



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2024 by R Dickson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/24/3351318

72 Hurn Way, Christchurch BH23 2PD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Bernard M Radley against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is 8/23/0092/HOU.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey rear extension to include mansard roof. Raise eaves and roof to form 1st floor accommodation to include 1.5 storey extension to south side with gable. Outbuilding added as shown in uploaded revised location and block plan plus details of building description).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development differs between the application form and the decision notice. The description I have used in the banner above is from the decision notice which is more concise. I have excluded the superfluous reference to the previous planning approval.

Main Issue

4. The proposed development consists of alterations to the existing dwelling and the construction of an outbuilding. The Council considers that the proposals that relate to the existing dwelling are acceptable in terms of design, and these already have permission, which was granted in 2022. However, the Council does not support the proposed garage. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed outbuilding on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site, 72 Hurn Way, comprises a bungalow on a relatively large plot. There is an existing shed within the rear garden which would be removed, with the proposed outbuilding sitting in the same place. The outbuilding would be gabled to the front and rear. Despite being situated behind the dwelling, the rear garden is highly visible from Hurn Way, owing to a vacant plot adjacent to

- the site. While I understand that this plot benefits from a separate planning permission, I have made my assessment based on the situation before me.
6. Hurn Way is a residential street with a verdant character. No 72 is one of many bungalows on the street. However, there are a number of larger dwellings within Hurn Way. The dwellings appear to be of varying age, with many having been modernised. The front and the rear garden at the appeal site are highly visible from Hurn Way, creating a visual openness. This is in contrast to other properties, some of which are not as open to views within the street scene when compared to the appeal site and are gated with taller front boundary treatments.
 7. The outbuilding to the rear of the dwelling would, from the road, appear to be of a similar scale to the existing bungalow. It would be highly prominent from the road, as the open nature of the site would offer little screening. The plans submitted show that the first floor of the outbuilding would have sufficient room for standing, suggesting that the overall structure would be of a substantial height, particularly compared to the host dwelling. As such, it would be a noticeably large addition to the rear garden which would not integrate harmoniously within the street scene. There are other outbuildings in neighbouring gardens, however these appear to be significantly smaller than the proposed outbuilding and are not similar to the large addition proposed in this appeal.
 8. I understand the existing shed is difficult to detect from the road, however it is considerably lower in height than the proposed outbuilding. It also has a different relationship with the host dwelling, as it is only one storey and has a much smaller footprint than that proposed. As such, it is recessive in character, compared with the proposal which would be notably more dominant.
 9. The existing dwelling already has planning permission, gained in 2021¹, which would increase the height of the bungalow, as well as its overall scale and massing. During my site visit there was no apparent evidence of work having started on site. Even if the bungalow were to be updated in line with the approved plans, I have not been provided with evidence to suggest that the increased height of the bungalow would balance the height and scale of the proposed outbuilding. Therefore, even if the bungalow were to be extended, the proposed outbuilding would still have an unacceptable impact on the street scene.
 10. There is another example of a larger outbuilding at 80 Hurn Way which is set in the rear garden behind a larger two storey dwelling. The outbuilding at No 80 is seen in a different context to the appeal site, as its host dwelling is considerably larger, which diminishes the overall impact of the outbuilding. As such, it is difficult to compare the two, which are considerably different in terms of their impact on the character and appearance of the area. The appellant directs me to a garage at No 82, which appears to be considerably smaller than that proposed, and as such, is not comparable to the two storey outbuilding proposed.
 11. Accordingly, the proposal would be a dominant and incongruous addition to the rear garden of the host dwelling which would be an obtrusive addition within the street scene. As such it would harm the character and appearance of the

¹ Local Authority reference number 8/21/0990

area, and would be contrary to Policies HE2 and H12 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy (2014), which seek to ensure that development is permitted where it is compatible with or improves its surroundings in terms of design and scale within the locality.

Other Matters

12. I have had regard for other developments in the area, particularly the retirement village to the rear of the appeal site. I could not see any evidence that this had been commenced during my site visit. I have therefore made an assessment on the situation before me and have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

R Dickson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR