
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: 8 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/22/3290860

38 Glen Road, Poole BH14 0HF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Craig Osborne against the decision of BCP Council.
 - The application Ref APP/21/01097/F, dated 14 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is addition of dormer to roof, rear balcony and associated fenestration alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the addition of a front dormer to the roof. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the rear balcony and associated fenestration alterations.
2. Planning permission is granted for the rear balcony and associated fenestration alterations, at 38 Glen Road, Poole BH14 0HF, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref APP/21/01097/F, dated 14 July 2021, so far as relevant to that part of the works hereby permitted and the plans submitted with it, and 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: Location map and site plan (drawing number 1102/01A), Existing elevations (drawing number 1102/03), Existing plans (drawing number 1102/02), Proposed elevations (drawing number 1102/05B), and Proposed plans (drawing number 1102/04A).
 - 3) No development shall take place until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and samples.
 - 4) No development shall take place until details of the materials of the privacy screens to the south-east and north-west elevations of the balcony hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The privacy screens shall be at least 1.8m in height, and shall be permanently retained as approved.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. 38 Glen Road (No 38) is a detached building within a mostly residential area that comprises a mix of ages and styles of houses and bungalows. Positioned upon a steeply sloping hillside the front appears as a bungalow with rooms in the roof, whilst to the rear the building has a two storey form. No 38 is close to the end of the road and is one of a small group of three properties that when viewed from the street form a cluster of single storey homes of similar ages and styles.
5. The rear balcony would stretch the width of the first floor, with full height windows provided to the bedrooms. The south-west facing nature of the balcony along with its shallow projection from the rear wall, would cause limited loss of light or shading to nearby residents. The steep nature of the hillside would provide users of the balcony with views over the roofs of the houses below, and having regard to this the privacy of the residents of these properties would be retained. The height, depth and use of solid materials for the side panels would effectively screen views both into and out of the balcony, thereby maintaining the privacy of both the occupiers of No 38 and that of nearby residents.
6. The balcony would have a contemporary appearance, with large windows and external materials that would harmonise with those found on the rear of the neighbouring dwellings. Although the balcony would project beyond the existing rear wall, the degree of extension would be modest, and it would appear subservient in size and form to the host building.
7. Having regard to these findings the rear balcony and associated fenestration changes would neither harm the living conditions of nearby residents, nor adversely affect the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area. As such, the rear balcony would accord with Policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan (2018) (LP). This policy seeks amongst other things, a good standard of design, that development would not have a harmful impact upon amenity for local residents and future occupiers, and that extensions respect and relate to the existing building and character of the area, thereby reflecting objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
8. No 38 is part of a small group of dwellings at the end of the road that create a discrete cluster of modest, similarly styled single storey homes constructed from similar materials. The front dormer would harmfully interrupt the cohesion of this group. The use of timber and metal cladding along with the full height, large windows would be a strident contrast to the limited palette of materials present within the group and their much smaller windows. Moreover, the dormer would form an incongruous juxtaposition with the conventional and unassuming styles of both No 38 and the other properties in the group.
9. Furthermore, the size and height of the dormer, particularly its projection below the eaves and beyond the front wall would be such that it would dominate the modest proportions of the building. Rather than reflect the

character and appearance of No 38, the size and positioning of the dormer would create a top-heavy appearance, and one which would overwhelm the modest form of the host. Whilst one of the other properties in the group has front facing dormers, these have a physical subservience of size and form to the roof, being set well below the ridge and above the eaves. The contrast that would result between the neighbouring property and the appeal property would be strikingly apparent.

10. There are a variety of styles and ages of homes in the area, but in most cases the individual dwellings have a consistency of appearance and style, and where extended they have mostly maintained this consistency. The appellant has drawn my attention to other properties that are considered to be a precedent. However, the developments at Glenmount Drive, 18A Glen Road, and the apartments at 29 Glen Road are all new buildings rather than extended ones. This is also the case with 36 and 36A Glen Road, and as they are set forward of No 38, this positioning serves to enhance the discrete nature of the cluster of dwellings of which the appeal property is part. 19 Glen Road has a balcony but also has a flat roof rather than a dormer, and thereby is not comparable to the appeal proposal. Given these differences, none of the examples cited forms a binding precedent for approving the front dormer.
11. No 38 is at the end of the gently curving road, and there would not be long distance views of the dormer. However, the elevated position of the dormer would make it visible within the street scene, both from the road and also for pedestrians walking uphill towards Glen Road using the nearby public footpath. As No 38 is part of the cluster of similar dwellings that form a distinct terminus to the road, the dormer would appear harmfully disruptive to this cohesion. Moreover, LP Policy PP27 requires extensions to respect and relate to the existing building and local character. Given my findings it follows that the front dormer would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area, contrary to the above referenced LP policy and objectives of the Framework. Moreover, this harm could not be overcome by the conditions suggested by the Council.

Other Matters

12. The appellant's concerns regarding the Council's handling of the application are procedural matters. Such concerns fall to be pursued by other means separate from the appeal process and are not for me to consider.

Conditions

13. The conditions suggested by the Council have been considered against paragraph 56 of the Framework. Where necessary and in the interests of clarity and precision they have been altered to better reflect these requirements.
14. The standard time condition has been imposed, as has one requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, so as to avoid doubt and in the interests of proper planning. To ensure that the external appearance of the balcony harmonises with the character and appearance of the host building and with that of the area, details of materials are required for approval by the Council. The proposed elevation drawing shows privacy screens to either side of the balcony, and these would be essential to maintain the privacy of nearby residents. Consequently, I have

conditioned the submission of details of materials for the screens in addition to requiring that they are retained as approved.

Conclusion

15. The scheme involves different elements that are physically and functionally independent. In this respect I find the rear balcony and associated fenestration alterations to be acceptable and clearly severable from the front dormer. Consequently, I am issuing a split decision in this case and grant planning permission for the rear balcony and associated fenestration alterations but dismiss the appeal insofar as it relates to the front dormer.
16. Thus, for the reasons given above, and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is part allowed and part dismissed.

J J Evans

INSPECTOR