



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2020

by C J Ford BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

a person appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/20/3248494

16 Shepherd Close, Christchurch, BH23 5PF

- 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 Mr & Mrs McNeill against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 8/19/1490/HOU, dated 13 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'front & rear extension & loft conversion'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council does not raise any concerns in respect of the proposed ground floor front and rear extensions. As there is no reason to take a different view, the decision focusses on the changes to the roof.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Shepherd Close street scene.

Reasons

4. Shepherd Close comprises of bungalows that are set back from the street with spacious front garden areas. The appeal property occupies a prominent position at the head of the cul-de-sac along with No 15. The two dwellings stand either side of a public footpath through to Glenavon Road and have a common low and wide built form with gable ended roofs.
5. Nevertheless, beyond these two dwellings, there is no general consistency in the height of the properties positioned around and near to the cul-de-sac. Nos 9 and 11 have noticeably higher roofs, as does an infill property to the east of No 14. The appellant's evidence further indicates that No 13 has planning permission to increase the roof height. There is likewise no consistency in the roof form with Nos 9 and 11 having hipped roofs. In this context, raising the roof height by approximately 1.5m and changing the roof form from gable to hipped ends as proposed would be compatible with the street scene.
6. However, front dormer windows do not feature elsewhere in the street and the three proposed would visually emphasise the roof. In contrast, the properties

with higher roofs have maintained plain front roof slopes with only the occasional roof light. In this context, the roof would look cluttered and unduly prominent with the resulting incongruous appearance of the property being detrimental to the street scene.

7. In light of the above, it is concluded the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the Shepherd Close street scene. It would conflict with Policy H12 of the 2011 Borough of Christchurch Local Plan which seeks to ensure residential extensions are appropriate in character and design to the immediate locality. It would also conflict with Policies HE2 and KS1 of the 2014 Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 - Core Strategy. Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure development represents high quality design, compatible with the architectural style of its surroundings and meets the environmental aims of sustainable development.

Other Matters

8. The need to provide accommodation for carers is recognised. However, this does not justify the identified harm of the proposed scheme.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C J Ford

PLANNING DECISION OFFICER