



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: 10 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/24/3349876

42 De Lisle Road, Bournemouth, BH3 7NG

- 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 Carl Dillon against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is 7-2024-29186.
 - The development proposed is extensions and works to include ground floor extension to side and rear of existing dwelling, first floor extensions. New front porch. Extensions to provide pitched roof with vaulted ceiling to ground floor with velux windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The planning application form contained a lengthy description of the proposal. The banner heading above uses a more concise version of the wording, as was given by the Council on their decision notice. This accurately describes the proposed works.
3. The decision notice clearly stated that planning permission was refused for the proposed works but did not amplify upon the reason for the refusal. Nevertheless, the officer's report, which informed the decision, gave a clearly stated reason for refusal and identified conflict with the development plan and national planning policy. Despite the contents of the decision notice, I am satisfied that the applicant was in no doubt why planning permission had been refused. This is further evidenced by their appeal submissions, which clearly address the main issues, as I have identified them below.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effects of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area, and upon the living conditions at 44 De Lisle Road and 26 Stokewood Road, with particular regard to visual impact, daylight, and sunlight.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey, detached dwelling within a residential suburban neighbourhood comprising principally detached homes of similar age and form. No 42 is currently unextended. It is separated from its common side boundary

with No 44 to the west by the width of a pedestrian access. To the opposite side is a gated side driveway which leads to a detached garage to the rear of the dwelling. The garage sits close to the plot's eastern boundary which is shared in common with the rear boundaries of Nos 26 and 26A Stokewood Road. This garage arrangement is common for other properties to this side of De Lisle Road in the immediate area.

6. The proposal would involve extensions with a T-shaped footprint that would wrap around the side and rear elevations of the property. At first-floor, the full width of the rear elevation of the dwelling would be projected back to a depth of 3m. At ground floor the property would be extended across the full width of the house to just over 6m in depth with a lean-to roof over. This would be linked to a full depth lean-to side extension that would be set just over 0.5m away from the east side boundary and which would project beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling and the 6m deep extension to replace, and extend over the footprint of, the existing garage.
7. When seen from the public domain along De Lisle Road, the majority of the works to the rear of the appeal property would be out of sight. The side addition would appear as a typical, lean-to garage. This would be neither out of keeping nor incongruous within the street scene. However, when viewed from the curtilage of both neighbouring properties (44 De Lisle Road and 26 Stokewood Road), the full scale of the additions would be openly seen from their grounds, where they would engulf and obscure the entirety of the building's rear elevation, and would appear disproportionately large and sprawling, with significant encroachment into the depth of the property's rear garden. This would also be evident from the public domain along Stokewood Road. From here the increased size and built sprawl would be seen through the gap between Nos 26 and 26A as both incongruous in relation to the proportions of the original dwelling and out of keeping with the otherwise common alignment of the two-storey scale of the properties extending along De Lisle Road when viewed from this direction.
8. When observed from the private garden space that is set close to the rear elevation of No 44, the flank wall of the extension would fill the existing void between the commonly aligned rear walls of these neighbouring dwellings and the detached garage building at No 44. I am not persuaded by any substantive evidence to suggest that levels of daylight or sunlight to No 44 would be significantly affected. Neither am I persuaded that the outlook from any windows to habitable spaces would be impacted. Nevertheless, the scale and bulk of the much deeper side elevation to No 42 would impose itself as an overbearing and visually dominant presence within the neighbour's immediately adjoining rear garden setting.
9. I understand that No 26 is occupied as apartments. Nevertheless, space to the north side of the building nearest to the appeal site is used as a private amenity area. The proposed side/rear extension would span the full length of the area between the building at No 26 and the side boundary with 26A. Although this element of the proposal would be single-storey, it would rise above the height of a typical residential garden fence and would impose itself at reasonably close quarters upon the neighbour's already confined outdoor space as a visually intrusive and overbearing means of enclosure.
10. Overall, I find the scale of the proposed enlargement of No 42 would unreasonably dominate the existing dwelling. This would be openly perceived from its surroundings as being out of keeping with, and harmful to the host property and

wider character and appearance of the area. By so doing, the proposal would fail to follow the basic principle of subservience that is part of the guidelines for house extensions contained within the Council's *Residential Extensions – A Design Guide for Householders*, which was adopted as supplementary planning guidance in 2008. In addition, due to the size, siting, and proximity of the extensions to the side boundaries of the appeal site, I find the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of occupiers at 44 De Lisle Road and 26 Stokewood Road. For these reasons there would be conflict with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 as far as it seeks to ensure that all development displays a design quality that respects the site and its surroundings.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has referred to aspects of the proposal that they consider could be constructed as permitted development. I accept that, in isolation, there are various elements that could be added to the appeal property without the need to first obtain planning permission from the local planning authority. There are other elements that may be possible subject to a prior approval application process. However, I have based my decision upon the effects of the entirety of the proposed works. There is nothing before me to suggest that the effect of any works that may be undertaken as permitted development would be directly comparable to the appeal proposal.
12. I understand the appellant's desire to improve the living space at the appeal property to meet their family's needs, but this does not alter my findings.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR