appellant states that the proposal would not have an impact upon neighbouring properties in terms of loss of daylight or outlook. However, these are not matters in dispute and thus they do not alter or outweigh my overall conclusions on the main issues.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Bremford INSPECTOR