



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2022

by Jonathan Manning BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1ST April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/22/3292402

1 Queens Road, Poole, BH14 9HF

- 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 Richard Morgan against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref APP/21/01833/F, dated 18 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is proposed ground floor rear extension, side porch and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues for the appeal are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of the occupant(s) of No 4 Palmerstone Road, with regard to actual and perceived loss of privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is located on Queens Road and lies in a prominent position on the junction with Palmerstone Road and Courthill Road. The host dwelling is a two-storey detached house. The surrounding area is largely residential, although there is a school directly opposite the appeal site on the southern side of Queens Road.
4. I observed that whilst there is some variation in dwelling types and architectural styles, the simple, uncluttered and relatively uniform nature of the roof forms in the area contributes strongly to the character and appearance of the area. The proposed loft conversion would raise the ridgeline by approximately 0.7 metres and would include gables to the west and east and dormer windows to the north and south.
5. Although I accept that the proposed dormers are relatively small and I note the height difference to the adjacent property, I consider that the scheme would significantly increase the mass and scale of the existing

- roof. In my view, the bulk of the proposed roof and the dormer window features would be alien to the simple and largely uniform nature of the roof forms in the surrounding area.
6. Further, the materials of the proposed dormers would not be in keeping with those in the surrounding area and would further draw attention to the incongruous nature of the proposed development.
 7. The proposed ground floor rear extension would be relatively large and would significantly expand the footprint of the host dwelling. It would fill the gap between the host dwelling and the neighbouring property at No 4 Palmerstone Road. Although single storey in height and the host property would retain amenity space to the front of the property and small area to the south, the proposed extension would be evident within the street scene and the infilling of the entire gap would appear as overdevelopment and would be contrary to the fairly uniform nature of the spacing between dwellings in the area.
 8. The appellant has set out that the useability of the courtyard area where the proposed rear extension would be located is limited and it is dominated by a large neighbouring extension to the east, a neighbouring fence/shed, and is directly behind the existing garage and therefore does not benefit from natural light or views. Whilst this is noted, it does not in any way overcome or mitigate the identified harm, as set out above.
 9. Whilst I do not have any concerns with regard to the scale or mass of the proposed porch to the front of the property, the proposed modern materials would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
 10. For all of the reasons given above, the scheme would cause demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan, November 2018 (the LP).

Living conditions

11. The proposal includes a new window in the eastern gable. Due to its orientation with No 4 Palmerstone Road and as shown on the submitted plans, I observed on my site visit that the gable window would have relatively direct views over its rear garden/amenity space. Whilst I acknowledge that there are already first floor windows that currently have similar views of the rear amenity space, the proposed eastern gable window would be in a more elevated position that would increase the level of overlooking. This would result in an unacceptable increase of actual and perceived loss of privacy to the occupants of No 4, causing harm to their living conditions. Consequently, the scheme does not comply with Policy PP27 of the LP.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Jonathan Manning

INSPECTOR