



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2021

by James Blackwell LLB (Hons) PgDip

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/21/3285846

1 St Anthony's Road, Bournemouth, BH2 6PB

- 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 Shirley Roberts against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2021-23281-J, dated 25 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is replacement boundary wall and raised fence. Tree removal.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the appeal site is within the Saints Conservation Area (SCA), as per section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area in this decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a large, detached dwelling located on a prominent corner plot at the junction of St Anthony's Road and St Augustin's Road. It is situated within the SCA, which is characterised by spacious residential plots, set along wide and verdant roads. This is particularly true along St Anthony's Road, along which front boundaries are generally typified by low-level brick walls, mature trees and hedgerows. These features give the street scene an attractive green backdrop, which contributes very positively to the character of the area and the wider setting of the SCA.
5. There is an existing low level boundary wall with timber fence above which surrounds the frontage and northern elevation of the appeal property, which has a maximum height of approximately 1.4 metres. Given the substantial size and prominent location of the appeal property, this boundary treatment is extensive along both St Anthony's Road and St Augustin's Road, and already appears as a key feature of the street scene. At present, its height does not inhibit views of the dwelling itself, which means the corner plot retains a

relative openness, which again contributes positively to this aspect of the street scene.

6. The proposed development would increase the combined height of the boundary wall to approximately 1.8 metres. The increased height would mean that the bulk of the appeal dwelling would be largely obscured from view at street level, which would directly conflict with guidance set out in the Council's Extensions SPD¹, which says "*creating a fortress effect where the front of the property cannot be seen from the street is not appropriate and degrades the character of the area*". As a result, the combined height of the proposed boundary treatment would appear dominant and oppressive, and would significantly detract from the openness experienced at the corner junction, which would harm this aspect of the street scene.
7. The additional height would also jar with the prevailing low level boundary treatments which typify St Anthony's Road, thereby exacerbating its dominance within the street scene. Moreover, it would appear as a stark contrast to the mature green trees and hedgerows which characterise this road. As a result, the new boundary wall and fence would dominate the corner of the junction, which would be particularly prominent and oppressive given its extensive length along both St Anthony's Road and St Augustin's Road.
8. Whilst I note there are numerous examples of taller boundary treatments in the vicinity of the appeal site, none of these fronts out on to St Anthony's Road, which means this road in particular retains a strong degree of openness which contributes positively to the character of the SCA. Moreover, none of the examples are as extensive in length as the boundary of the appeal dwelling itself, which means they can generally be accommodated more effectively without appearing overly dominant in the street scene.
9. For these reasons, the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies CS39 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) and saved Policy 4.4 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan (2002), which together seek to ensure new development preserves the special nature of its conservation areas, by ensuring it responds positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, with particular regard to scale and siting. As set out above, the development would also conflict with the guidance set out in the Extensions SPD. Finally, the development would conflict with the overarching design objectives of the Framework (2021), which places a great emphasis on the preservation of the historic environment, including conservation areas.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

James Blackwell

INSPECTOR

¹ Residential Extensions, A Design Guide for Householders (September 2008)