



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2022

by R E Jones BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/22/3301184

69 Johnston Road, Poole BH15 3HS

- 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 D Bartlett against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref APP/22/00282/F, dated 2 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Form single storey extension to front'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 71 Johnston Road, with particular reference to outlook; and
 - the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. The adjoining semi-detached dwelling at No 71 has a front ground floor window close to the side boundary with the appeal dwelling. The window faces a spacious front garden and driveway, while an existing low boundary wall separating the two properties would be visible from the room the window serves.
4. The proposed extension would adjoin a new side boundary wall and project around 3.6m from the front elevation. The extension's immediacy to the neighbouring window combined with its length, height and bulk would have an oppressive and overwhelming visual impact from the room served by the window. Because of this unreasonable level of enclosure, a harmful loss of outlook would be experienced by those neighbouring occupiers.
5. The appellant refers to the room most effected having a dual aspect, while the open aspect in front of the neighbouring window would maintain good levels of outlook. However, these points do not overcome the proposal's dominating effect upon occupiers within the room, as it would be difficult to ignore the extension's presence in views looking towards the street.

6. Comparisons have been made between the proposal and the front extension at No 67 regarding the relationship with a neighbouring window. Yet, that extension does not protrude to the same extent as the proposal, while it has a different scale and roof profile. Accordingly, the two schemes are not similar or directly comparable and I give this matter little weight.
7. On the above basis the proposal would harm the living conditions of No 71 Johnston Road, with particular reference to their outlook. The development would fail to accord with Policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan (November 2018) which, amongst other things, seeks to prevent harmful development that is overbearing or oppressive upon the amenity of residents.

Character and appearance

8. The area surrounding the appeal site is residential in character with a street scene formed mainly of semi-detached and terrace properties set back from the highway. Many of the dwellings in the area have been altered at the front by a variety of extensions, porches and conservatories.
9. The proposed extension's front elevation would have a gabled roof profile where it faces the street. The roof's shallow roof pitch would visibly jar with the steeper angle and profile of the main dwelling's gable and pitch roof. This would contrast with most of the front additions along the street, which have single pitch roofs that neatly align with the profile of the host dwellings. With a wider, more expansive roof the proposal would appear incongruous in the street. Moreover, the extension's overall width and projection from the front elevation is excessive and dominates the dwelling's front elevation. It would be visible from the street and appear unacceptably bulky and discordant in contrast to the other additions I saw which were generally smaller in scale.
10. My attention has been drawn to what the appellant feels are comparable front additions in the locality.
11. In the case of No 67, at 3m, that extension is shorter in depth, while its scale has also been broken up by a short set back at one end. It has a less bulky single pitch roof profile that is consistent with the host dwelling. The extensions at Nos 11, 24, 27, 33, 35, 37, 42, 44, 48, 50, 56, 64, 70 and 75 Johnston Road are smaller compared to the appeal scheme. Those schemes do not extend as much across the frontage or have an outward projection as excessive as the proposal. In addition, they incorporate roofs which are largely single pitch and less bulky in profile. Accordingly, I consider the examples are not directly comparable with the appeal before me and I have given those cases little weight.
12. Therefore, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such it would be contrary to Policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan (November 2018), which seeks, amongst other things, for schemes to reflect and enhance local development patterns in terms of height, scale, bulk, massing, detailing and visual impact.

Other Matters

13. The proposal would benefit the appellants by increasing the amount of internal living space, whilst being in an accessible location close to shops and services. These are matters that would be consistent with the sustainable development aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Nevertheless, those benefits would not outweigh the proposal's adverse effect on neighbouring living conditions and the character of the surrounding area. Besides, more space at the property could be created in a less harmful way.

14. I note the commitment to construct the extension in materials to match the host dwelling. This would be an expectation of the development plan policies which seek to protect local character and appearance, therefore weighs neutrally in the proposal's favour.

Conclusion

15. Taking the above reasons into account and the other matters raised including the Framework, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

RE Jones

INSPECTOR