



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2017

by Robert Parker BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17th November 2017.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1255/D/17/3180270

4 Ledgard Close, Parkstone, Poole, Dorset BH14 0HG

- 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 Dean Parram against the decision of Poole Council.
 - The application Ref APP/17/00266/F, dated 23 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is: (i) Removal of existing conservatory and erect two storey extension with attached garage; and (ii) Removal of existing pitched roof to allow for new second floor accommodation with terrace and flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
 - a) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - b) whether the proposed development would have an acceptable relationship with the houses which are under construction immediately to the west of the appeal site, with particular reference to the living conditions of future occupiers of those properties.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Ledgard Close is an unmade track leading off Bournemouth Road on its south side. The cul-de-sac contains a handful of dwellings in a blend of styles, within a pleasant sylvan environment. At the time of my visit building work was well advanced on a scheme of housing on the former site of 5 Ledgard Close. The new properties display an overtly contemporary design with several different roof forms in evidence.
4. No 4 Ledgard Close is more conventional in comparison. This two-storey, brick and tile house is screened by vegetation on the approach from Bournemouth Road, but there are clear views of the property from its driveway entrance and above boundary hedging along the southern boundary, where Ledgard Close climbs towards Inverclyde Road. The dwelling is prominent from the adjacent construction site.

5. The proposal is to erect a sizeable extension on the front elevation of No 4 and an additional storey of accommodation beneath a new mono-pitch roof. The resultant building would be substantially taller and bulkier than the original hipped roof property, making it dominant in localised views. Furthermore, the large expanses of unrelieved wall and juxtaposition of old and new fenestration would make the development incongruous and visually unattractive.
6. There is nothing fundamentally wrong in seeking to remodel the existing dwelling, given its rather plain appearance and the mix of architecture in the vicinity. However, the appeal proposal would create a building of excessive scale and poor design. Accordingly, I conclude that it would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area by failing to demonstrate the high standard of design sought by Policy PCS23 of the Poole Core Strategy (2009).

Living conditions

7. The proposed development would incorporate a roof terrace at second floor on the western side of the building. This would be surrounded by a low balustrade which would provide users with direct and uninterrupted views towards the four dwellings which are presently under construction to the west of the site. I am told that the terrace would be approximately 10 metres away from kitchen and bedroom windows in those properties. This close proximity would be intrusive for future residents and it would result in unacceptable overlooking.
8. The Council raises additional concerns regarding noise from use of the terrace. The terrace would be unusually large, making it attractive as an entertaining space. Given the proximity of the appeal property to those adjoining, there is a reasonable probability that social gatherings would disturb neighbours. This further weighs against the scheme.
9. I therefore conclude that the physical relationship of the proposed development with adjacent houses would lead to poor levels of privacy and potential noise nuisance. The proposal would thus conflict with Policy DM1 of the Poole Site Specific Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012) insofar as it requires development to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

10. The appellant argues that the proposal is necessary to regain the privacy that will be lost as a result of the occupation of the neighbouring residential scheme. Whilst I appreciate that these are genuine motives, any benefits in terms of providing more secluded amenity space would be outweighed by the significant harm arising from the design of the scheme, as identified above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Parker

INSPECTOR