



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025

by **C Coles MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 JUNE 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/W/25/3360344

6 Skintle Green, Colden Common, Hampshire SO21 1UB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Adam Hill against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 22/00683/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of a detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Adam Hill against Winchester City Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area having regard to protected trees and parking.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is the side garden of 6 Skintle Green (No 6), a detached, two-storey dwelling located on a corner plot at the end of a cul-de-sac on a residential estate of similar style and size of dwelling. A row of trees subject to Tree Preservation Order (TPO) sit along the boundary with the public footpath to the east of the site which form a dominant feature within the area and the site in particular. The street scene is characterised by open space to the front of dwellings which is accessed by a pedestrian pathway with roadways and parking to the rear.
5. The proposed development is a three-storey, gable ended, detached dwelling of contemporary design and materials to be located within the side garden of No 6. The existing garage for the host dwelling would be reallocated for the proposed dwelling and new parking would be provided for the host dwelling in the rear garden to No 6.
6. The appellant contends the height of the proposal would sit just above that of the host dwelling and would form a bookend to the cul de sac, back clothed against the mature trees. However, the height of the proposal (approximately 1.65m above the surrounding development) would give the dwelling a prominent appearance when viewed on the approach, would appear at odds with the existing street scene

of two-storey dwellings and draw attention to the development where you are not expecting to find any. The appellant has highlighted properties within 500 metres of the proposal which are three-storey, however, these dwellings are predominantly three-storey by virtue of converting existing roof space, therefore they do not have the same height difference with the surrounding properties as the proposal.

7. To avoid impact on the protected trees the proposed dwelling would be positioned close to No 6 leaving limited space between the two buildings. This would make the proposal appear cramped and overdeveloped. Whilst the stepped nature of the proposal would allow greater separation between the dwellings at first floor level and above, this would not overcome the cramped site layout.
8. The proposed dwelling would also be close to the footpath to the east (Right of Way, Colden Common 11) which the appellant contends would be well screened by the TPO trees and boundary planting. Although the TPO trees would remain, much of the mature vegetation that currently provides effective screening would be lost to make way for the proposal which would draw attention to the development from the footpath. The appellant has provided examples of where residential development is close to the footpath, however, the combination of the loss of some of the mature vegetation, the height of the development and the proximity of the proposal to the footpath would result in the site having a cramped and overbearing appearance when viewed from the footpath.
9. It is acknowledged that the proposed outdoor amenity space for both the host dwelling and the proposal would be acceptable in terms of overall size, however, the proximity of the trees and their canopies to the proposal would make the amenity space for the development feel dark and oppressive. Whilst the development may not directly impact the protected trees to the extent they would need to be removed, the proximity of the proposal to the trees is likely to lead to pressure for pruning to allow light into the development and specifically the external amenity space which could also have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.
10. Furthermore, the proposal provides three parking spaces for the proposed development, two in the existing garage and one to the front of the garage and three parking spaces retained in the realigned rear garden for the existing dwelling. These parking spaces would share a turning and circulation space and an access driveway which is only wide enough for one vehicle to pass through at a time. So many vehicles parked in the identified space would further erode the feeling of space around the properties which would exacerbate the overall cramped appearance I have identified above.
11. In conclusion, for the reasons identified above the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy CP13 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 (March 2013) (LP Part 1) and Policies DM15 and DM16 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 (April 2017) (LP Part 2) and the Colden Common Village Design Statement 2021 (Adopted 2022) (CCVDS). These policies seek to ensure among other things, that development respects and responds positively to the qualities, features and characteristics of the local area.

Other Matters

12. The proposed biodiversity enhancements, energy efficiency and sourcing of local timber for the proposed dwelling, and personal circumstances of the appellant are noted, however these are not considered sufficient to overcome the harm caused by the proposed development.
13. I acknowledge Hampshire County Council Highway Authority (HCC HA) have raised no objection to the proposal. However, this carries neutral weight in the balance. None of these other matters are sufficient to overcome the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

14. The proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area for the reasons identified above. This would bring the scheme into conflict with the development plan as a whole. I have given significant weight to the benefits of delivering an energy efficient new home in a location with good access to shops and services, and modest weight to the economic benefits during construction and thereafter through additional spending in local businesses. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified. As such, material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Coles

INSPECTOR