



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 May 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/23/3316844

4 Regent Drive, Bournemouth, BH7 7RW

- 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 Mike Kibble against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref: 7-2022-19036-A, dated 1 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey rear extension and single-storey side extension to existing dwelling with conversion of existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the host property.

Reasons

3. No.4 is part of a large residential estate of properties of a similar style, it is sited facing Harewood Crescent but is served by a shared driveway off Regent Drive. It occupies a prominent position at the entrance to Regent Drive and the upper part of the rear elevation is visible in views along the road. To the side of the attached garage is an open grass area up to the footpath which effectively aligns with the driveways of the properties to the rear. In line with the Council's position, I agree that the setback and these areas of soft landscaping positively contribute to the visual amenities of the area and are part of the planned layout of the estate.
4. The proposal would create a two-storey rear extension together with a single-storey element which would extend across the rear of the garage, which is to be converted, and project to the side. This would infill the space up to the new boundary wall to be positioned on the back edge of the footpath. This enclosure would disrupt the openness to the side of the property with the projecting extension and extensive length of wall being visually intrusive in the street scene.
5. The appellant has referred to other walls sited close to a road, but their locations are not identified. From what I saw on my site visit these appear to be generally located along Harewood Crescent which is the main spine road through the estate and has a different relationship with the adjacent

properties. Moreover, each case is to be considered on its own merits. The proposed boundary and side extension to No.4 would restrict views along Regent Drive and would be at odds with the wider pattern of development. Whilst the appellant has suggested that the boundary wall could be lowered, or different materials used, this would not address the harm derived from the siting and the loss of the landscape buffer which contributes to the character of the area.

6. Both the single-storey and two-storey extensions are designed with a flat roof which would restrict their bulk. However, with the height of the two-storey extension sitting above the existing eaves line, it would be an incongruous and notable addition which would fail to integrate with the existing property.
7. In conclusion, I find that collectively the design and siting of the alterations would not respect the character and appearance of the local area and would be harmful to the host property. The development would therefore conflict with Policy CS41 of the adopted Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) as well as the provisions of the Residential Extension guide (2008) and the National Planning Policy Framework all of which, amongst other matters, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Other matters

8. I understand that the grass verge is owned and maintained by the appellant, however privately owned amenity spaces around properties are not uncommon in modern estates and its ownership does not alter my findings.

Conclusion

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

G Ellis

INSPECTOR