



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2020

by S Edwards MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/19/3242065

17 Dunlin Close, Christchurch BH23 4BE

- 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 and Mrs R Fear against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 8/19/1165/HOU, dated 12 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is erect front, side and rear extensions (Demolish part of garage and conservatory).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. On 1 April 2019, Christchurch Borough Council ceased to exist and became part of a new Unitary Authority known as Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council. The development plans for the merged Local Planning Authorities will remain in place for the area within the new Unitary Authority they relate to until such time as they are revoked or replaced. I shall therefore determine the appeal having regard to the policies set out within the Borough of Christchurch Local Plan¹ (LP) and the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 – Core Strategy² (CS).
3. The description of development provided in the application form has been amended in subsequent documents. The appellants have confirmed that the description provided in the Council's Decision Notice is considered acceptable. Accordingly, this is the description which I have adopted, as it accurately reflects the proposal before me.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a bungalow and a garage set on a prominent corner plot at the junction of Dunlin Close and Falcon Drive. It forms part of an open plan residential area primarily characterised by dwellings of a similar scale and appearance. The proposed development includes the erection of single storey additions to the front, side and rear elevations of the dwellinghouse.

¹ Adopted in March 2001.

² Adopted in April 2014.

6. The front extension would project significantly further forward than the existing bungalow, thus lacking subservience in relation to the host property. This would be exacerbated by the design of the proposal, which would compete with the gable element of the original dwelling. Additionally, the extension would, by reason of its excessive footprint, erode the contribution which the appeal site currently makes to the openness and spaciousness of the locality. The visual impact of the proposal would be to some extent be mitigated by the existing hedge when viewed from the East. Nevertheless, the extension would be highly visible from other public vantage points by reason of the open nature of this corner plot, resulting in a form of development which would unduly stand out as an incongruous addition, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
7. My attention has been drawn to a number of other properties located in the area, which have established the principle of front extensions. Be that as it may, I am not certain that the circumstances of these particular schemes, for which limited information has been provided, represent a direct parallel to the proposal before me which, in any event, I am required to assess on its individual merits.
8. The appellant insists that the proposed development is required to provide additional accommodation for his family. However, planning permission runs with the land rather than with the appellant. Consequently, if the appeal were to be allowed, the resultant additions would become a permanent feature within the street, which I found harm to in respect of the front extension. The identified harm outweighs the weight which can be afforded to the personal circumstances of the appellant. Additionally, it has not been demonstrated that the appeal scheme represents the only way in which additional accommodation could be created.
9. The appeal development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of this area and would therefore fail to accord with LP Saved Policy H12 and CS Policy HE2. Amongst other things, these policies require development proposals to be appropriate in character, scale, design and materials to the immediate locality. By reason of the adverse impact it would cause to the area, the proposal would not represent a sustainable form of development and would also conflict with CS Policy KS1.

Other Matters

10. Various concerns have been raised by interested parties, including reservations regarding highway safety. However, the Council did not object to the proposal on these grounds, and there are no reasons for me to take a different approach.

Conclusion

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

S Edwards

INSPECTOR