



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2024

by Nick Davies BSc(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/W/23/3335256

62 Allenview Road, Wimborne Minster, Dorset BH21 1AU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO).
 - The appeal is made by Mr John Pullen against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref is P/PAED/2023/04686.
 - The development proposed is an additional storey added to existing dwelling to provide bedroom accommodation and bathrooms together with associated internal alterations to existing ground floor to provide staircase access to new first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. Subject to a number of qualifying criteria, paragraph AA of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the GPDO grants planning permission for the enlargement of a one storey dwellinghouse consisting of the construction of one additional storey, immediately above the topmost storey of the dwellinghouse, together with any engineering operations reasonably necessary for the purpose of that construction. Paragraph AA.1 sets out the circumstances in which development is not permitted by Class AA. The council does not dispute that the proposal would be permitted development against the criteria in AA.1.
3. Paragraph AA.2 requires developers to apply to the local planning authority for prior approval as to a range of matters in (3) (a) (i) to (iv). The council's reason for refusal indicates that it refused prior approval solely under the matter described in (3) (a) (ii), which is the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, including the design and architectural features of the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, and any side elevation of the dwellinghouse that fronts a highway.
4. Therefore, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

Reasons

5. 62 Allenview Road lies in an extensive residential area comprising traditionally designed dwellings, largely constructed in brick with tiled roofs. Many of the roads have grass verges, and the buildings are generally set back behind landscaped front gardens, which gives the area a pleasant suburban character. In the wider area there is a mixture of bungalows and two-storey houses, but

the appeal property is one of a discrete group of four bungalows that front Allenvue Road between its junctions with Lacy Drive and Cheriton Way. Whilst they are not of identical design, they are built in the same materials with similar architectural detailing, and they are all L-shaped, with low-pitched gables facing the road and on a similar alignment. Consequently, they form a well-balanced and coherent group in the street scene.

6. Whilst the four bungalows are seen as a distinct group, they are also part of a wider street scene that is composed almost entirely of single storey dwellings, including all of the buildings on both sides of Allenvue Road to the south, as far as its junction with Byron Road. The dwellings in Cheriton Way and River Close that are visible from the appeal site are also low-level bungalows. The only two-storey properties that can be seen from the immediate surroundings of the appeal site are isolated examples, some distance away, in Lacy Drive and opposite the Byron Way junction. As a result, when viewed from the pavement opposite the appeal site, the wider street scene is very much characterised by low-profile buildings that sit unobtrusively behind grass verges and planted gardens.
7. The proposal would result in the appeal property being a full storey higher than the three other bungalows in the row. When viewed from the road in front of the site, the marked difference in ridge heights would be stark. The external appearance of the resultant building would be overly dominant within this visually discreet and intimate row of buildings. It would be an incongruous feature in the street scene that would harmfully disrupt the balance and coherence of this group of bungalows.
8. When viewed in a wider context, from the north, the existing bungalow is seen as part of a wide expanse of similar buildings, where there is a consistency of ridge heights, resulting in a visually harmonious roofscape. The additional storey would result in the external appearance of the building being inconsistent with the prevailing height and form of the neighbouring properties. It would be a strident feature, which would not be sympathetic to the existing character of the area and would not assimilate well into its surroundings.
9. In wider views from the south, the higher rooflines in Lacy Drive are just visible behind the appeal site. Consequently, the uniformity of the roofscape is not quite so apparent. Nevertheless, the additional storey would still be a prominent and unexpected feature in the street scene that would appear entirely discordant with the surrounding development.
10. The appellant's evidence includes photographs of examples in the general area where bungalows and houses can be seen in juxtaposition. However, I note that these are largely some distance from the appeal site, in locations where there is not such a consistency of building form. They do not, therefore, alter my conclusion that the appeal scheme would result in the external appearance of the dwelling being prominent and discordant, with an overly dominant presence in the street scene that would be incompatible with the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
11. Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework aims to achieve well-designed and beautiful places. Paragraph 135 says that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. For

the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal scheme would fail to meet these aims.

Conclusion

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

Nick Davies

INSPECTOR