



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2022

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/22/3307356

309 Verity Crescent, Poole, BH17 8UB

- 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 Mrs E Bliss against the decision of BCP Council.
 - The application Ref. APP/22/00465/F, dated 30 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is retrospective application to retain wooden bike shed on the front forecourt.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's second reason for refusal contends that the Appellant failed to provide additional information that was necessary in their view to enable proper consideration of the proposal. The Appellant states that the application was drafted following discussions with a Planning Officer on the type of information that would be required to support the proposal. That information includes a location plan, photographs, dimensions and details of the materials used in the construction of the proposed bike shed. I am satisfied that these details, together with the fact that the bike shed has already been constructed and can be viewed on site, are sufficient to enable an assessment of the impact of the proposal. I have proceeded to determine the appeal on this basis.
3. The Appellant has also raised concerns over the handling of the application particularly after the Council's request for additional information. This is not a matter that I can comment on in the context of this appeal and in the first instance is an issue that the Appellant should take up directly with the Council.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a two storey semi-detached property on the southern side of Verity Crescent. The host property is set back from the road with an open frontage that is predominantly used for parking, enclosed, in part, by a low boundary wall. The surrounding area comprises an estate of similar semi and detached properties, including some chalet style bungalows.

Combined, they form an attractive estate where most of the frontages (front forecourts) are set aside for parking, with low boundary fencing/walls or landscaping.

6. The appeal proposal seeks planning permission for a single storey detached timber bike shed sited within the frontage to the appeal site. The bike shed has already been constructed and planning permission is therefore sought retrospectively for its retention.
7. The fact that the host property and other properties within the surrounding area are set back from the road provides in my view a sense of openness that contributes positively to the character of the area. As I confirmed above, most frontages are set aside for parking, but are otherwise open and do not contain any similar sheds or outbuildings. Whilst I accept that some driveways are used to park mobile homes and caravans, my attention has not been drawn to any comparable permanent outbuildings within the frontages to other properties in the area.
8. Within the above context, I agree with the Council that the siting, scale and height of the proposed bike shed results in an uncharacteristic and visually prominent feature within the streetscene. As such, the proposal is out of keeping and detracts from the open character of this part of the estate. Whilst outside storage containers or boxes are sometimes found within such locations, these are normally acceptable as they are small scale and discrete. The opposite is the case with the proposal, whose scale, footprint and height are in my view excessive and more reflective of a medium sized shed that you would expect to find in a rear garden but not on the frontage to a property, as proposed
9. I accept that the light colouring (stain) to the wood is similar to the colour of the existing brickwork on the host property and that this assists in mitigating its impact to a certain extent. Similarly, that landscaping could also mitigate its impact. Even so, there is no landscaping scheme before me and I am not convinced that a such a scheme would provide any meaningful screening or could be accommodated within the existing parking layout. I also note that the proposal allows electric bikes to be stored safely and supports the use of cycling. However, none of these considerations affect the findings I have reached or outweigh the harm to the character of the surrounding area.
10. Accordingly, I find that the proposed wooden bike shed would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area contrary to policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan (November 2018). This policy seeks, amongst other requirements, to ensure that new development respects and relates well to existing buildings and maintains and, where possible, enhances those details that contribute positively to local character.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having taken all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR