

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2023

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C1760/D/22/3307618

46 Viney Avenue, Romsey, Hampshire SO51 7NQ

- 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 Lucee Sillence against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02031/FULLS, dated 6 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is for a loft conversion with creation of rear and front dormer and internal alterations at first floor level and removal of existing chimney.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Subsequent to the refusal of planning permission, the subject of this appeal, the Council issued a Certificate of Lawfulness for a Proposed Development comprising the erection of a dormer window on the rear elevation of 46 Viney Avenue (Ref. 22/02443/CLPS), which would facilitate the creation of an additional bedroom without the need for an application for planning permission. I give this significant weight as a material planning consideration and one which would outweigh the second element of the Council's reasons for refusal with regard to the provision of additional car parking. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue therefore is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached house located within a residential estate of two storey dwellings of similar designs albeit some are within terraces.
5. I note the appellant's reference to a dormer window being permitted to the front elevation of another dwelling within the same Ward as the appeal site, however I have been given little detail on this and ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits.

6. I noted on my site visit that the immediate vicinity comprises front roof slopes which are unaltered and the proposed dormer would be quite a substantial addition to the principal elevation of the host dwelling.
7. I consider that notwithstanding the set-down from the ridge and the distance between the side of the roof and the eaves line, it would amount to an uncharacteristic feature that would appear incongruous within the street scene.
8. Whilst I accept that the proposal is not located within a designated Conservation Area nonetheless the National Planning Policy Framework places great emphasis upon high quality design. There may be a number of anomalies to front elevations, but nonetheless those examples at nos 58 and 60, and 64 Viney Avenue are materially different to the appeal proposal before me.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would result in an unduly prominent and visually intrusive roof alteration that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy E1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) which stipulates that development will be permitted if it is of a high quality in terms of design and local distinctiveness and, amongst other things, should integrate, respect and complement the character of the area in which the development is located.

Conclusion

10. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR