



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: 19 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/23/3317066

78 Sherwood Avenue, Poole, Dorset BH14 8DL

- 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 Lorraine Lee-Benson against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref: APP/22/01424/F, dated 13 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is to remove roof and add 2 storey extension and extension to rear.
-

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.

Reasons

3. No.78 is a modest, detached bungalow sited to the north side of Sherwood Avenue on the brow of the hill. The neighbouring bungalow, No.76, has accommodation within its roof and on the other side is a two-storey property with a balcony to the front. The properties along Sherwood Avenue vary in scale and design and as noted by the appellant there is a transition taking place with several, including the neighbour (No.80), having been reconfigured and a more contemporary appearance introduced. Nonetheless the properties, both those in their original and revised forms, generally have pitched roofs, with a gabled or hipped end to the road which creates a rhythm and spacing between the properties. Additionally, whilst there are some variations, the height generally follows the topography with a gradual stepping of the roofs up the hill.
4. The proposal would create a modern three-storey property with a flat roof. Whilst the upper floor would be set back there would be a significant increase in the height and scale of the property. The west elevation would be positioned up to the boundary and would extend some distance beyond the rear elevation of No.76 with a first-floor terrace proposed on the single-storey projection. To the other side, the two/three-storey facades would be positioned a limited distance from the boundary. As a result, the building would span the width of the plot and would have a substantial mass and presence.

5. The architectural style reflects the angular and flat roof form of properties nearby along Whitecliff Road and Daylesford Close. However, in the context of the linear alignment and mix of chalet-style properties and bungalows along Sherwood Avenue, I consider that the cuboid form together with the height and scale of the building would visually jar. I recognise that the character of the area is evolving with the establishment of more individual and larger properties. A contemporary palette of materials and features is also exhibited on several properties nearby. Nevertheless, due to the topography and juxtaposition with the neighbours, the extent of the increase in height would be dominant in the street scene.
6. I acknowledge that the National Planning Policy Framework indicates that planning decisions should, amongst other things, not prevent or discourage innovation or change. It is also clear from the appellant's reference to numerous other contemporary schemes that the Council supports such approaches, particularly in this area. Nonetheless, each proposal must be considered on its own merits. In this case, I agree with the Council that it would be a visually intrusive development that would insufficiently integrate with its setting.
7. Consequently, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Thus, it would therefore fail to accord with the requirements of Policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan which requires a good standard of design that reflects or enhances local patterns of development and neighbouring buildings in terms of layout and siting, built site coverage, height and scale, bulk and massing and visual impact.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR