



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/23/3317982

175 Cranleigh Road, Bournemouth, BH6 5JZ

- 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 Brian Mitchinson against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref: 7-2022-28776, dated 19 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a carport.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The carport is substantially complete; therefore, this is a retrospective proposal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on - i) the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of No.173 Cranleigh Road and the host property.

Reason

Character and Appearance

4. The detached chalet bungalow with a garage to the side is set back from the road. The frontage formed of a shingled forecourt is predominantly used for parking and is enclosed by low boundary walls. The properties along Cranleigh Road vary in scale and design, however, they follow a similar alignment with an open frontage which provides a sense of spaciousness. There are instances of taller boundary treatments and landscaping but structures beyond the front building line are not a defining feature of the area.
5. The erected carport is a timber structure with a faux tiled pitched roof. Whilst subservient in scale, sited towards the front of the plot and orientated parallel to the road it extends in front of the property and is an uncharacteristic and visually prominent feature within the street scene.
6. There is an existing bin store structure to the front of the block of flats at No.171 and the neighbouring property, No.177, operates as a day nursery and has a higher boundary fence, signage and other elements associated with the

use within the frontage. These properties therefore have different functions and while the bin store is a notable frontage feature it is an anomaly. Nonetheless, as acknowledged by the appellant overall these features are relatively minor and do not materially alter the prevailing residential character of the area.

7. In contrast, the carport is a larger, more significant structure, which obscures views of the bungalow including its entrance. The visual intrusion is accentuated by the contrasting materials and the property's setting is dominated by parking. The carport is also seen from several vantage points as the property is located close to where a number of roads merge. The appellant has suggested that the timber sides could be removed and whilst this would result in a more open structure, it would still be an incongruous feature interrupting the established pattern of development and appearance of the property.
8. Consequently, I find the siting and form of the development out of keeping with the character of the area contrary to Policy CS41 of the Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) as well as the provisions of the adopted Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders (2008) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). Together these seek to ensure that developments are well-designed and of high quality, respect the site and its surroundings, respond to local distinctiveness, and contribute positively to the appearance of the public realm.

Living Conditions

9. The carport will be visible from within the host property and at an oblique angle from the neighbouring property, No.173, however, there is sufficient separation for it not to have an overbearing or overly intrusive impact. As such, I do not find that the change to the outlook would unduly harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the host or neighbouring property. In that regard, I do not find the proposal would conflict with the aspect of Policy CS41 in relation to protecting the amenities of future occupants and neighbouring residents.

Other matters

10. The appellant explains the reason for the carport is to provide a cover to protect their car from nearby street trees. I understand the additional maintenance that may necessitate and the frustrations with attempts to get the trees pruned. However, the property does have an existing garage and a sizable parking area, and I do not find these are matters which outweigh the public harm to the character of the area from the siting of the carport.

Conclusion

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

G Ellis

INSPECTOR