



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 13 October 2021

by Nick Davies BSc(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/W/21/3277441

3 Compton Gardens, Poole, Dorset BH14 8PP

- 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 M Adamson against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref APP/20/01224/F, dated 9 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is to sever plot and erect extension to create a pair of semi-detached dwellings with associated access and parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the address of the site and the description of the proposed development given on the application form. However, planning permission was granted¹ in 2018 for the subdivision of 3 Compton Gardens to form a pair of semi-detached houses. The appellant's evidence indicates that this permission has been implemented since the planning application was submitted. Consequently, the proposal effectively seeks an extension to the existing semi-detached dwelling now known as 3a Compton Gardens.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies at the head of a small cul de sac of houses, which are set back from the road behind planted front gardens that are enclosed by low boundary walls. Although they vary in their detailed design, the houses all have ridged roofs running parallel to the road with hipped ends. Consequently, although there are single storey extensions between them, there are significant gaps between the houses at first floor and roof level. Combined with the substantial level of planting in front, between, and behind the houses, this gives the Close a spacious, suburban character.
5. Although now subdivided from the original house, 3a still has the appearance of being part of it, as an attached garage with accommodation above. The visual impression that the overall building is still one unit is reinforced by the lack of

¹ LPA Ref: 17/01821/F

any physical subdivision of the front garden/parking area. The hipped roof, and the angled relationship with No 4 to the east, results in a significant gap being evident between the buildings when looking into the cul de sac. The subdivision of the dwelling has, therefore, been achieved with little harm to the spacious character of the Close.

6. The proposed extension would project well beyond the rear elevation of 3a, and it would be at an angle so that it would run parallel with, and close to, the boundary with No 4. It would be two-storey with a ridged roof for much of its length, but it would be attached to the existing dwelling by a lower flat-roofed link. It is contended by the appellant that its positioning, predominantly to the rear of the site, and the presence of planting in the front garden, would result in the extension being largely unnoticeable in the street scene. I saw that, from some angles, it would be largely hidden from view by the medium-sized tree in the front garden.
7. Its angled nature, however, and its two-storey scale and height, mean that it would be readily visible in the gap between Nos 3a and 4 from the eastern pavement of the cul de sac, all the way up from its junction with Compton Drive. The presence of the extension between the houses would result in a visual coalescence of the roofs of the two buildings, and would reduce views through the site to the trees beyond. This would significantly diminish the value of the gap in maintaining the spaciousness that is characteristic of this group of buildings. This would conflict with Policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan (2018) (the Local Plan), which seeks to maintain or enhance any details that contribute positively to local character.
8. The lower flat-roofed linking structure would not be readily apparent in views up the cul de sac. The two-storey ridged element would, therefore, appear as an isolated structure, set behind the frontage building. Although it would not extend beyond the rear building line of No 4, this would not be visually apparent, and the building would appear as an incongruous addition, at odds with the orderly arrangement of buildings fronting the cul de sac. Consequently, although the quantum of site coverage would not be out of keeping with other plots in the Close, the scale, positioning and design of the extension would result in it being discordant with the existing pattern of buildings. Consequently, the extension would not reflect or enhance the local pattern of development and neighbouring buildings, as required by Policy PP27 of the Local Plan.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The development would, therefore, be contrary to Policy PP27 of the Local Plan, which seeks to achieve a good standard of design in all new developments.

Other Matters

10. It is contended that a detached ancillary building of a similar size could be built in much the same location under permitted development rights. However, an application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for such a proposal was refused. Although the merits of this decision are a matter of dispute, no fall-back position has been formally established. I therefore afford this prospect little weight in my decision.

11. My attention has been drawn to paragraphs 60 and 69 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which identify the government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, and advising that great weight should be given to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes. Section 11 of the Framework also promotes the effective use of land in meeting the need for homes. The appellant argues that there is a need for new housing sites in the area because the Council has only met 68% of its assessed need under the Housing Delivery Test.
12. However, the appeal proposal would not result in an additional home, as a new dwelling has already been created through the implementation of the earlier planning permission. There is no evidence to indicate that the larger dwelling now proposed would make a more important contribution to local housing needs than the smaller unit that has already been created. The Framework's advice regarding the delivery of a sufficient supply of homes does not, therefore, carry any weight in support of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

13. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Davies

INSPECTOR