



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2021

by J J Evans BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/D/21/3274826

104 New Road, West Parley, Ferndown BH22 8EL

- 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 A White against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref 3/21/0155/HOU, dated 22 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, raise roof and form rooms in roof-space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 104 New Road (No 104) is a detached bungalow positioned within a row of dwellings to the eastern side of the road. To either side of New Road there are long lines of houses and bungalows, many of which are of a similar age and style. Those to the east of the road mostly have similar sized plots, with deep rear gardens beyond which are fields. These houses and bungalows are set back from the public highway behind comparable sized front gardens, and taken together they form a long linear row of buildings that frames the eastern side of the road.
4. The row of dwellings within which the appeal property is positioned are mostly bungalows, and they have simple forms, many with hipped roofs. Several of the bungalows have been extended, including rooms in the roofs and also rear extensions. There are houses to each end of the row, and these form tall termini to the bungalows between them. The similar heights of the bungalows, their simple forms and their modest sizes, gives a harmonious and distinct appearance to the row.
5. The proposed roof and rear extensions to No 104 would substantially increase both the depth and height of the building. The increased height would be visible from some distance away above the roofs of the nearby bungalows. Particularly when approaching from the south the building would appear unduly prominent within the row. Whilst the appellant refers to the roof needing to be

- raised for the financial viability of the scheme and to provide head-space for the rooms of the first floor, the extent of the height increase and the long length of the extended dwelling would be harmfully apparent above the roofs of other bungalows. The combined effect of the roof and rear extensions would create a tall, long and bulky building, that would have an overbearing and dominating juxtaposition with the modest properties either side.
6. Moreover, the crown roof and gables under truncated hips would appear overly contrived and at odds with the modest dimensions and simple forms of nearby bungalows. The scheme would provide a family home within a generous plot. Nevertheless, this has to be considered within the context of the impact of the scheme upon the neighbouring bungalows and also upon the character and appearance of the area. Taken as a whole, the large size and the form of the extended dwelling would be a disruptive and incongruous addition to the row.
 7. The appellant has drawn my attention to the different styles of houses and bungalows in the area. The rows of housing along New Road are distinct from each other, with each forming a separate entity either side of the road. There is a greater variety of properties and extensions to the west side of the road. However, this variety does not erode the unity of those bungalows that form the distinctive row to the eastern side of the road, of which the appeal property forms part.
 8. I saw at my site inspection that 108 New Road (No 108) is very different from the other houses and bungalows in the row to the east of the road, particularly as regards size, form and materials. These differences make it a unique and prominent addition to the row. Nevertheless, this property and the appeal proposal have different contexts. No 108 is at one end of the ribbon development whereas No 104 is within the row of bungalows, with modest sized properties either side. Given these differences, No 108 does not form a binding precedent for approving the appeal scheme. Moreover, if I were to allow the appeal, 106 New Road would be overwhelmed by the close proximity of being between two large and tall buildings.
 9. The appellant has also referred to a fallback alternative being available under permitted development rights. However, it is not the role of an Inspector when dealing with an appeal for planning permission to conduct an exercise as to lawful use and operation in order to decide whether the appellant might be able to rely on permitted development rights as a fallback. Having regard to the appellant's comments concerning the head height requirements for a first floor and the limited information provided of what an alternative scheme would look like, the weight that I can attribute to any fallback in this instance is limited.
 10. Consequently, for the reasons given above, the scheme would fail to respect the character and appearance of the area, and this would be contrary to Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy (2014). This seeks amongst other things, high quality development that is compatible with its surroundings, thereby reflecting objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and those of the National Design Guide.

Other Matters

11. Local residents have raised a number of matters, including concerns with regard to the levels of sunlight experienced and increased shading. However,

following my findings on the main issue and as I am dismissing the appeal, I have not considered these matters further.

Conclusion

12. Thus, for the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J J Evans

INSPECTOR