



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2019

by Thomas Bristow BA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/19/3235991

2 Langdon Road, Poole BH14 9EH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Walsh against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref APP/19/00749/F, dated 11 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. On 1 April 2019 the former Councils of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole combined to form a single Authority. Nevertheless, until superseded, the existing development plan documents of former Councils remain extant. Each proposal must be determined on its merits in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance the development plan includes policies of the Poole Local Plan (adopted 13 November 2018, the 'LP'). I have also had regard to various other material considerations including the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') and Planning Practice Guidance ('PPG').

Main issue

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

Reasons

4. No 2 is now a three-storey property, appearing inter-war in origin as with many nearby. It occupies a corner plot of Langdon Road and Richmond Road. The proposal is to create an extension beyond the side elevation of the property facing towards the latter (plans 'P1 A', 'S1 B').¹ That would be in place of, albeit significantly larger than, an existing conservatory. There is no indication that the conservatory is anything other than compliant with the relevant

¹ Given the inconsistency between the development applied for, stated in the application form to be a 'three-storey side extension with single-storey rear extension', and the plans, I have described the development proposed based on the supporting plans in the banner heading simply as a 'side extension'.

requirements of permitted development rights.² Notwithstanding the description in the banner heading above, the appellant explains that the proposal is for a 'one and a half storey side extension'. That aptly reflects how accommodation at first floor level is intended to be within the pitch of the roof, served by roof lights. This scheme follows a withdrawn proposal for a larger extension,³ and also the conversion of the property's attic at some point previously.

5. The proposal would, undoubtedly, be beneficial to the occupants by way of providing additional space. It would occupy a less private, accessible, and welcoming part of the garden than that which falls to the rear of the property. The pitch of the roof would match the original building, and the detailing and materials proposed would tie the extension in to the aesthetic of the property. No 2 does not fall within an area protected on account of the nature of its built form, and various properties in the area have been altered over time. There is some infill or more recent development nearby.⁴ Planting within, and boundary features around, the plot of No 2 would also partially obscure the proposed extension.
6. Nevertheless the extension would represent a substantial addition. It would reach a maximum height around the eaves of the existing property. It would be around half, or slightly more, the width of the existing property and also project beyond its rear elevation. I was unable to identify other properties in the immediate vicinity with such substantial side extensions as is proposed. Symmetry and harmony are intrinsically visually pleasing qualities, and the proposal would result in No 2 appearing out of keeping with Nos 4, 6, 8 and 10 (which are of the same typology).
7. Properties along the opposite (western) side of Richmond Road are varied in design and there is a staggered building line, as is the case elsewhere. However there is a strongly consistent building line along this side of Richmond Road, reflected clearly in the terrace of Nos 49 to 63 beyond the rear garden of No 2 in particular. The infill or more recent development referred to above, whilst on occasion substantial in bulk, nevertheless broadly reflects the prevailing building line. I also note that, on the opposite side of Richmond Road, the building line again becomes regular southwards of Roselle Road around Courthill Road. That results in a characteristic pattern of development and an ordered, relatively spacious quality. The PPG emphasises that new development should look to respond appropriately to the existing layout of buildings, streets and spaces.⁵
8. The proposed extension would project notably beyond the established building line along Richmond Road. It would be readily visible, being set close to the pavement, with limited opportunity for replacement planting. That would appear incongruous and out-of-step with the prevailing pattern, detracting from the broad consistency of the street scene described above and views along it. In my view that would be particularly the case when seen in

² Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the 'GPDO').

³ Ref APP/18/01646.

⁴ Including, it appeared, at the Girlguiding building between Nos 10 and 14 Langdon Road, Nos 1A and 1B Langdon Road, the buildings occupying the corner plots of Langdon Road and Richmond Road opposite and of Courthill Road and Richmond road a short distance away.

⁵ Reference ID: 26-024-20140306.

conjunction with nearby properties along Langdon Road, on account of the incongruous design of the proposal relative to them that would result. The existing conservatory is a far more modest and lightweight structure. It is barely visible outside the confines of the appeal site, with the development proposed exceeding the limitations of permitted development.⁶

9. I acknowledge that there are various factors that would moderate the visual effects of the scheme. I accept that the proposal has been modified relative to that advanced previously. However that does not indicate that it is acceptable, and informal pre-application advice is not binding.⁷ For the above reasons, conversely, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area in conflict with the relevant provisions of LP policy PP27 and NPPF paragraph 127(b). In brief, and amongst other things, the former sets out that development should reflect or enhance local patterns of development including in respect of layout, siting, building line, bulk and scale. Similarly the latter explains that development should be sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the NPPF, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Bristow

INSPECTOR

⁶ Noting the limitation in Schedule 1, Part 1, Class A(A.1)(e)(ii) of the GPDO.

⁷ PPG Reference ID: 20-011-20140306.