
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2022

by Benjamin Webb BA(Hons) MA MA MSc PGDip(UD) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/22/3296543

5 Redan Close, Christchurch BH23 5DJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO).
 - The appeal is made by Jill Gentle against the decision of BCP Council.
 - The application Ref 8/21/1117/PNHAS, dated 23 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is an additional storey.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The matters for prior approval in relation to Class AA set out in paragraph AA.2(3)(a)(ii)(aa) and (bb) are the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, including the design and architectural features of the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, and any side elevation of the dwellinghouse that fronts a highway. The latter is not relevant in this case.
3. Though the appellant disputes the extent to which a site's surroundings can be considered, the use of 'including' in paragraph AA.2(3)(a)(ii) does not limit the matters which can be taken into account to those listed. Nor does it therefore indicate that the impact of the development on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse may only be considered in isolation. In this regard the development would be perceived with reference to its surroundings. It is therefore appropriate to assess of the development within that context.
4. The appellant states that the officer report contains incorrect measurements. However, even if this is the case, it makes no difference to the overall assessment. I have based my own decision on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

Reasons

6. 5 Redan Close is a modest single storey bungalow with shallow pitched roof. It is located within a cul-de-sac containing other closely spaced bungalows of largely matching design. The streetscene is therefore characterised by a high

degree of uniformity, and provides the primary context within which No 5 is viewed.

7. Most of the plots within Redan Close adjoin or back on to other plots which contain single storey bungalows fronting other streets. No 5 is an exception given that it backs on to a group of plots containing 1.5 and 2-storey dwellings fronting Wharncliff Road. However, whilst limited glimpses of these dwellings are possible from Redan Close, this does little to disturb the character and uniformity of Redan Close itself, or No 5's place within it. Nor do blocks of flats or other 2-storey dwellings which exist within the broader area.
8. Adding a first floor to No 5 would have a transformative effect. Aside from inevitable changes in height and mass, the dwelling type itself would change; No 5 would no longer be a single storey bungalow, it would be a 2-storey house. The altered positions of the ridge and eaves would be simple expressions of the change and would starkly differ from those of all the other dwellings in the street. The development would not as such complement the streetscene in Redan Close, in relation to which No 5 would appear wholly incongruous.
9. The fact that a very loose relationship would exist between No 5 and the dwellings to its rear would not alter the adverse effect identified above. Nor does the fact that one of the 2-storey dwellings to the rear neighbours a single storey bungalow. This is because the streetscene in Wharncliff Road differs from that in Redan Close.
10. Cited provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) relating to new homes are not relevant as the development would not provide a new home. Though the Framework supports the efficient use of land, this is set within the context of the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character. In this case, as set out above, the relevant 'area' is Redan Close, whose character would not be maintained. For much the same reasons the development draws no support from design policies set out within the Framework.
11. The submissions reference Section 38(6) of Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). However, this does not apply to Prior Approvals given that the principle of development is already established through the grant of permission by the GPDO. No development plan policies were cited in the decision notice, insofar as development plan policies have been otherwise referenced, these do not lead me to a different view of the acceptability of the scheme.
12. I therefore conclude that the effect of the development on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse would be unacceptable.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Benjamin Webb

INSPECTOR