



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2022

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20TH July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/22/3297546

29 Panorama Road, Poole, Dorset, BH13 7RA.

- 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 White against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref APP/21/01758/F, dated 6 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as household extension (revised Scheme).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be:
 - a) the effect of the development on the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the character and appearance of the street scene; and,
 - b) whether the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers in terms of a loss of privacy.

Reasons

First main issue

3. The property the subject of this appeal, 29 Panorama Road is a modest, traditional vernacular style detached bungalow. It is one of a group of 5 or so similar modest dwellings.
4. The appellant proposes the removal of the pitched roof and the construction two additional floors. The building as extended would have a series of flat roofs. When viewed from the street, due the floors becoming progressively narrower, the building as extended, would appear to be of a stepped pyramidal form. The design incorporates balconies at both first and second floor level. Due to the form of the building as extended, the fenestration pattern and finishes it would overall have a contrasting contemporary appearance to the vernacular form and appearance of the host and neighbouring properties.
5. Policy PP27 of the Borough of Poole-*Poole Local Plan* (Adopted 13 November 2018) (LP) requires extensions and or alterations to buildings to be designed to respect and relate to the existing building and maintain or enhance any details

that contribute positively to the local character. Further, along with other things, development is required to reflect or enhance local patterns of development and neighbouring buildings in terms of, amongst other things, height and scale, bulk and massing, materials and detailing.

6. Due to the three-dimensional form of the property as extended, the choice of materials, overall height and fenestration pattern the proposed extension would fail to either respect or relate well to the existing form, style or character of the host property. Accordingly, the proposed design would not serve to maintain or enhance the vernacular design of the existing building.
7. The character of the area is made up of a mix of residential properties, along with local shops restaurants and hotels. In respect of the residential properties these are an eclectic mix of architectural styles and building forms. As identified by the appellant there are examples of contemporary style properties in the road. However, based on my observations I am not persuaded, given their location in relation to number 29, that they are directly comparable with or set a precedent for the proposed development here.
8. The neighbouring property, number 27 has a substantive raised roof and dormers making it, in contrast to number 29 and the other relatively unaltered neighbouring dwellings, appear as a large and somewhat bulky chalet. Nevertheless, it is still read as one of the existing group of more modest properties. Accordingly, to my mind it has not changed the group such that a large and overtly contemporary dwelling, as proposed would be acceptable on the appeal site.
9. Further, the overall height of the property, if extended as proposed would, as illustrated be even higher than number 27 as extended.
10. The house as extended would be of a visually interesting contemporary design. However, as an extension to the existing dwelling and in this location, it would appear as an incongruous and alien form of development that as well as causing harm to the architectural integrity of the host property, would not serve to reflect or enhance local patterns of development and neighbouring buildings in terms of height, overall scale, bulk, massing, materials, or detailing
11. I therefore conclude in respect of the first main issue that the proposal would result in an obtrusive and dominant feature. It would therefore cause harm to the integrity of the host property. Furthermore, it would fail to respect the existing character and appearance of the neighbouring properties and be an inappropriate development within the street scene of Panorama Road. For all these reasons it would be contrary to the objectives of LP Policy PP27, as it relates to, amongst other things, the quality of design and the need to reflect and enhance local patterns of development and neighbouring buildings.

Second main issue

12. The Council contends that the windows to the habitable rooms in the east and west elevations at first and second floor level would result in overlooking leading to a loss of privacy to the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
13. Given the plan layout, location of windows in relation to the side boundaries and the sill heights indicated I am not persuaded, from the limited evidence provided, that there would be a significant level of direct or perceived overlooking. In my judgement, any overlooking that would result would not be

such as to result in such a significant loss of privacy as to cause harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers.

14. On balance, I therefore conclude in respect of the second main issue that the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers in terms of a loss of privacy. It would accord with the objectives of LP Policy PP27 as it seeks to protect residential living conditions.

Conclusions

15. The proposed development would not result in harm to residential living conditions. However, it would cause harm to architectural integrity of the host property, character and appearance of neighbouring properties and the street scene. I consider this to be a compelling objection. Accordingly, and while having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR