



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: 5 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/21/3273154

The Glade, 1A Bingham Avenue, Poole BH14 8ND

- 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 D Bower against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
- The application Ref APP/20/01503/F, dated 18 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 March 2021.
- The development proposed is a first floor extension to garage and car port.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension to garage and car port at The Glade, 1A Bingham Avenue, Poole BH14 8ND in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref APP/20/01503/F, dated 18 December 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1596P/100c, 1596P/101, 1596P/103e and 1596P/104d.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be as specified in the application form.
 - 4) All works relating to the ground clearance, tree works, demolition and development with implications for trees shall be carried out as specified in the approved arboricultural method statement and shall be supervised by an arboricultural consultant holding a nationally recognised arboricultural qualification.

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.

Procedural Matters

3. Approval has previously been given for the proposed car port as part of a separate application. It is understood that the Council's substantive concerns relate to the proposed first floor extension and not the remainder of the proposal, and I see no reason to disagree. As such, the focus of the main issue is in respect to the first floor extension.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor extension on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the likely future impact on surrounding trees.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a large, detached house that has a detached, double garage with a hipped-roof to its north. There are a number of well-established trees that are in close proximity to the garage building including a Monterey Pine and an Oak tree, referred to by the parties as T1 and T2 respectively. The surrounding area is predominantly comprised of other large, detached dwellings in generously-sized plots. The local character is spacious, verdant and benefits from numerous mature trees that are subject to an Area Tree Preservation Order.
6. The proposed first floor extension would maintain the footprint of the existing garage building but would increase its scale through adding height and bulk at roof level. The proposed extension would incorporate a gable roof and windows in each elevation, including two small dormer windows on the east facing roof slope. As a result, there would be a modest increase in the proposed roof's proximity to the canopies of the surrounding trees.
7. Despite the close proximity of T1 and T2 to the garage, there is no evidence to suggest that the construction of the proposed first floor extension would lead to direct harm to the trees, rather it has been put forward that its construction would likely lead to the future pruning or removal of T1 and T2. The increased scale of the proposed extension would result in a moderate increase in the building's height of approximately 1.2 metres, however this would not significantly affect the amount of detritus falling on the roof slopes. Moreover, the proposed extension would maintain the existing footprint of the garage which would limit the overall increase in roof area under the canopies of the nearby trees. Therefore, the proposed scale of the first floor extension would respond suitably to the natural features of the surrounding environment.
8. The proposed roof form of the first floor extension would add a modest degree of complication at roof level with the dormers. However, its design would not cause a significant increase in the amount of detritus that would accumulate on the roof slopes. Furthermore, any necessary clearing of detritus could be undertaken without direct harm to the surrounding trees. As such, it is not considered likely that the proposal would result in an increased future pressure to prune or remove T1 or T2. Due to the limited effect on the surrounding trees, the proposal would be acceptable with regard to its impact on the local climate.
9. Given the above, the proposed first floor extension would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the likely future impact on surrounding trees. It therefore accords with Policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan, adopted November 2018, which seeks to ensure development responds to natural features on the site and does not result in the loss of trees that make a significant contribution to the character and local climate of an area.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time period for commencement and requiring that development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, which is necessary for certainty, I recommend that the external materials match those specified in the application form to preserve the character and appearance of the area.
11. I also recommend a condition to ensure that the works are carried out in accordance with the submitted arboricultural method statement under the supervision of an arboricultural consultant. This is necessary to protect the trees in the surrounding vicinity of the construction works and ensure that any works to the trees do not result in their harm.
12. As the proposal was submitted as part of a householder application for development within the curtilage of the dwelling, the use of the building for any other purpose beyond this scope would not be permitted by a planning permission granted by this appeal decision. As such, a condition to ensure the development is used solely for purposes incidental to the domestic use of the main dwelling is not considered necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The proposed development would 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 allowed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR