

Revised Application at 16 St George's Avenue

OBJECTION LETTER - APP/25/00580

Date: 19 September 2025

Dear Mr Hawkey,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] We write to submit an updated objection to the revised planning application at 16 St George's Avenue, specifically concerning the proposed detached outbuilding described as a "music room."

We acknowledge and appreciate that the applicant has revised the position of the building [REDACTED] This is a welcome amendment. However, we must emphasise that the proposed structure remains fundamentally harmful to [REDACTED] residential amenity, and the minor repositioning of approximately 200–300mm does not overcome the key issues raised in our earlier objection.

We continue to support the proposed first-floor infill extension, which appears modest and in keeping with the neighbouring context. Our objection applies solely to the outbuilding.

1. Overshadowing and Visual Intrusion Remain Unacceptable

The revised siting does not materially reduce the dominance, massing, or visual intrusion of the proposed structure, which remains an 8.09m long, 2.5m high wall on the boundary, rising to a 3.83m ridge height. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

This impact is compounded by the building's hard and monolithic form, replacing what is currently a green and open outlook with a solid wall. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] remains material and harmful, in breach of Core Strategy Policy CS16(e), which seeks to protect neighbouring amenity from overbearing development and loss of outlook.

2. Noise Disturbance: No Safeguards Proposed

The building is still proposed as a music room, with no acoustic mitigation, usage limitations, or management plan. [REDACTED]

This risk remains incompatible with both Policy CS16(e) and Paragraph 198(a) of the NPPF (December 2024), which advises that planning decisions should 'mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life.'

3. Proximity to Mature Boundary Tree – Risk Remains

Although the structure has been marginally repositioned, the proposed foundations will still be located within 200–450mm of the trunk of a mature tree depending on whether they are central under the wall or offset. This is well within the 'structural root zone' defined by BS 5837:2012, where any excavation poses a high risk of irreversible damage or destabilisation.

Based on the submitted plans and tree dimensions, the development would still encroach upon approximately 40% of the Root Protection Area (RPA). This is a substantial incursion, particularly in the context of a long-established tree offering demonstrable amenity, privacy, and biodiversity value.

The risk to this tree remains both significant and avoidable. No arboricultural assessment, mitigation strategy, or justification for the chosen siting has been provided. The continued proximity and excavation works are therefore incompatible with Policy CS13 (Green Infrastructure), which requires that development must not undermine the functional integrity of green infrastructure — including private garden trees, as confirmed in paragraph 7.22 of the Core Strategy.

4. Misleading Drawings Remain Uncorrected

We reiterate our concern that the submitted elevation drawings continue to misrepresent the relationship between the proposed outbuilding and the main house. Based on our site measurements, the visual impact has been understated and remains materially misleading. This lack of accurate information undermines the ability of decision-makers and neighbours to properly assess the proposal.

Conclusion

We acknowledge that the applicant has made a minor adjustment in response to concerns regarding rainwater overhang, and we appreciate that this aspect has been resolved. However, the overall design, scale, proximity, and function of the proposed outbuilding continue to result in an unacceptable level of harm to residential amenity.

The revisions do not address:

- The dominant and overbearing impact of the structure [REDACTED]
- The uncontrolled potential for noise disturbance;
- The risk to a mature tree and local biodiversity;
- The ongoing inaccuracy and lack of transparency in the submitted elevations.

As such, we respectfully maintain our objection and request that this element of the proposal be refused in line with Core Strategy Policies CS16 and CS13, and Paragraph 198(a) of the NPPF.

