
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2016

by David Walker MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1255/W/16/3154434
52 Rossmore Road, Poole BH12 3NL

- 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 Gardner against the decision of Poole Council.
 - The application Ref APP/16/00310/F, dated 23 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is to erect 6 new semi-detached houses.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an unusually wide plot in a residential street of generally narrow plots. It is located in an area with a range of dwelling designs, including two storey houses, although the properties in the immediate vicinity are all of bungalow design.
 4. The proposal would provide six two storey houses in three semi-detached blocks positioned to maintain existing frontage depths, the original dwelling to be demolished. Although the indicative street scene provided shows the three blocks arranged as to follow the gradient of the street the eaves of the lowest house would be at around the level of the ridge of the adjacent bungalow No 50a.
 5. In the context of much lower height bungalows that surround the appeal site the two storey houses would be unduly tall and be out of character in the streetscene as to appear incongruous. I acknowledge that Nos 54 and 56 on the other side of the appeal site are large dormer-type bungalows with correspondingly higher roof profiles. However, the proposed houses would sit forwards of these such that the full height of the two storey gable end of plot 1 would be plainly visible in this part of the street.
 6. My attention has been brought to other two storey developments at Brixey Close and at 206 Rossmore Road. In relation to these the 8 houses at Brixey Close are lower in height than the house designs proposed, and the terrace at
-

No 206 is positioned among other two storey houses. I do not therefore find parallels between the examples cited and the proposal before me.

7. I am satisfied that the three blocks proposed would maintain the general grain and pattern of development in the area and that the entrance and planting arrangement would avoid a fractured and busy looking frontage. I also acknowledge that the Council has indicated it has no objections to the appearance of the houses and that the scheme has raised no representations from nearby residents.
8. However, the harm I have identified would conflict with the requirements of Policies PCS5 and PCS23 of the Poole Core Strategy 2009 (the Core Strategy) to contribute positively to those attributes of a particular street which distinguish it, including building height, and to respect the setting and character of the site, among other things.
9. The parties disagree over whether or not the Council can identify a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Nonetheless, even if there was not a five-year housing supply and the proposed dwellings were added to this supply, the net contribution that five additional dwellings would make towards addressing an undersupply of housing would have only minimal benefit from a social and economic standpoint.
10. In reaching my findings I have also had regard to the accessible location of the appeal site and the efficient use of land that the proposal would deliver. These are undoubtedly factors weighing in support of the scheme. However, the conflict with the policies of the Core Strategy I have identified indicates that the proposal would not amount to a sustainable with reference to paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
11. Overall, therefore, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and with regard to the development plan read as a whole, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Walker

INSPECTOR