
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2017

by R J Jackson BA MPhil DMS MRTPI MCMi

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

Decision date: 04 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1255/D/17/3179540
99 Lulworth Avenue, Poole BH15 4DH

- 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 & Mrs Jenkins against the decision of Poole Council.
 - The application Ref APP/17/00567/F, dated 26 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is front, rear & first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Lulworth Avenue is a straight residential road. Towards the eastern end of the road, where the appeal site is located, properties are only located on the northern side as there is a public park going down to the harbour opposite. The vast majority of the properties are detached, but there is a mixture of building forms with bungalows, bungalows with rooms in the roofs, chalet bungalows and two-storey dwellings all found locally. Particularly at the eastern end of Lulworth Avenue a number of the properties have clearly been the subject of recent development works as a number are completed in a contemporary style, including with balconies at first floor level.
4. The appeal property and its neighbour, No 97, are a pair of detached bungalows with rooms in the roof being 'hands' of each other with projecting single storey gables on each property away from the joint boundary. The properties are close to one another with the gap between them being smaller than others along Lulworth Avenue.
5. The proposal would involve substantial re-working of the building to convert it into a two storey dwelling with a balcony across the front elevation and a single storey rear extension. Drawings and visualisations submitted show the building would be in a contemporary style in keeping with others in the area. While it would have a low pitch to the roof, this would be in keeping with the architectural style chosen. As paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) makes clear planning decisions should not

attempt to impose architectural styles to require certain development forms or styles.

6. The overall height of the building, while taller than those on either side, would not be of greater height than others towards the eastern end of Lulworth Avenue within the vicinity of the appeal site. Overall the architectural treatment would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and, of itself, would not appear overly large or unduly dominant.
7. However, as noted above the gap with No 97 is narrow with it being visually reduced at roof level by the eaves overhangs. The eaves of the proposed property would be only a short distance below the ridge of No 97 and the proposal would have the effect of apparently reducing this gap further. This would lead to the resultant development, through its increased height, appearing cramped in the street scene, with this being emphasised by the proposed gable element on the western side of the property adjacent to No 97.
8. Although this gap is already smaller than others in the area, this apparent closing of the gap further between properties would be harmfully out of keeping with the generally spacious character and appearance of the area, and would not respect the setting of No 97.
9. Consequently the proposal would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy PCS23 of the Poole Core Strategy (2009) in that it would not respect the setting and character of adjoining buildings by virtue of its scale and siting. It would also be contrary to paragraph 64 of the Framework in that it would not improve the character and quality of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

RJ Jackson

INSPECTOR