



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/19/3242063

4 Howe Close, Mudeford, Christchurch BH23 3JA

- 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 Kevin Holiday against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 8/19/1085/HOU, dated 18 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion/extension to bungalow roof with alterations to the garage roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

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).

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within a small cul-de-sac comprising bungalows with either front or side gables and a more substantial and taller chalet bungalow on one of the corner plots, with garages being generally set back in relation to the main dwelling. Properties share a similar appearance and open frontages, which give the area a pleasant suburban feel.
5. The appellant's property forms part of a row of almost identical bungalows, and the significant increase to the building's ridge height would therefore detract from the established pattern of development within the Close. This would be

¹ Adopted in March 2001.

² Adopted in April 2014.

exacerbated by the inclusion of a first floor window within the front gable and the excessive bulk and scale of the dormer windows either side, which would dominate the property. The extended dwelling would, as a result, unduly stand out as an incongruous feature within this otherwise homogeneous suburban area.

6. Whilst my attention has been drawn to the chalet bungalows which can be found in the immediate area, their design and scale is justified by their siting on prominent corner plots. For this reason, I am of the view that no direct comparison can be drawn between these chalet bungalows and the proposal before me, despite the proximity of these properties to the appeal site.
7. The proposal would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Saved Policy H12 of the LP and Policy HE2 of the CS which, amongst other things, 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 locality, the appeal scheme would not represent a sustainable form of development and would therefore also conflict with Policy KS1 of the CS.

Conclusion

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

S Edwards

INSPECTOR