
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2020

by Patrick Whelan BA(Hons) Dip Arch MA MSc ARB RIBA RTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/W/19/3242971

247 Blandford Road, Poole, Dorset BH15 4AZ

- 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 Carlton Development (Poole) Ltd against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref APP/19/00997/F, dated 2 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is to demolish bungalow and garage and erect terrace of 3x2-bedroom dwellings with parking to rear of new estate road (resubmission).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies in an area containing shops, a community hall, a hotel, and houses of different types built in different eras, their front building lines set back to varying degrees from Blandford Road to which they generally front.
 4. Four recently completed terraced houses stand to one side of the appeal site. The proposed terrace of three houses would reflect their footprints, garden sizes and their architectural arrangement, including their front building lines, which are set close to the back edge of the footway. I can identify no harm to future occupiers, and there is no incompatibility between the proposal and the immediate context to this side.
 5. However, to the other side of the site stands what appears to be a hotel converted from a detached house, No 249. It occupies a large plot on the corner of two streets, from which it is set substantially back. The bungalow presently occupying the appeal site shares a similar set-back building line, which makes for a green and spacious character around the street corner, enclosed by front boundary hedges.
 6. The back wall of the proposed terrace would stand forward of No 249 which fronts to the same direction as the proposed terrace. This back to front positioning would be exacerbated by the proximity of the flanks of the buildings, close to the party fence which would separate them. The effect of this siting would be to overpower No 249's position in the street scene, and to
-

undermine the character of spaciousness around it which, together with the bungalow, adds a spatial distinctiveness to the pattern of development in the area.

7. The appellant indicates that this proposal is part of a comprehensive scheme¹ for the whole of the corner and has submitted a sketch scheme in support. I have noted that a comprehensive scheme for the corner is also indicated in a draft development brief². However, as I have no evidence that a comprehensive scheme, to include No 249, has planning permission or is otherwise likely to proceed, the weight I can accord this is limited. It would not outweigh the harm to the street scene from this proposal, which shows No 249, and the awkward bearing of this scheme upon it, as being retained.
8. The development would therefore conflict with policies PP27 and PP28 of the Poole Local Plan 2018. These seek development that reflects or enhances local patterns of development and neighbouring buildings including in terms of building lines and siting, and which permit plot sub-division only where this would preserve or enhance the area's residential character. It would be at odds too with policies PQF1 and PQF3 of the Poole Quays Forum Neighbourhood Plan 2017 which require development to contribute positively to local distinctiveness, and to respond positively to the area's character and grain. It would also run against the Framework³ which indicates that development should be sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Other Matters

9. The front garden of No 249, which the Council suggests may be in residential use, is given over largely to car parking. Though the outlook from the front windows of the building would change, given the built-up context and the degree of openness in front of them, there would be no harm to the outlook of any occupiers from this development.
10. There is no dispute that the appeal site lies within 5km of the Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA), the Dorset Heaths Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar site, and the Poole Harbour SPA and Ramsar site, whose integrity Natural England has advised would be likely to suffer significant adverse effects from increased urban pressures such as recreational access from future occupiers of this development, without mitigation.
11. The parties disagree whether mitigation in the form of financial contributions to strategic recreation management have been made. Had I been minded to allow the appeal, it would have been necessary for me to go back to the parties to seek further information on this. However, as I am dismissing the appeal, it is not necessary for me to consider this matter further, as it would not change the outcome.

Conclusion

12. The proposed development would provide three additional homes which is a social benefit that attracts considerable weight. It would bring economic benefits from its construction, and from the spending of future occupiers in the

¹ Sketch Layout 'A'

² Draft Hamworthy Centre Development Brief, prepared for Poole Quays Forum, July 2015

³ National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 127

local economy. However, these benefits would not outweigh the environmental harm it would cause to the spaciousness of this corner and the distinctive character to the pattern of development in this section of the street scene, and its conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole.

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

Patrick Whelan

INSPECTOR