The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 14 May 2019

by Robert Parker BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 June 2019

Appeal A Ref: APP/Q1255/W/18/3213442
143 Haymoor Road, Poole BH15 3NT

- 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 MHH Poole Ltd against the decision of Poole Council.
- The application Ref APP/18/00204/F, dated 9 February 2018, was refused by notice dated 9 April 2018.
- The development proposed is sever land and erect a three bedroom detached house with parking.

Appeal B Ref: APP/Q1255/W/18/3219094
143 Haymoor Road, Poole BH15 3NT

- 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 MHH Poole Ltd against the decision of Poole Council.
- The application Ref APP/18/01384/F, dated 18 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2018.
- The development proposed is sever land and erect a two bedroom detached house with parking.

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.

2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

3. The above appeals relate to alternative proposals for the same site. The main issue is common to both cases and therefore I shall deal with them together.

4. The Poole Local Plan (PLP) was adopted in November 2018 and the policies contained therein supersede those cited on the decision notice for Appeal A. The parties have been able to comment on the implications of the change in policy for that appeal. They have also been given the opportunity to make representations following revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework which were published after both appeals were submitted.

Main Issue

5. The main issue to consider is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Appeal A

6. The appeal site lies at the end of a row of 3-storey dwellings and forms the side garden to 143 Haymoor Road. This is one of two houses, the other being 187 Haymoor Road, flanking the entrance to a residential cul-de-sac. Both properties are set back from the junction, and this creates a visual linkage between Haymoor Road and the spur containing Nos 145-187. There is a pleasing sense of space which contributes positively to the appearance of the area, albeit I accept that this is not characteristic of the road as a whole.

7. The proposed development would respect the prevailing building line on the main street of Haymoor Road. The design would have a family resemblance to other properties in the row in terms of eaves and ridge height, and the building would have a similar side profile to No 143 which has a narrow gable and flat roof extension at the rear. However, the new dwelling would be significantly closer to the road, its south-eastern corner sitting approximately a metre from the back edge of the pavement.

8. The height and proximity of the building to the road would make it unduly dominant on this prominent corner site. The appellant argues that the scheme would emphasise the distinctive more intimate character of the cul-de-sac behind, but in my opinion it would impinge upon the openness of the junction and create a visual pinch point. The development would appear cramped, the limited width of the dwelling in comparison to No 143 reinforcing this impression.

9. The Council has cited several policies from the PLP, but Policy PP28 is most relevant. This states that residential proposals involving plot severances or plot sub-divisions will only be permitted where there is sufficient land to enable a type, scale and layout of development including parking and usable amenity space to be accommodated in a manner which would preserve or enhance the area's residential character. The constrained nature of the plot means that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the provisions of Policy PP28.

Appeal B

10. This proposal would have the same built footprint as Appeal A, but the new dwelling would be only 2-storey with a deeper main gable. The architectural similarity with No 143 would be sacrificed for a building of reduced height. The mass and bulk of the dwelling would be less in comparison to Appeal A, but the relationship of the building to the boundary of the site would be unaltered.

11. Haymoor Road contains a range of different dwelling types, but the buildings are generally clustered together in groups of similar style. Although broadly in character with 2-storey housing elsewhere in the street, the proposed design would provide a direct contrast with adjacent 3-storey properties, in the context of which it would be viewed. Consequently, it would stand out as a discordant feature in the street scene, appearing as an afterthought which has been shoehorned onto this tight corner plot.

12. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, contrary to PLP Policy PP28.

Other Matters

13. The appellant acknowledges that a financial contribution towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring is necessary to mitigate or avoid the adverse impacts on European protected sites. I am told that this contribution will be secured by Unilateral Undertaking prior to determination of the appeals, but no such planning obligation is before me. However, as I am dismissing the appeals for other reasons the decisions do not turn on this matter.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

Robert Parker

INSPECTOR