



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2022

by J J Evans BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/D/22/3290844

11 Cheriton Way, Wimborne Minster BH21 1DR

- 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 Foxall against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref 3/21/1374/HOU, dated 8 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is to raise the ridge height to form new habitable accommodation on the first floor with the addition of front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host building and upon the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 11 Cheriton Way (No 11) is a detached bungalow positioned upon a hillside within a mostly residential area. The property is part of a residential estate that comprises mostly detached houses and bungalows of similar ages and styles. The repeated styles, forms, and materials palette used in the dwellings gives a strong visual cohesion to the estate. The presence of wide roads along with areas of public open space creates a spacious, planned appearance to the area, with extensive views of the rows of dwellings that are to either side of the roads.
4. No 11 is part of the long row of detached bungalows that step up the hillside from Allenvie Road, with the line continuing into Glendale Close. There are repeated styles and forms of bungalows within this row, and they are positioned behind similar sized front gardens. The bungalows also share common stylistic themes, particularly so with regard to the repeated palettes of materials and the shallow roofs.
5. Given the pitch of the roofs, very few of the bungalows in the row of which No 11 forms part have roof extensions, and the presence of so many unaltered roofs contributes to the defined harmony of the street scene. Although the individual bungalows step gently up the hillside, their repeated similarities is a distinctive characteristic, and one which contributes to the planned cohesion of the area.

6. No 11 contributes to this cohesion, repeating the form, materials, and positioning upon its plot that is common to those bungalows nearby. Raising the roof along with the installation of dormers would harmfully disrupt the distinctive homogeneity of the row. Given the consistency of the roofs of the other bungalows, increasing the height and size of the roof of No 11 would make this property conspicuously apparent. This prominence would be unacceptably evident given the positioning of the property close to the top of the slope and because it would be within a long row of other bungalows characterised by shallow roofs. In addition, the dormers would serve to exaggerate the size and altered appearance of the roof. As No 11 would be the only property within the long row of bungalows that would be extended in this way, these differences would not only erode the cohesive nature of the area, but would also unacceptably draw the eye.
7. Moreover, the increased height and size of the roof along with the dormers would result in an overly complex roofscape when compared to that of the simple nature of nearby bungalows. The extensions would combine to overwhelm the modest dimensions of the front facing gabled roof, with the new roof and dormers dominating the bungalow. As very few other properties have roof alterations and extensions, the appeal proposal would appear incongruously alien and bulky presence within the street scene.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to the extensions that have taken place to 6 Glendale Close (No 6). However, this property is higher up the hillside and occupies a corner plot, thereby having a very different positional context. Given this context and that No 11 is within the row rather than at one end, No 6 does not form a binding precedent for approving the appeal scheme.
9. Thus, the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area. Having regard to the nature of the proposal the conditions suggested by the Council to seek matching materials would not overcome this substantial harm. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy (2014). This policy seeks amongst other things, high quality development that reflects and enhances local distinctiveness, thereby reflecting objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. Irrespective of my decision, issues of land ownership would be a matter for the relevant parties to resolve and are not for my consideration. Finally, concerns regarding the Council's handling of the application relate to procedural matters and have no bearing on my consideration of the planning merits of the case.

Conclusions

11. The proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. The scheme would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole, and there are no considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Thus, for the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J J Evans INSPECTOR