



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2023

by Nick Davies BSc(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/22/3303981

5 Floral Farm, Wimborne BH21 3AT

- 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 & Mrs John Bassinder against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref APP/22/00420/F, dated 29 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension above existing garage to form new bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor extension above existing garage to form new bedroom at 5 Floral Farm, Wimborne BH21 3AT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref APP/22/00420/F, dated 29 March 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1211-PLAN-01 – Existing Elevations; 1211-PLAN-02 Rev. A - Proposed Elevations; 1211-PLAN-03 – Existing Layouts; 1211-PLAN-03.1 – Existing Roof Layout; 1211-PLAN-04 Rev. A - Proposed Layouts; 1211-PLAN-05 - Location & Block Plans; 1211-PLAN-04.1 Rev. A - Proposed Roof Layout.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within a residential estate comprising largely of brick-built houses and bungalows with concrete tiled roofs. The development is of low-density with the dwellings set well back from the roads behind open plan front gardens, and areas of open space. The dwellings in the immediate vicinity are generally large, two-storey buildings, on spacious plots, and are prominent in the street scene due to the general absence of boundary enclosure to the road frontages. There is no particular sense of local distinctiveness in the

architectural design of the dwellings and, overall, the estate has a rather ubiquitous suburban appearance and character.

4. No 5 is one of a row of three similar houses that are set well back from the road, behind level lawned front gardens. They all have gables facing the road and flat-roofed garages to the side that are recessed well back from the front of the building. The appeal property is on a corner, with a larger plot, and has a wider, double garage, similar to several others close by. The general scale, design and materials of the house are typical of the estate, and it sits comfortably in its surroundings.
5. The proposed first floor extension would cover the entire footprint of the garage, and would have a pitched roof integrated into that of the existing house. There is already an extant planning permission for a first-floor extension over the garage and, whilst I have not been provided with details of its design, it is described by the Council as similar. The evidence indicates that the permitted scheme involves an extension that would be set 1.2 metres in from the side wall of the garage, resulting in seven square metres less floorspace than now proposed. The appellant contends that the approved scheme would require steel supports that would be costly, and would compromise space in the garage below. Nevertheless, there is a more than theoretical possibility that the existing permission would be implemented if I were to dismiss this appeal. It is, therefore, a genuine fallback position, so carries substantial weight in my decision.
6. The extension now proposed would reflect the architectural style and detailing of the existing house and those surrounding it, and it would be constructed in similar external materials. As it would be set well back from the front façade of the host dwelling, with a slightly lower ridge line, its visual impact would be subservient. It would be a significant extension, but it would not involve any additional site coverage. Furthermore, in an area characterised by large, detached properties, its height and scale would not be disproportionate to its context. In these regards, the proposal would accord with the requirements of Policy PP27(1) and (2) of the Poole Local Plan (November 2018) (the Local Plan).
7. The Council contends that the siting, height, mass, and scale of the extension would appear unduly prominent in the street scene. However, its siting over the existing garage would be the same as the permitted extension. Its height would be a little lower than the existing house, and commensurate with that of surrounding properties. It would, of course, be visible from the road, but, being set back behind the front gable, it would be hidden when approaching the site from the northwest. It would also be obscured by foliage when approaching from the southeast. As with the permitted extension, therefore, it would only be readily visible in close views from in front of the house and from Hill Terrace.
8. Viewed from immediately in front of the site, the extension would be set back from the front gable of the house, with a roof sloping away from the road. The existing gable would, therefore, remain the visually predominant element of the overall building. Furthermore, the visual presence of the extension would be reduced, to some extent, by the lean-to canopy roof over the garage door, which would break up the apparent mass of this elevation. It would also be

approximately 18 metres back from the pavement. Consequently, it would not appear overly prominent in the street scene.

9. The side and rear of the extension would be readily visible from Hill Terrace. However, its design would reflect the existing house and the similar neighbouring properties, so it would assimilate comfortably into its surroundings. The two-storey side wall would be set approximately a metre off the boundary and its roof would slope away, so it would not be unduly dominant. The modest increase in the width of the extension over the approved scheme would not significantly alter its prominence in the street scene.
10. For these reasons, I find that the proposed extension would be compatible in scale and design to the existing and surrounding properties. Consequently, it would be an unremarkable addition that would not be overly prominent in the street scene. I therefore conclude that there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the area. As a result, the development would accord with Policy PP27 of the Local Plan, which seeks to ensure a good standard of design in all new developments, including extensions to existing buildings.

Conditions

11. In accordance with the legislation, I have imposed a condition limiting the period within which the development must commence. I have also included a condition specifying the relevant plans, as this provides certainty. In the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the area, a condition is also necessary to ensure that the extension is constructed in matching materials. Neither party has suggested that any other conditions would be necessary.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Davies

INSPECTOR