



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/D1265/D/21/3284694

1 Elmgate Drive, Bournemouth BH7 7EF

- 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 Louis Pow against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2021-27980, dated 2 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extension to existing boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and extension to existing boundary wall at 1 Elmgate Drive, Bournemouth BH7 7EF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2021-27980, dated 2 November 2020.

Preliminary Matters

2. The boundary wall has already been carried out, so the development is therefore retrospective. I have used the Council's description of development, as this more accurately describes the entirety of the proposals.

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 property comprises a detached dwelling located on a corner plot at the junction of Elmgate Drive and Harewood Crescent. The area is predominantly residential in nature, and is made up of attractive detached dwellings in red/brown brick, many of which include elements of mock Tudor frontage. Whilst the front boundaries of many of the houses along Elmgate Drive are largely open or low-level, boundary treatments along Harewood Crescent are noticeably taller.
5. The development comprises a curved boundary wall which wraps around the corner of the appeal property along its south-western side. This leads to an open driveway which fronts on to Elmgate Drive. Whilst the wall is punctuated by a number of taller brick piers, the bulk of the wall is made up of lower-level curved sections, which are approximately 1.4 metres tall. This means the dwelling remains readily visible in the street scene, ensuring that the prevailing sense of openness within the vicinity is retained. This is helped by the wide, open and unobstructed driveway, which ensures that much of the frontage onto

Elmgate Drive remains commensurate with the openness of the neighbouring properties. Moreover, the height of the boundary wall reflects the height of boundary treatments used along the front and side of the house opposite (which also occupies a corner plot), thereby ensuring a degree of consistency at the junction of Elmgate Drive and Harewood Crescent.

6. In terms of design, the wall has been constructed to a good standard and utilises the red/brown brick which typifies the dwellings in this area. This allows the wall to assimilate properly within the street scene, without appearing dominant or incongruous in the context of neighbouring houses.
7. For these reasons, I am satisfied that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the area. It is consistent with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) and guidance set out in the Council's Extension SPD¹, which together seek to ensure new development responds positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, with particular regard to design, scale and siting. The development would also reflect the overarching design objectives of the Framework (2021).

Other Matters

8. The driveway access is sufficiently wide and unobstructed to ensure any vehicles accessing or egressing the appeal property can do so safely with appropriate levels of visibility.
9. Any restrictions or covenants which prevent the construction of walls along the boundaries of properties within Elmgate Drive do not pertain to the planning merits of the development, and would therefore be beyond the scope of this appeal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework (2021), and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal should be allowed.

James Blackwell

INSPECTOR

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