



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2021 by M Long

**Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 29 June 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/21/3273703**

**29 Warnford Road, Boscome East, Bournemouth, Dorset BH6 5PQ**

- 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 Mrs L Hart against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
  - The application Ref 7-2020-23242-E, dated 29 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 February 2021.
  - The development proposed is the reconstruction of a garage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a large, detached house located on a generous corner plot at the junction of Warnford Road and Corhampton Road. There is substantial spacing between the appeal property and No 31 Warnford Road, a detached dwelling with a gable frontage, situated to the north-west of the appeal site. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and comprised of a mix of detached and semi-detached properties. There are a number of garage developments in the vicinity which vary in size and design, however they are mostly smaller in scale than the proposed scheme.
5. The proposed development is a detached garage building with a substantial footprint that incorporates a gable roof, a wide double garage door and a window located in the gable above, which would face toward the highway. The proposal would be positioned close to the shared boundary with No 31 and its front elevation would be set forward of the neighbouring dwelling. The proposal would be prominent along the Warnford Road streetscene and there would be some partial views of the development from the surrounding sites.
6. Approval has previously been given for a garage building with a similar footprint and positioning at this site, however the proposed roof form of the

appeal scheme is significantly different and includes a gable roof which would add considerable bulk at roof level. Although the proposed gable roof responds to the gable frontage of No 31, the close proximity and position in front of the neighbouring dwelling would result in the additional roof bulk appearing overly dominant to the detriment of the character and appearance of No 31.

7. In comparison to the proposal, the garage buildings in the surrounding vicinity are generally smaller and have more modest roof forms. There is a garage with a gable roof located to the north-west of No 31, however it has a lower height than the proposal, does not project in front of No 31 and its gable is oriented perpendicular to the highway which reduces its overall prominence along the streetscene. The proposal's increased bulk at roof level, in addition to the wide double garage door, would appear harmfully out of scale in the local context.
8. While the generous spacing between the appeal dwelling and No 31 would allow for an outbuilding development with the proposed substantial footprint and positioning, the proposed roof form would appear overly dominant. With regard to the large host dwelling, the proposal would appear suitably subservient. However, when considered in relation to No 31 and the surrounding area, the proposed garage would be out of scale and would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the local area.
9. Given the above, the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would not accord with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted October 2012, which seeks to ensure development is well designed and contributes positively to the appearance of the public realm. There would also be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to prevent development of poor design.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

10. The proposed development would not accord with the development plan, when considered as a whole. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*M Long*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*K Taylor*

INSPECTOR