



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 10 November 2021

by A Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C1760/D/21/3278066

27 Minchin Road, ROMSEY, SO51 0BL

- 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 Ross Snow against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01045/FULLS, dated 8 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey small extension to the side of the property to extend the kitchen and the master bedroom. Also change of the front access porch from a flat GRP porch with surround to a pitched, slate tiled porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted insofar as it relates to change of the front access porch from a flat GRP porch with surround to a pitched, slate tiled porch, at 27 Minchin Road, Romsey, SO51 0BL, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01045/FULLS, dated 8 April 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans insofar as they relate to the pitched roof to porch only: HM Land Registry Current Title Plan Title Number HP800626, Block Plan 00624058-EAB28C, Minchin-00 and Minchin-001.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located in a prominent roadside position within a modern housing development. There are a variety of building styles and forms throughout the development and the dwellings to either side of the appeal property are different in terms of materials and scale. Nevertheless, an overall consistency is achieved through simple building forms, similar roof pitches, well composed fenestrations with strong symmetry, and a consistent material palette.

4. The proposed extension would sit alongside the existing property in a prominent roadside position. It would utilise matching materials. Its roof would sit well below the roof of the existing property. In terms of position and the general scale of the proposal I am satisfied that it would be subservient to the host dwelling and would appear as a clear addition to one side of its symmetrical front façade.
5. At its outer edge it would adopt a half octagonal footprint which would give it a complicated form. The proposed roof would comprise lots of small roof planes, following the extension's footprint. As a consequence, the overall form of the extension would draw the eye and represent an uncomfortable contrast to the much simpler form of the existing building and buildings in the area.
6. This problematic form would be exacerbated by the blank first floor façade, which would be at odds with the conventional façade treatment of buildings in the area with openings spaced consistently across elevations.
7. In summary, the proposal, insofar as it relates to the two storey extension, would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would not accord with Policy E1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan DPD Adopted Local Plan 2011-2029 and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which together seek to ensure that development proposals are designed to integrate, respect, compliment and be sympathetic to local character.
8. The proposal is also for the erection of a porch canopy over the front door. The Council does not object to this element. The porch canopy would be well designed and would respond well to the strong symmetry of the building's front façade. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal, insofar as it relates to the porch, would not harm the character or appearance of the area, and would accord with the Policy and Framework paragraph referred to above.

Conditions

9. I have had regard to the planning conditions suggested by the Council and the appellant insofar as they relate to the porch. I have considered the conditions against the tests in the Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition to ensure that matching materials are used to safeguard the character of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the porch. However, in relation to the two storey side extension it should be dismissed. These elements of the proposal are both physically and functionally severable. I therefore consider a split decision to be a logical outcome.

A Tucker

INSPECTOR