



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2024

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/24/3348113

The Boathouse, 43A Pearce Avenue, Poole, BH14 8EG

- 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 Mr Weston against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is APP/24/00284/F.
 - The development proposed is to extend roof to accommodate loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to extend roof to accommodate loft conversion at The Boathouse, 43A Pearce Avenue, Poole, BH14 8EG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref APP/24/00284/F, 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 approved plans: Drg Nos 22408/001, 22408/101, 22408/102, 22408/01 and 22408/02.
 - 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.
 - 4) The roof extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the rooflight window to the south-east elevation has been fitted with obscured glazing which conforms to or exceeds Pilkington Texture Glass Privacy Level 3 and has been fixed shut. The rooflight shall be retained as installed thereafter.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, formerly an annexe extension to No 43 but now lawfully occupied as an independent unit. It is located within a residential neighbourhood comprising an eclectic mix of predominantly detached houses. The property currently has a hipped roof with a flat crown. The proposal would remodel the roof by increasing the ridge height and changing the

flat section to a full hip roof with the existing eaves level to the building's end, north-east elevation, raised to form a heavily clipped gable. The proposal would also include a dormer window to the front elevation and a single rooflight to the rear over a new stairwell.

4. The existing sub-division of Nos 43 and 43A is irregular. No 43 is the more dominant half, occupying a corner position where Pearce Avenue turns through ninety degrees and with a cross-wing plan form and dual ridge-height with a more dominant two-storey hipped roof projection facing the north-west road frontage. As a result, together with the obvious subdivision of the two occupancies, the elevation of the building as a whole facing Pearce Avenue in this direction is wide and already unbalanced. Despite this, it sits comfortable as a building of individual style amongst the wider area's very mixed appearance.
5. The appeal proposal would undeniably change the appearance of No 43A. Its increased roof ridge height would step above the ridge to the more subservient wing of No 43 by around 0.7m, rising to an apex. Together with the gabled dormer to the front, the proportions of 43A would change to have a more vertical emphasis. This would not be uncharacteristic locally, where amongst the mix, some dwellings along Pearce Avenue overtly display similar proportions.
6. The new ridge height to 43A would be slightly taller than the ridge height of the more dominant wing to No 43, but not significantly so. Moreover, the property would remain proportionate as an obvious two-storey dwelling. The dormer would merely reflect a variety of similar features seen locally, where accommodation within roof voids at second floor level is obvious to some properties. Its size and alignment would be comfortable within the roofscape and balanced with the fenestration pattern below.
7. The individual nature of each part of the semi-detached pair would become more exaggerated, but I am unable to detect any particular harm that would result. Given the building's existing arrangement and its unique form and appearance, I find the change would merely create an alternative version of an individually styled building. This would simply add to the area's existing mix in a manner that would reflect the local development pattern without harm to its character or appearance. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would display the quality of design that is required by Policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan, adopted in 2018.

Other Matters

8. I have taken note of further comments received from neighbouring and nearby residents. The roof to 43A would maintain its existing pitch, and despite the close relationship between the appeal property and 45 Pearce Avenue, which lies to the south-east, I share the Council's view that the raised height would not significantly increase the building's mass or bulk when seen from this immediately adjoining property. For the same reason, and due also to the setting and orientation of these two dwellings in relation to each other, there would be no loss of daylight or sunlight that would harmfully impact the neighbour's living conditions.
9. I saw the presence of a first-floor window to the right-hand corner of the south-east elevation of No 43A, which is not shown on the planning application drawings. I do not know the background to this. Neither is it a matter that is before me as part of this appeal. However, I recognise the potential for looking towards the first-floor

balcony and immediately adjoining bedroom windows at No 45 from the proposed rooflight. Any potential loss of privacy could be avoided by imposing a condition that would require the glazing to be obscurely glazed and fixed shut.

10. The appeal property is adjacent to two trees that are covered by Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) on neighbouring plots at both 41 Pearce Avenue (TPO 83/2001) and 45 Pearce Avenue (TPO 374). The first, a Scots Pine to the front of No 41, has a very limited canopy spread over a front corner of the appeal site which is hardstand and in front of a large outbuilding, understood to be used as an annex for holiday lets. The second is an Oak to the rear garden of No 45 and set behind the annex building at the appeal site. I share the Council's view that the proposed works would be sufficiently distant from any trees to avoid harm.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested some conditions in the event of the appeal succeeding. I have considered these in light of advice in the Planning Practice Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.
12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to ensure that the development is finished in materials to match the existing dwelling. To safeguard the living conditions at No 45 I have imposed a condition to control the glazing within the proposed new rooflight but in an alternatively worded form to that suggested by the Council.
13. Given the domestic scale of the proposed development, the distance of the nearby protected trees, and the existing development and surfaces nearest to them within the curtilage of the appeal site, I am satisfied that measures to protect their crown spreads or root systems would be unnecessary.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR